

SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

SHORELINE MASTER PROGRAM / CODE AMENDMENT

A. Background

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable:

City of Monroe Shoreline Master Program Periodic Review, Shoreline Regulations Update, and Critical Areas Regulations Update

2. Name of applicant:

City of Monroe (City)

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

Ben Swanson, Community Development Director
Anita Marrero, Senior Planner
City of Monroe Community Development
806 West Main Street, Monroe, WA 98272

360-863-4544 | (360) 863-4513

4. Date checklist prepared:

March 25, 2019

5. Agency requesting checklist:

City of Monroe

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

The City's Planning Commission will review the Shoreline Master Program (SMP) revisions on Monday, April 22, 2019 during a public hearing. This public hearing will fulfill the Department of Ecology's requirements for a joint review and comment period. The City Council is tentatively scheduled to discuss the SMP at an initial meeting in May of 2019 and adopt the Final SMP by Ordinance before June 30, 2019.

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

Periodic review of the City's Shoreline Master Program is required every eight years in accordance with RCW 90.58.080.

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

City of Monroe SMP Periodic Review Checklist (see Appendix A)

City of Monroe SMP City-Initiated Update Matrix (see Appendix B)

City of Monroe Codified Shoreline Regulations, and Critical Areas Regulations (Appendix C)

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.

No pending applications or governmental approvals within the city limits would be affected by the SMP periodic review amendments.

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

The proposed SMP will need the following approvals:

- State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) review and threshold determination for non-project actions;
- City Council adoption; and
- Washington State Department of Ecology approval (RCW 90.58.090).

Approval of findings of final ordinance and amendments by the Monroe City Council.

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

In 2003, the Shoreline Management Act (SMA), chapter 90.58 RCW, was amended to require cities to regularly update their SMP. For the City of Monroe, RCW 90.58.080(2) requires the City to review and update its SMP on or before June 30, 2019, and then once every eight years after the date of approval by the Department of Ecology, the regulatory body in charge of overseeing the periodic review.

The purpose of the statutorily-mandated periodic review is to assure that the City's SMP complies with the SMA and its implementing guidelines, WAC 173-26 to 173-27, and to assure consistency of the SMP with the City of Monroe's comprehensive plan and development regulations adopted under the Growth Management Act (GMA), chapter 36.70A RCW, and other local requirements. Proposed changes to the City's SMP fall primarily into two categories: those required by the Department of Ecology to incorporate changes in state guidance since the SMP was adopted in 2008 (see Appendix A Periodic Review Checklist), and those recommended by the City, primarily to update use standards and shoreline environment designations consistent with the City's 2015-2035 Comprehensive Plan (December 2015) and recently acquired and master-planned park/open space areas (see Appendix B

Matrix), and to integrate the City's Critical Areas Ordinance by reference (which was most recently updated in 2017) into the SMP.

The Department of Ecology developed a SMP Periodic Review Checklist for jurisdictions conducting their periodic review that provides guidance on amendments to state law, rules, and applicable guidance adopted between 2007 and 2017. The reviewed and completed City of Monroe periodic review checklist is included as Appendix A to this SEPA checklist.

RCW 90.58.090(4) and RCW 36.70A.480(3) requires SMPs to provide for management of designated critical areas located within shorelines of the state. The 2008 SMP incorporates critical areas standards directly into the SMP, such that critical areas protections within shoreline jurisdiction are different than those that apply in other areas of the City. Critical areas protections that apply outside of shoreline jurisdiction were most recently updated in 2017 (Ordinance 022/2017, codified currently as MMC Chapter 20.05). The current SMP update will integrate critical areas standards by reference, primarily incorporating the standards in MMC Chapter 20.05, with some focused additional updates and exclusions consistent with Ecology's most recent guidelines. Updating the SMP to integrate the critical areas standards by reference will improve consistency of standards across Monroe, and ease understanding and implementation moving forward.

The SMP code revisions identified in the Periodic Review Checklist and incorporated 2017 CAO code revisions are included as Appendix C to this SEPA checklist.

