



## *SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST*

### **A. Background**

**1. Name of proposed project, if applicable:**

City of Duvall Shoreline Master Program Periodic Review

**2. Name of applicant:**

City of Duvall (City)

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

Lara Thomas, Director  
City of Duvall Community Development  
PO Box 1300  
15535 Main Street NE  
Duvall, WA 98019

(425) 788-2779

**4. Date checklist prepared:**

July 25, 2019

**5. Agency requesting checklist:**

City of Duvall

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

The City's Planning Commission will review the Shoreline Master Program (SMP) revisions during a Public Hearing in September 2019. This public hearing will fulfill the Department of Ecology's

requirements for a joint review and comment period. The City Council is scheduled to discuss the SMP at an initial meeting in August/September 2019 and adopt the Final SMP by Ordinance in October 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 Duvall SMP Periodic Review Checklist (see Attachment A)

City of Duvall Codified Shoreline Regulations, and Sensitive Areas Regulations (Attachment B)

**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).

**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 Duvall, RCW 90.58.080(2) required the City to complete a Comprehensive Update (as adopted in 2016), and then through a periodic review process once every eight years per a schedule set 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 Duvall'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 all occur within one category: those required by the Department of Ecology to incorporate changes in state guidance since the SMP was adopted in 2016 (see Appendix A Periodic Review Checklist). Updates also integrate the City's Sensitive 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 Duvall periodic review checklist is included as Attachment A to this SEPA checklist.

RCW 90.58.090(4) and RCW 36.70A.480(3) requires SMPs to provide for management of designated sensitive areas located within shorelines of the state. The 2016 SMP incorporated sensitive areas standards (referred to as sensitive areas standards in Duvall) into the SMP primarily by reference but provided some shoreline jurisdiction specific standards as elected by the City and required by Ecology at the time of the comprehensive SMP Update. The currently proposed SMP update will maintain integration of Sensitive Areas Ordinance standards by reference, primarily incorporating the standards as currently adopted in DMC 14.42, with some focused additional updates and exclusions consistent with Ecology's most recent guidelines.

The SMP code revisions identified in the Periodic Review Checklist and incorporated 2017 SAO standards are included as Attachment B 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 Duvall includes:

- Snoqualmie River,
- Associated upland areas (shorelands) that are landward 200-feet of the OHWM from the Snoqualmie River shoreline, as well as associated wetlands and associated floodplains as required by RCW 90.58.030.

The shoreline jurisdiction associated with the Snoqualmie River extends across the western and northwestern portions of Duvall city limits.

## ***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 Snoqualmie River.

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

Minor slopes associated with the banks of the Snoqualmie River and the Snoqualmie Valley Trail berm.

- 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.**

In the City of Duvall east of the Snoqualmie River floodplain soils are composed primarily of Tokul gravelly loam. Within the City's shoreline, soils are composed primarily of Nooksack silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes. Areas of hydric soil, mapped as Puget silty clay loam, also occur within the shoreline area. The majority of the City's shoreline is designated prime farmland (<http://www.ecy.wa.gov/services/gis/maps/county/soils/soils17.pdf>).

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

Geologically hazardous areas within the City include steep slope hazards, landslide and erosion hazards, and seismic hazards (liquefaction prone areas). Adjacent to the Snoqualmie River shoreline area, these geologic hazards are limited to seismic hazard areas, which are mapped throughout the majority of shoreline jurisdiction.

- 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.

- 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. The SMP regulations along with other City of Duvall 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 include the designated Snoqualmie River shoreline. Associated surface waters to the Snoqualmie River within city limits include Thayer Creek, Coe-Clemmons Creek, and various floodplain wetlands.

- 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 standards that largely prohibit in and over-water structures. 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.

- 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.

**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 Snoqualmie River is located in a 100-year floodplain (FEMA 2010 Preliminary Digital Flood Insurance Rate Maps [DFIRMs] and 2005 Effective FIRMs).

**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. This system eventually discharges into the Snoqualmie River 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 *King County Surface Water 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; 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.

**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.

**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. Low impact development techniques are required to be implemented 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 Snoqualmie: Bulltrout, Steelhead, Chinook.

Potentially present ESA Threatened species include: Marbled Murrelet, Streaked Horned Lark, and

Yellow-billed Cuckoo. Throughout King County, Gray Wolf and North American Wolverine are proposed for ESA listing; however, would not be expected to occur within Duvall or the immediately surrounding area.

**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, Cherry laurel, Evergreen blackberry and Himalayan blackberry (Shoreline Inventory Report).

**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

Source: eBird, 2019; 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 Sensitive 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.**

No sites within shoreline jurisdiction.

- 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.**

None known.

- 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 Snoqualmie River is open space and parkland, used primarily for recreation.

The SMP update will not have an effect on the current use of properties within shoreline jurisdiction and will ensure that future uses and associated development activities will be consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan and the use standards in the SMP. 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?**

Much of the eastern Snoqualmie River floodplain was used for agricultural activities though at least the first half of the 1900s. Outside of intermittent educational and cultural agriculture activities within the City-owned Dougherty Farmstead property, there is no existing agricultural use within the City's shoreline jurisdiction.

