

SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

A. Background

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable: Gold Bar Shoreline Master Program Periodic Review Amendments

2. Name of applicant: City of Gold Bar

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

Prepared by BHC Consultants, LLC

Contact: Talia Tittelfitz – talia.tittelfitz@bhccconsultants.com

(206) 357-9916

City of Gold Bar

107 5th Street

Gold Bar, WA 98251

(360) 793-1101

4. Date checklist prepared: February 27, 2019

5. Agency requesting checklist: City of Gold Bar

6. Proposed timing or schedule (including phasing, if applicable): City Council action expected in May or June 2019

7. Do you have any plans for future additions, expansion, or further activity related to or connected with this proposal? If yes, explain. This proposal amends the City of Gold Bar's Shoreline Master Program (SMP), which may be subsequently amended as necessary. No specific changes to the SMP beyond the amendments proposed here have been developed.

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

- Gold Bar 2015 Comprehensive Plan
- Gold Bar 2016 Critical Areas Ordinance
- Snohomish County 2012 Shoreline Master Program
- Snohomish County 2016 Comprehensive Plan
- Washington State Department of Ecology SMP Guidance

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

None. Any future individual development projects covered by the SMP will be reviewed for consistency with local, state, and federal regulations.

10. List any government approvals or permits that will be needed for your proposal, if known. Adoption of SMP amendments requires City Council adoption by ordinance. Under the Shoreline Management Act (SMA), the Washington State Department of Ecology must review master programs and any proposed updates to master programs for consistency with the SMA.

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. This proposal is to amend the City of Gold Bar's SMP to ensure consistency with updated state laws and rules per the periodic review requirements of the SMA. The current adopted SMP includes an inventory and analysis of shoreline ecological conditions of Skykomish River, Wallace River, and May Creek and sets forth goals, policies, regulations, and administrative procedures regarding uses and activities within the city limits for those areas within the shoreline jurisdiction. The proposed amendments are essentially procedural in nature and will not directly result in changes to shoreline use and management.

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 City of Gold Bar is located in Snohomish County, approximately 30 miles east of the City of Everett, on State Route 2, and 40 miles west of Stevens Pass. The Skykomish River, Wallace River, and May Creek and their associated wetlands comprise the SMA shorelines of the City. The shoreline jurisdiction encompasses the full extent of the floodway and extends landward to include a minimum of 200 feet of floodplain contiguous to the floodway.

B. Environmental Elements

1. *Earth*

a. **General description of the site:**

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

While the City includes Wallace River and May Creek, the Skykomish River shapes the physical landscape of the region forming the east-west valley that leads to the Cascades. The City is framed on the north and south by rugged foothills that are largely undeveloped. The shoreline jurisdiction is generally characterized by steep slopes.

b. **What is the steepest slope on the site (approximate percent slope)?** This proposal is for

a non-project action and does not recommend project action on a specific site.

- 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.** This proposal is for a non-project action and does not recommend project action on a specific site.
- d. **Are there surface indications or history of unstable soils in the immediate vicinity? If so, describe.** This proposal is for a non-project action and does not recommend project action on a specific site.
- 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 filling or grading is expected as a direct result of this non-project action.** No filling or grading is expected as a direct result of this action. Development proposals emerging subsequent to the adoption of this master program would be evaluated relative to federal, state, and local regulations and standards on an individual project-specific basis.
- f. **Could erosion occur as a result of clearing, construction, or use? If so, generally describe.** No erosion would directly result from the adoption of these proposed amendments. All future development will be evaluated as stated in the Administration chapter of the City's SMP for consistency with the goals and policies of the SMA and are subject to federal, state, and local regulations and standards for clearing, grading, and erosion control.
- g. **About what percent of the site will be covered with impervious surfaces after project construction (for example, asphalt or buildings)?** The SMP provides for the regulation of development and the amount of impervious surface coverage in the shoreline jurisdiction. Specifically, the SMP states that all clearing and grading activities should be conducted to avoid adverse environmental and shoreline impacts and designed with the objective of maintaining natural diversity in vegetation species, age, and cover density. In addition, SMP setbacks and critical area buffers further limit impervious surface and streets within the shoreline jurisdiction are to be designed with the minimum pavement area required, using pervious materials where feasible.
- h. **Proposed measures to reduce or control erosion, or other impacts to the earth, if any:** The SMP has policies and regulations that relate to the reduction and control of erosion. Specifically, Chapter 5 – Shoreline Modification Provisions addresses shoreline stabilization, with policies requiring shoreline stabilization activities to be carried out only when no feasible alternatives exist and only if no net loss of ecological functions will result, to prioritize non-structural stabilization measures, and to address erosion impacts through mitigation sequencing as needed.