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

The SMP periodic review is a non-project action that affects activities, uses, and developments within the shoreline jurisdiction. Shoreline jurisdiction within the city of Monroe includes:

- Woods Creek,
- Skykomish River,
- Tye Stormwater Facility (Lake Tye), and
- Associated upland areas (shorelands) that are landward 200-feet of the OHWM from these three shorelines, as well as associated wetlands and associated floodplains as required by RCW 90.58.030.

The shoreline jurisdiction associated with the Skykomish River and Woods Creek extends across the southeast portion of Monroe city limits, and the shoreline jurisdiction associated with Lake Tye extends along the western city limits to the south of State Route 2.

B. Environmental Elements

1. Earth

a. General description of the site:

(circle one): Flat, rolling, hilly, steep slopes, mountainous, other _____

The City's shoreline areas are characterized by low-lying floodplains extending from the Skykomish River, Woods Creek, and Lake Tye shorelines. Most of these low-lying areas consist of City-owned park and open space areas. The Skykomish River channel is wide and generally shallow, with dynamic shifts in gravel/sediment bar locations and channel alignment. Lake Tye itself is a 42-acre man-made stormwater lake that is approximately 30 feet deep, constructed primarily to provide stormwater detention and to alleviate flooding in surrounding floodplain areas.

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

Within the southern portion of the City's shoreline jurisdiction near 17th Ave SE and just outside of the northern portion of the City's shoreline area near Rivermont Ave there are steep slopes with a percent rise of 40% or greater (City of Monroe, 2015).

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 City of Monroe has a large range of soil types. The Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) indicates that the shoreline areas around Lake Tye has soil types classified as Bellingham silty clay loam, Puget silty clay loam and Terric medisaprists.

The area in the shoreline area around Woods Creek and the Skykomish contains soils that are classified as Kitsap silt loam, 25 to 50 percent slopes, Pilchuck loamy sand, pits, Puyallup fine sandy loam, Riverwash, Sultan silt loam and Urban land.

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

The slopes located at the northern and southern ends of the City's shoreline jurisdiction on the Skykomish River are at risk of landslides (Snohomish County, 2019). Additionally, most of the City's shoreline jurisdiction is located in an area that has moderate to high risk of liquefaction in the event of an earthquake (Snohomish County, 2015).

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.

No specific filling or grading is proposed. The SMP states that any clearing and grading in the shoreline area, should minimize significant vegetation removal to the extent feasible. The City may require that the proposed development or extent of clearing and grading be modified to mitigate the impacts to ecological functions. Additionally, each shoreline environment has its own regulations regarding filling or grading.

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

There is potential for erosion to occur along the city's shoreline and could be exacerbated as a result of unplanned or poorly planned clearing, construction, or other use. The SMP includes provisions to limit clearing, retain existing native shoreline vegetation, manage stormwater, and provide erosion and sediment control (MMC Chapter 15.02, MMC 20.08.020 and MMC 20.08.070).

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

This is a non-project action with no specific construction resulting in new impervious surface.

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

The SMP includes provisions to limit clearing, retain existing native shoreline vegetation, manage stormwater, and provide erosion and sediment control (MMC Chapter 15.02, MMC 20.08.020 and MMC 20.08.070). The SMP regulations along with other City of Monroe regulations provide specific criteria to prevent and mitigate these impacts at the project level. These provisions are implemented on a project-by project basis.

2. Air

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

None

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

No

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

None

3. Water

a. Surface Water:

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

Primary surface waters are those that are designated shorelines, including the Skykomish River and Woods Creek, which flows into the Skykomish and originates from Lake Roesinger approximately 7 miles north of the city. Associated surface waters to the Skykomish River within city limits include the Cadman Pond (associated with former Cadman site gravel mining operations).

Lake Tye is the third designated shoreline, located along the western edge of city limits. Fryelands Drainage Ditch drains into the southeast corner of Lake Tye, and discharge from the controlled outlet is routed west to Cripple Creek and eventually to French Creek.