**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 major structures in the shoreline include the Snoqualmie Valley Trail corridor, public utilities, the boat launch facility at Taylor's Landing and mobile home park development at the Riverside village. Other public parks structures include pedestrian bridges, benches, and picnic facilities.

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

No.

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

The zoning designations, established by DMC 14.10, establish a Public Facility designation for the entire area to the west of the Snoqualmie Valley Trail. To the east of the trail, zoning is established based on existing or planned land uses fronting Main Street. Many of these areas are also zoned Public Facility. Other designations included Mixed Use (MU12), Light Industrial, a small area of Midtown, and Riverside Village. With the exception of developed areas of the Riverside Village subarea, existing primary uses associated and consistent with these zoning designations to the east of the trail corridor do not extend west into the floodplain and shoreline environment.

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

The Comprehensive Plan designations within the City's shoreline jurisdiction are consistent with Zoning. See the adopted 2015 Comprehensive Plan for details.

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

The SMP system of shoreline environment designations will not change for the proposed periodic update.

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

Sensitive areas that have been determined to be in the shoreline area are wetlands, tributary streams, fish and wildlife habitat corridors, liquefaction hazard areas, critical aquifer recharge areas, and floodplain.

**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, associated with the Riverside Village mobile home park. No changes in housing or jobs would occur as a result of this periodic SMP update.

City Parks employees intermittently work within public park and open space areas in shoreline jurisdiction, completing park maintenance and supporting public activities.

**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 *Duvall Comprehensive Plan* and *Duvall 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.

**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 projects 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?**

Most of the Duvall shoreline area is publicly owned recreation and open space and is generally accessible to the public for active uses (shoreline access, picnics and gatherings, wading, swimming, boating) and passive uses (walking / dog walking, horse / equestrian uses, wildlife observation, meditation) (Map 7 of the Inventory and Characterization). The King County owned and managed Snoqualmie Valley Trail extends through most of the shoreline area, linking many of the City owned parks and open spaces together, as well as to additional facilities to the south of Duvall. Specifics of existing public access areas and facilities are provided in the Chapter 5 reach summaries in the Inventory and Characterization Report.

**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. Duvall'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.**

The Duvall Train Depot is documented as a historic structure by the City. The depot is directly adjacent to the shoreline area but located east of the Snoqualmie River floodplain and all associated wetlands. The Dougherty Farmstead is documented as a historic property, with the Duvall Historical Society providing guided public tours through the farmhouse and outbuildings. Structures associated with the property are primarily located outside of shoreline jurisdiction. See Section 3.1 of the Inventory and Characterization Report for cultural and historical background.

**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 because 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 because 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.

## 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.**

State Route 203 (Main Street NE) parallels the Duvall shoreline area to the east, however never crosses in to shoreline jurisdiction. NE Stephens Street, Stella Street, and Cherry Streets all extend west from Main Street NE, with Stephens Street providing primary access to the parking lot at Depot Park. Parking for King County Metro's Duvall Park and Ride facility is located partially within the shoreline area, with access provided directly off Main Street NE. Similar access off Main Street NE is also provided for Taylor's Landing parking. The eastern landing of the NE Woodinville Duvall Road Bridge is within the City's shoreline jurisdiction.

**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?**

Yes. King County Metro bus routes provide access to stops immediately adjacent to the City's Snoqualmie River shoreline area.

**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.

**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.

### 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 Troy Davis

Position and Agency/Organization Senior Planner, City of Duvall

Date Submitted: July 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 Duvall Shoreline Restoration Plan* 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 sensitive 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 sensitive areas regulations adopted in 2017. These sensitive area regulations are more protective of plants, animals, fish and associated habitats than the current SMP; in addition, the integrated sensitive 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.

**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 sensitive areas (see regulations integrated by reference in Attachment B) including threatened or endangered species habitat and wetlands.

Increased public access to extensive publicly-owned areas of the shoreline is a goal of the City's SMP with regulations supporting this goal. 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. 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 sensitive 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. In addition, the SMP would complement the existing city, state, and federal efforts to protect shoreline functions and values.

**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 sensitive 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 Duvall generally has an established land use pattern in the shoreline area that predates current codes and regulations; however that is generally consistent with these designations. The pattern includes extensive park and open space areas owned and managed by the City, and limited areas of existing public facility, 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 Snoqualmie River jurisdiction.

**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 public parks improvements rather than new development.

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 sensitive areas regulations from 2017 that were deemed to meet the test for “best available science” and provides greater protection for sensitive areas such as wetlands, streams, fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and geologically hazardous areas.

**References**

City of Duvall. 2016. *City of Duvall 2015 Comprehensive Plan*.

<http://www.duvallwa.gov/DocumentCenter/View/2974/2015-Duvall-Comprehensive-Plan>

eBird. 2019. 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>.

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

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

# Appendix A

Ecology Periodic Review Checklist

# Appendix B

City of Duvall Codified Shoreline Regulations, and Sensitive Areas Regulations

# Appendix C

Proposed Revisions to Shoreline Master Program  
& Duvall Municipal Code – Unified Development Regulations (Chapter 14.42 – Sensitive Areas  
Ordinance adopted 2017)