No changes to erosion-related regulations are included in the proposed SMP amendments prompted by periodic review.

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.** No emissions are expected to result from these proposed amendments to the SMP.
- b. **Are there any off-site sources of emissions or odor that may affect your proposal? If so, generally describe.** None are known or expected to result from these proposed amendments to the SMP.
- c. **Proposed measures to reduce or control emissions or other impacts to air, if any:** This proposal involves a citywide non-project action. The Gold Bar SMP has environmental protection policies and regulations that relate to air. Specifically, the SMP's Shoreline Use Policies and Regulations state that pollution should be controlled and prevented.

No changes to air quality or emissions-related regulations are included in the proposed SMP amendments prompted by periodic review.

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.** Gold Bar is located between the Wallace River and the Skykomish River, with May Creek running through the City. May Creek converges with the Wallace River at the west end of the City. The Wallace River meets the Skykomish approximately 6 miles to the west of Gold Bar. The Skykomish River eventually flows into the Snohomish River and into Puget Sound.
- 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.** No, not as a result of the proposed SMP amendments. Development in the shoreline area is conditioned by the Gold Bar Municipal Code and development regulations in the SMP consistent with the SMA and with the Gold Bar Comprehensive Plan.
- 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.** None resulting from the proposed SMP amendments.

4) Will the proposal require surface water withdrawals or diversions? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known. No, not as a result of the proposed SMP amendments.

5) Does the proposal lie within a 100-year floodplain? If so, note location on the site plan. Gold Bar is located in the Skykomish River valley, and portions of the valley are located within the floodway and floodway fringe as designated by FEMA. This proposal, however, does not relate to a specific project. Future development proposals within the 100-year floodplain will be evaluated subject to City standards and regulations.

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. No, not as a result of the proposed SMP amendments.

b. Groundwater:

1) Will groundwater be withdrawn from a well for drinking water or other purposes? If so, give a general description of the well, proposed uses and approximate quantities withdrawn from the well. Will water be discharged to groundwater? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known. No, not as a result of the proposed SMP amendments.

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. This is a non-project proposal. Project-level review will condition approvals to mitigate waste impacts.

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. Infiltration is the citywide approach for the management of stormwater, according to the Shoreline Analysis Report. Excessive runoff that does not infiltrate typically discharges directly to the Skykomish River by outfall.

2) Could waste materials enter ground or surface waters? If so, generally describe. It is possible for waste materials to enter ground or surface waters; however, this non-project action includes policies and regulations to reduce or prevent these occurrences.

3) Does the proposal alter or otherwise affect drainage patterns in the vicinity of the site? If so, describe. No, not as a result of the proposed SMP amendments.

d. Proposed measures to reduce or control surface, ground, and runoff water, and drainage pattern impacts, if any: No measures proposed, as the proposed SMP amendments are not expected to affect runoff or drainage patterns. No changes to stormwater management or drainage-related regulations are included in the proposed SMP amendments prompted by periodic review. Per the SMP, the provisions of Section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1974 generally apply to any project involving discharge of dredge or fill material to any water or wetland area. New development is required to manage stormwater in accordance with the City's adopted Surface Water Design Manual and, if feasible, BMPs found in the Low Impact Development Technical Guidance Manual for Puget Sound. Project-level review will condition approvals to mitigate impacts to surface, ground, and runoff water.