- 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.**

Not applicable. As a non-project action, adoption of the SMP revisions would not require any in or overwater work. New development within shoreline jurisdiction would be subject to the provisions of the SMP, which includes specific standards for in and over-water structures (SMP Chapter 4.C, Chapter 5.D and Chapter 5.F). The SMP limits where new in-water or over-water structures could occur, prohibiting new facilities in many areas along the respective shorelines. Where allowed, the SMP generally limits such new in- or over-water structures to those providing water-dependent public access. Allowances for new development adjacent to shorelines must also be consistent with SMP provisions for allowed uses, required setbacks and vegetated buffers.

- 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.**

Not applicable. As a non-project action, adoption of the SMP revisions would not require any fill or dredging to be placed in or removed from surface water or wetlands. New development within shoreline jurisdiction would be subject to the provisions of the SMP, which includes specific standards for dredging and filling (SMP Chapter 2.C – Use Matrix; SMP Chapter 4.D).

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

Not applicable. As a non-project action, adoption of the SMP revisions would not require any surface water withdrawals or diversions. New development within shoreline jurisdiction would be subject to the provisions of the SMP, which includes specific standards for utilities as a primary use, and prohibits any new public water system / treatment plants within shoreline jurisdiction (except where no feasible alternative exists and a conditional use permit is granted). City water supply is provided currently via the Spada Lake Reservoir (25

miles northeast of Monroe at headwaters of Sultan River) as part of a regional drinking water system with the City of Everett and the Snohomish County PUD; there are no plans or anticipated needs for surface water withdrawals or diversions within the City's shoreline jurisdiction.

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

A significant portion of shoreline jurisdiction associated with the Skykomish River is located in a 100-year floodplain (FEMA 2010 Preliminary Digital Flood Insurance Rate Maps [DFIRMs] and 2005 Effective FIRMs). Additionally, the southern tip and northern portion of Lake Tye and associated shoreline jurisdiction is located within the 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.

Not applicable. As a non-project action, no discharges of waste materials to surface waters are proposed. The City maintains a storm drainage system consisting of pipes, ponds, ditches, and bioswales. The majority of the system eventually discharges into one of Monroe's three shorelines consistent with the City's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit.

b. Ground Water:

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

Not applicable. As a non-project action, adoption of the SMP revisions would not require any groundwater withdrawals or discharges. New development within shoreline jurisdiction would be subject to the provisions of the SMP – including integrated provisions for protection of critical aquifer recharge areas, other City regulations for stormwater management and the *Department of Ecology Stormwater Management Manual*, which includes specific standards for groundwater withdrawals.

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

Not applicable. As a non-project action, adoption of the SMP revisions would not require any discharges of waste material into the ground. Existing and proposed developments in the shoreline is required to be connected to the sanitary sewer system (MMC 13.08.20). Where allowed, and new, replaced, or expanded docks or other in-water or over-water structures

would be constructed in accordance with Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Best Management Practices to avoid discharge of pollutants (SMP Chapter 5.D and Chapter 5.F).

c. Water runoff (including stormwater):

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

As a non-project action, adoption of the SMP revisions will not result in new runoff. The SMP does not impact existing city-wide policies addressing the preservation and improvement of water quality. New development in the shoreline is required to comply with the provisions of the SMP, the City's development and surface water utility regulations, and the *Department of Ecology Stormwater Management Manual*.

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

As a non-project action, adoption of the SMP revisions will not result in waste materials entering ground or surface waters. The SMP requires shoreline use and development control and treatment of stormwater to protect and maintain water quality and quantity in accordance with the City's stormwater regulations.

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

As a non-project action, adoption of the SMP revisions will not affect drainage patterns.

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

The SMP encourages management of stormwater throughout the city consistent with the City's stormwater management regulations (MMC Chapter 15.01 – Stormwater Management). Low impact development techniques are encouraged where feasible.

4. Plants

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

- deciduous tree: alder, maple, aspen, other
- evergreen tree: fir, cedar, pine, other
- shrubs
- grass
- pasture
- crop or grain
- Orchards, vineyards or other permanent crops.
- wet soil plants: cattail, buttercup, bulrush, skunk cabbage, other

- water plants: water lily, eelgrass, milfoil, other
 other types of vegetation

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

Since this is a non-project action, the adoption of the SMP revisions will not result in the removal or alteration of any vegetation. It is one of the goals of the SMP to conserve, enhance and restore vegetation in the shoreline area.

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

ESA listed Threatened fish species in the Skykomish and Woods Creek: Bulltrout, Steelhead, Chinook.

Potentially present ESA Threatened species include: Marbled Murrelet, Streaked Horned Lark, and Yellow-billed Cuckoo. Throughout Snohomish County, Gray Wolf and North American Wolverine are proposed for ESA listing.

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

The SMP encourages the conservation and restoration of native vegetation and includes a *Shoreline Restoration Plan*.

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

Invasive plant species known to on or near the site are Fountain butterfly bush, Scot's broom, Herd Robert, English ivy, English holly, Yellow flag iris, Purple loosestrife, Reed canarygrass, Japanese knotweed, Cheery laurel, Evergreen blackberry and Himalayan blackberry (WSDOT, 2017).

5. Animals

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

Birds: Raptors, Waterfowl, Bald Eagle, Peregrine Falcon, Vaux Swift, Gulls, songbirds

Mammals: Raccoons, Rodents, Deer, Opossum, Skunk, Beaver Otter

Fish: Chinook, Coho, Pink, Chum, Bull trout, Steelhead
Lake Tye is a manmade lake and contains stocked trout.

Source: eBird, 2018; WDFW PHS, 2019

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

Listed under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) as endangered are Chinook salmon, steelhead trout and bull trout.

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

The site is located in the Pacific Flyway, which acts as a flight corridor for migrating waterfowl and other birds. The Pacific Flyway extends from the northern part of Alaska to Mexico and South America.

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

The SMP provides regulations to minimize the impact of development on wildlife and associated habitat within the shoreline environment, including integrated Critical Areas Ordinance standards.

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

Rodents such as Norway rats (*Rattus norvegicus*) and nutria (*Myocastor coypus*) are likely to be present. American bullfrog (*Lithobates catesbeianus*) are likely present and prey on tree frogs and other native amphibians, reptiles and even birds.

6. Energy and Natural Resources

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

Not Applicable.

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

No. The SMP retains the maximum building height limits of the underlying zoning.

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

Not applicable.

7. Environmental Health

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

Not applicable. Adoption of the SMP revisions would not result in exposing the public to any environmental harms.

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

Department of Ecology database identified one contaminated site, Monroe Auto Salvage, within the shoreline area that the cleanup has started at. There are also several sites located around the shoreline areas that are awaiting cleanup, cleanup has started at or cleanup has been completed (DOE, 2019).

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.

An underground gas transmission pipeline is found in the northeastern portion of Lake Tye (Pipe Line Safety Trust, 2019).

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.

Not applicable

4) Describe special emergency services that might be required.

Not applicable.

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

Not applicable.

b. Noise

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

Not applicable.

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.

Not applicable.

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

Not applicable.

8. Land and Shoreline Use

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

The majority of the shoreline area that is located on the Skykomish River is open space and parkland, used primarily for recreation. This area contains Al Borlin Park, Skykomish River Centennial Park and the Cadman Inc. Sky River Facility, an old gravel mining site. The property located directly behind and west of Al Borlin Park has a variety of uses, but are primarily residential and commercial. The shoreline area that is located on Lake Tye is used commercially, industrially and for recreation (Lake Tye Park).

The SMP update will not have an effect on the current use of these properties, and will ensure that future uses and associated development activities will be consistent with the City's 2015-2035 Comprehensive Plan and the use standards in the SMP. Generally, current use patterns are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

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

No.