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:** ornamental plants used in landscaping

b. What kind and amount of vegetation will be removed or altered? None as a result of the proposed amendments to the SMP. Vegetation removal and alteration is determined at project-level review.

c. List threatened and endangered species known to be on or near the site. No threatened or endangered plant species are known to exist in Gold Bar.

d. Proposed landscaping, use of native plants, or other measures to preserve or enhance vegetation on the site, if any: None resulting from the proposed amendments to the SMP. Project-level review will condition approvals to preserve and enhance vegetation.

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

- Himalayan blackberry
- Japanese knotweed

Other noxious weeds and invasive species known to propagate in riparian areas of Snohomish County include ivy, butterfly bush, holly, and broom.

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.**

- Hawk
- Heron
- Eagle
- Songbirds
- Harlequin duck
- Salmonids (Chinook, coho, chum, pink, bull trout, steelhead)
- Deer
- Cougar
- Small rodents

b. **List any threatened and endangered species known to be on or near the site.** Gold Bar is subject to Section 4(d) of the Endangered Species Act. Federally listed salmonid species occurring in Gold Bar's waters include Chinook salmon, bull trout, and steelhead. Coho salmon are also listed as a Species of Concern. All four species use Gold Bar's water bodies for spawning and rearing and as migration corridors. There are no known bald eagle sites in Gold Bar, but bald eagles are known to frequent the Skykomish River valley. Finally, the Wallace River provides habitat for harlequin duck, which is a priority species listed by the WDFW.

c. **Is the site part of a migration route? If so, explain.** Yes, anadromous fish, migratory birds, and other wildlife use the Skykomish and Wallace Rivers and the general vicinity of the Gold Bar shoreline area as a migration route through the Skykomish River valley.

d. **Proposed measures to preserve or enhance wildlife, if any:** One of the proposed amendments to the SMP resulting from periodic review is to delineate wetlands in accordance with the approved federal wetland delineation manual. Another proposed amendment is to adopt the City's 2016 Critical Areas Ordinance by reference, which provides for the protection of all critical areas including wetlands; fish and wildlife habitats, migratory routes, and spawning areas; frequently flooded areas; geologically hazardous areas, including erosion, landslide, steep slope, and seismic hazard areas; and groundwater recharge areas. In case of any conflict between the provisions of the CAO and other parts of the SMP, the provisions most protective of the shoreline jurisdiction shall apply, as determined by the City's Shoreline Administrator.

e. **List any invasive animal species known to be on or near the site.** None known. Per Washington Invasive Species Education, invasive animal species known to occur in riparian areas of western Washington include the American bullfrog and nutria.

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.** No energy needs associated with the proposed SMP amendments.

- b. **Would your project affect the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties? If so, generally describe.** Not as a result of the proposed SMP amendments.
- 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:** None. No development is specifically proposed for this non-project legislative action.

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.** None resulting from the proposal.

- 1) **Describe any known or possible contamination at the site from present or past uses.** The Department of Ecology has located sites of known and possible contamination, mostly by solvents, benzene, and petroleum, within the Skykomish River shoreline jurisdiction. These sites include Jackpot Station 165, Gold Bar Maintenance Shop, Gold Bar Exxon, and Gold Bar Gas & Grocery, all designated NFA. Just outside the City boundary, remediation of the Cascade Quarry Dyno Nobel Spill resulting in NFA status being granted in 2018. The current SMP also identifies Mountain Deli Mart and a Snohomish County PUD substation as toxic or hazardous waste sites.

Within the Wallace River shoreline jurisdiction, the Apex Mine is listed by the Department of Ecology as awaiting cleanup of metal contaminants.

Outside the shoreline jurisdiction, the current SMP lists Seamount Resources, Loth Lumbar Company, and Snohomish County Fire District 26 as toxic or hazardous waste sites.

- 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.** In addition to the sites listed above, part of the Northwest Pipeline natural gas transmission system runs through Gold Bar, intersecting with the Wallace River.
- 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.** No toxic or hazardous chemicals are associated with the proposed SMP amendments.
- 4) **Describe special emergency services that might be required.** None. No development is specifically proposed for this non-project legislative action.