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:

No.

c. Describe any structures on the site.

The City's shoreline jurisdiction is composed of a variety of structures. At the southern end of Lake Tye there is the Monroe Skatepark and several public facilities that serve the lake's park. On the northern portion of the lake there is a large building that contains several businesses and an Everett Community College Campus. Additionally, there are several industrial facilities located just within the shoreline area on the eastern side of the lake.

The City's shoreline jurisdiction on the Skykomish river includes the old Cadman Inc. Mining Facility, park facilities and features, single family residences and commercial buildings.

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

No.

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

The majority of the shoreline area is zoned as Limited Open Space (LOS) and Public Open Space (PS), which includes the majority of the shoreline area that is found in Al Borin Park, Skykomish River Centennial Park, the Cadman site and Lake Tye Park. Some of the area is zoned as Light Industrial (LI), Service Commercial (SC), Downtown Commercial (DC), General Commercial (GC), and Urban

Residential (UR6000, UR96000: City of Monroe 2015).

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

The Comprehensive Plan designations within the City's shoreline jurisdiction are Parks, Shoreline Industrial, Medium Density SFR, Downtown Commercial, General Commercial, Low Density SFR (City of Monroe, 2015). The majority of the shoreline area is located within the parks designations.

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

The City's SMP has 7 shoreline environment designations. The proposed update will maintain six of these designations: Aquatic (A), High Intensity (HI), Natural (N), Shoreline Residential (SR), Tye Stormwater Facility (TSW) and Urban Conservancy (UC). The proposed update would eliminate the Urban Conservancy Mining (UCM) designation and re-designate this area between Urban Conservancy (portion of former Cadman gravel mine being redeveloped by the City as park and open space) and High Intensity (the remaining industrial-zoned Cadman property, currently used as a gravel handling and distribution yard).

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

Critical areas that have been determined to be in the shoreline area are wetlands and landslide areas. The SMP update also includes updates to the Critical Areas regulations (City of Monroe, 2015).

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

There is a small area where people live that is within the shoreline area and is designated as Shoreline Residential, with approximately 35 homes. Half of these homes are located on the western boundary of Al Borlin Park and the other half are located in the Monroe trailer park.

City Parks employees intermittently work within public park and open space areas in shoreline jurisdiction, completing park maintenance and supporting public activities. Additional employment is provided by private commercial and industrial businesses within the High Intensity environment; the exact number of people employed is unknown.

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

None.

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

Not applicable.

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

The SMP establishes long-term planning goals and policies, specific development standards and uses regulations, and permitting and administrative procedures. It is a standalone document but is linked and consistent with the cities other planning documents like the *Monroe Comprehensive Plan* and *Monroe Municipal Code*.

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

Not applicable.

9. Housing

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

None. The proposed update would not provide housing or change the underlying Comprehensive Plan land use designations or zoning districts.

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

None.

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

Not applicable.

10. Aesthetics

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

As the adoption of the proposed SMP revisions is a non-project action no specific new structures are proposed. The maximum height of a building in the shoreline area, based on zoning and the SMP is 50 ft.

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

No specific structures are proposed at this is a non-project action. If redevelopment was to occur the City's SMP states that development, uses and activities on or near the shoreline should not impair or detract from visual access to the water.

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

The SMP states that all shoreline development, uses and activities should be designed and operated to avoid blocking, reducing or adversely interfering with the public's visual access to the water and shorelines. However, this excludes vegetation conservation and restoration project that may reduce or interfere with the public's visual access.

11. Light and Glare

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

Not applicable.

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

Not applicable.

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

Not applicable.

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

The SMP includes measures to minimize light and glare.

12. Recreation

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

Al Borlin Park, Skykomish River Centennial Park, Lewis Street Park and Lake Tye Park are all located within the shoreline jurisdiction.

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

No.

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

A goal of the Shoreline Management Act is to enhance and provide public access to recreational opportunities within Washington State. Monroe's SMP aims to provide more recreational opportunities and avoid interrupting them.

13. Historic and cultural preservation

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

There are no known buildings, structures or sites within Monroe's shoreline jurisdiction that are listed on the national, state or City historic registers. To the northwest of Al Borlin Park, at the edge of the Woods Creek / Skykomish River shoreline jurisdiction, there are residential structures and some commercial buildings that may be over 45 years old.

- 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.**

According to the Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation's (DAHP's) online database (Washington Information System for Architectural and Archaeological Records Data, or WISAARD), areas around the City range from low to very high risk for encountering 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.**

No impacts to cultural or historic resources are anticipated as a result of adoption of the updated SMP.

- 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.**

No changes or disturbances to cultural or historic resources are anticipated as a result of adoption of the updated SMP; in fact, the SMP maintains provisions for consideration of cultural and historic resources that the City will enforce for any future development proposals (SMP Chapter 3.C)

14. Transportation

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

The shoreline around Lake Tye is served by Fryelands Boulevard. The Cadman Inc. Sky River Facility located within the Skykomish shoreline area is served by 177th Ave SE and Skykomish River Centennial Park is served by Sky River Pkwy. Al Borlin Park is served by S Lewis St and Simons Rd. The area located in the shoreline area just behind Al Borlin Park, which includes residential and commercial uses is served by S Lewis St, E Fremont St, South Ferry Ave, S Ann St, Simons Rd and Railroad Ave. The northern part of the shoreline area near Woods Creek and the Skykomish River is served by US Highway 2, Old Owen Rd, 204th Ave Se and Calhoun Rd.

- 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?**

The shoreline jurisdiction around Lake Tye is not currently served by public transit and the nearest stop is 0.6-miles away at the intersection of Fryelands Blvd and 156th St SE. The

shoreline jurisdiction located on the Skykomish has a transit stop that is located 0.2-miles away from Skykomish River Centennial Park.

c. How many additional parking spaces would the completed project or non-project proposal have? How many would the project or proposal eliminate?

The completed project would not require any additional parking spaces as it is a non-project action.

d. Will the proposal require any new or improvements to existing roads, streets, pedestrian, bicycle or state transportation facilities, not including driveways? If so, generally describe (indicate whether public or private).

NO.

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

There are no surrounding water, rail, or air transportation uses. First Air Field is located within city limits approximately 2,200 feet to the east of the north end of Lake Tye on the other side of Highway 2.

f. How many vehicular trips per day would be generated by the completed project or proposal? If known, indicate when peak volumes would occur and what percentage of the volume would be trucks (such as commercial and nonpassenger vehicles). What data or transportation models were used to make these estimates?

Not applicable. The SMP revisions are a non-project action.

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

Not applicable.

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

The SMP requires that proposed transportation and parking facilities should be located, planned, and designed to prevent net loss of shoreline ecological functions and should not have adverse impacts on other shoreline uses, public access or recreation

15. Public Services

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

No.

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

Not applicable.

16. Utilities

a. Circle utilities currently available at the site:

Electricity, water, telephone, sanitary sewer


c. 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.

No new utilities are proposed. The updated SMP states that all utility facilities should be designed and located to prevent net loss to shoreline ecological functions, preserve the natural landscape, and minimize conflicts with present and planned land and shoreline uses while meeting the needs of future populations in areas planned to accommodate growth.

The SMP requires that any future proposals for utilities (whether as accessory to permitted uses, or as a permitted primary use) be located inland from the land/water interface, preferably out of shoreline jurisdiction, unless this location is reasonably necessary within the shoreline environment. Utilities as a primary use are prohibited within the Natural environment and require conditional use permit approval throughout the Urban Conservancy and Aquatic environments. Utilities are required to be located and designed to avoid negative impacts to public access area and significant natural, historic, archaeological or cultural resources. Utilities are also encouraged to be jointly used with other utility and transportation rights-of-way. Underground utility facilities are preferred over above ground utility facilities. (SMP Chapter 3.K [Accessory Utilities]; Chapter 5.I [Utilities as Primary Use])

C. Signature

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

Signature:  _____

Name of signee Anita Marrero

Position and Agency/Organization Senior Planner, City of Monroe

Date Submitted: March 25, 2019

D. Supplemental sheet for nonproject actions

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

The proposal would not increase discharges to water; emissions to air; production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or production of noise. All development and redevelopment in the shoreline jurisdiction is subject to applicable local, state and federal regulatory requirements, in addition to the provisions of the SMP and other development code standards.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are:

The SMP includes policies and regulations for the protection of shoreline environment, addressing impacts of specific uses and shoreline modifications. The development standards and regulation of shoreline uses and modifications provide more protection for shoreline ecological processes and functions. The standards and regulations limit activities that could result in adverse impacts to the shoreline environment.

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

The SMP was developed, in part, to meet the goal of "no net loss" of shoreline ecological functions. Degradation of the natural environment and shoreline ecological functions due to development will be avoided, minimized, or mitigated in accordance with the SMA. Additionally, the *City of Monroe Shoreline Restoration Plan (SMP Chapter 7)* addresses the goal of improving shoreline ecological functions that have been degraded over time from past development activities. The SMP (including with proposed updates) provides for protection and enhancement of fish and wildlife habitat, natural vegetation, and management of critical areas through goals, policies, development standards, use regulations, and mitigation requirements.

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

The SMP revisions would incorporate the critical areas regulations adopted in 2017. These critical area regulations are more protective of plants, animals, fish and associated habitats than the current SMP; in addition, the integrated critical areas standards would be further updated to ensure protection of extensive important plants, animals, and associated habitats throughout shoreline jurisdiction.

Additional protections of native vegetation and limitations on shoreline developments are also provided for in the SMP. The SMP requires that all uses and developments (even exempt activities) achieve no net loss of ecological functions.

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

The SMP revisions would not result in depletion of energy or natural resources. All future extractive or resource based industries, such as mining or forestry are prohibited in all shoreline environments in the SMP. Past mining activities at the Cadman Site have stopped and gravel mine reclamation has been completed. This SMP updates the shoreline environment designation for this area to clarify that no future mining activity will be permitted

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

The shoreline environments and regulations were developed with the intent to preserve the city's natural resources.

4. How would the proposal be likely to use or affect environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated (or eligible or under study) for governmental protection; such as parks, wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, threatened or endangered species habitat, historic or cultural sites, wetlands, floodplains, or prime farmlands?

Generally, The SMP establishes policies and regulations protecting and conserving critical areas (SMP Chapter 3.D - critical areas regulations integrated by reference) including threatened or endangered species habitat and wetlands. The SMP revisions would incorporate a critical areas ordinance that is more protective of critical areas than the current SMP.

Increased public access to extensive publicly-owned areas of the shoreline is a goal of the City's SMP with regulations supporting this goal (SMP Chapter 3.H1 – Public Access policies). Another goal of the City's SMP is the identification, preservation, protection, and restoration of shoreline areas, buildings, and sites having historical, cultural educational, and scientific values (SMP Chapter 3.C.1). Floodplain management policies and regulations in the SMP include limiting upland development in areas that are historically flooded and integrating public access into the design of flood management facilities (integrated floodplain standards through critical areas regulations). The Shoreline Restoration Plan would provide the city and its residents opportunities to improve or restore ecological functions that have been impaired as a result of past development activities (SMP Chapter 7). In addition, the SMP would complement the existing city, state, and federal efforts to protect shoreline functions and values.

The Skykomish River upstream of the city is a designated wild and scenic river (starting at the confluence with the Sultan River and moving upstream from there; RCW 79A.55.070). The City's shoreline jurisdiction does not contain wild and scenic rivers, wilderness areas or prime farmlands.

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

The SMP was developed to be consistent with the state shoreline guidelines (WAC 173-26). The WAC provides a level of protection to assure no net loss of ecological functions and values. Measures include protection of critical areas by buffering and enhancement and protections of the native shoreline vegetation.

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

The City of Monroe generally has an established land use pattern in the shoreline area that predates current codes and regulations. The pattern includes extensive park and open space areas owned and managed by the City, and limited areas of existing higher intensity commercial, residential, and industrial use. Primary anticipated future development activities will be public parks projects that improve recreation and access opportunities while also restoring and enhancing ecological functions both within the Skykomish River / Woods Creek jurisdiction and around Lake Tye.

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

Redevelopment that will occur over time will be subject to the SMP and other City regulations. The SMP contains shoreline environment designations consistent with both the existing land use pattern and Comprehensive Plan land use designations.

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

The SMP revisions do not establish new or increased density of land use patterns. Reasonable foreseeable development will likely be redeveloped property and public parks improvements rather than new development within the city limits. The City has completed an extensive outreach and planning effort for park and open space improvements at the former Cadman Site and at Lake Tye Park; when developed, these improvements will result in anticipated increases in associated public services. These improvements will be reviewed for consistency with the updated SMP.

The SMP revisions will not directly impact demand on transportation, public services, or utilities because they do not directly alter the redevelopment potential of any sites.

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

No specific measures are proposed as increased demands are not anticipated.

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

The updated SMP is designed to be consistent with other local, state and federal laws. The proposal updates and integrates by reference the critical areas regulations from 2017 that were deemed to meet the test for "best available science" and provides greater protection for critical areas such as wetlands, streams, fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and geologically hazardous areas.

References

City of Monroe. 2018. *Comprehensive Plan 2015-2035*.

<https://www.monroewa.gov/DocumentCenter/View/3716/2015-2035-Comprehensive-Plan-FINAL?bidId=>

eBird. 2018. Birding Hotspots mapper. <https://ebird.org/hotspot/L866452>

Ecology (Washington State Department of Ecology). 2019. *What's In My Neighborhood*.

<https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/neighborhood/>

FEMA. 2019. FEMA Flood Map Service Center.

<https://msc.fema.gov/portal/search?AddressQuery=47108%20&%2047%20N%20CHERRY%20ST%20Hammond,%20LA#searchresultsanchor>

Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). 2015. *Web Soil*

Survey<http://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/WebSoilSurvey.aspx>.

Pipeline Safety Trust. 2019. National Pipeline Mapping System.

<https://pvnpm.phmsa.dot.gov/PublicViewer/>

Snohomish County. 2015. *Hazard Mitigation Plan Summary*.

<https://snohomishcountywa.gov/DocumentCenter/View/37255/HMP-Summary-Sept-2015-Final>

Snohomish County. 2019. Natural Hazard Viewer. [https://snoco-](https://snoco-gis.maps.arcgis.com/apps/MapSeries/index.html?appid=8924ce09ff58487ea905e63210ee7cdf)

[gis.maps.arcgis.com/apps/MapSeries/index.html?appid=8924ce09ff58487ea905e63210ee7cdf](https://snoco-gis.maps.arcgis.com/apps/MapSeries/index.html?appid=8924ce09ff58487ea905e63210ee7cdf)

WDFW (Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife). 2019. *PHS on the Web*.

<http://apps.wdfw.wa.gov/phsontheweb/>.

WSDOT (Washington State Department of Transportation). 2017. *SR 522 Snohomish River Bridge to US 2 (Al Borlin Park & French Creek Tributary) Mitigation Sites, USACE NWP (14) NWS-2010-31*.

<https://www.wsdot.wa.gov/sites/default/files/2017/06/14/Env-Wet-MonRpt-AlBorlin2016.pdf>

Appendix A

Ecology Periodic Review Checklist

Appendix B

City-Initiated SMP Update Matrix

Appendix C

Proposed Revisions to Shoreline Master Program
& Monroe Municipal Code – Unified Development Regulations

Chapter 22.82 – Shoreline Management
Chapter XX.XX – Critical Areas