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

The SMP includes provisions to limit development in shoreline areas. The SMP sets out policies and regulations to protect the City's shorelines. None are affected by the proposed amendments to the SMP as part of the periodic review, and no further policies or regulations associated with environmental health hazards are proposed.

b. *Noise*

1) **What types of noise exist in the area which may affect your project (for example: traffic, equipment, operation, other)?** None associated with the proposed amendments to the SMP. Noise in the City's shoreline jurisdiction is typical of urban and suburban environments, in which traffic noise predominates.

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.** None. No development is specifically proposed in this non-project legislation.

3) **Proposed measures to reduce or control noise impacts, if any:** The SMP requires certain measures to minimize noise impacts to wetlands. These include provisions to locate noise-generating activity away from wetlands; to enhance existing buffers with native vegetation plantings adjacent to the noise source if warranted; and, for activities that generate relatively continuous, potentially disruptive noise, to establish an additional 10' heavily vegetated buffer strip immediately adjacent to the outer wetland buffer.

No changes to noise-related regulations are included in the proposed SMP amendments prompted by periodic review.

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.** Existing land within the City's shoreline jurisdiction is mostly single-family and duplex residential housing with some parks, common area, and undeveloped land. No changes to land use within the shoreline jurisdiction will result from the proposed SMP amendments.

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?** Gold Bar's history of logging and small-scale farming dates to the early 1900s. According to the Shoreline Analysis Report, the clearing of timber and construction of housing and small farms adversely affected the shorelines of the Wallace River and May Creek. Today, the timber industry no longer exists in Gold Bar, and the current SMP allows for agriculture as low-intensity permitted or conditional use in the High Intensity, Shoreline Residential, Urban Conservancy, and Natural environments. While

forest practices and activities are prohibited within all shoreline environment designations, the SMP allows for preparatory work associated with the conversion of forest land to other uses in accordance with provisions for the proposed use and the general provisions of the SMP.

No changes to farmland and forest land regulations are included in the proposed SMP amendments prompted by periodic review.

- 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:** There are no working farms or forest lands in the City's shoreline jurisdiction.
- c. **Describe any structures on the site.** The majority of the structures that are located within the shoreline jurisdiction are single-family residences.
- d. **Will any structures be demolished? If so, what?** None will be demolished as a result of the proposed SMP amendments.
- e. **What is the current zoning classification of the site?** The majority of the shoreline jurisdiction areas are zoned Residential 12,500 and Residential 9,600. The shoreline jurisdiction also includes areas zoned for Community Business and Public Spaces & Parks.
- f. **What is the current comprehensive plan designation of the site?** Land Use Plan designations within the shoreline jurisdiction include Residential, Community Business, Open Space, and Parks.
- g. **If applicable, what is the current shoreline master program designation of the site?** The shoreline master program designations are High Intensity, Natural, Shoreline Residential, Urban Conservancy, and Aquatic.
- h. **Has any part of the site been classified as a critical area by the city or county? If so, specify.** Yes, there are environmentally sensitive areas within the shoreline jurisdiction. The locations of these areas, including NWI wetlands, are shown in SMP maps, including Figure 2, "Wetlands and Potential Habitat Areas," Figure 5, "Aquifer Recharge Areas," and Figure 6, "Fish Distribution." Geologically hazardous areas, wetlands, frequently flooded areas, critical aquifer recharge areas, and fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas are regulated by the 2016 Critical Areas Ordinance. One of the proposed amendments for this project is for the SMP to adopt the 2016 Critical Areas Ordinance by reference.
- i. **Approximately how many people would reside or work in the completed project?** None. No development is specifically proposed for this non-project action.
- j. **Approximately how many people would the completed project displace?** None resulting from the proposed SMP amendments.

k. **Proposed measures to avoid or reduce displacement impacts, if any:** None anticipated as a result of the proposed SMP amendments.

l. **Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with existing and projected land uses and plans, if any:** The proposal is to update the SMP to be consistent with the SMA and updated state rules and guidelines. The SMP includes the following general statement addressing compatibility with other land uses and plans:

- The regulations of this Chapter are in addition to other adopted ordinances and rules. Where conflicts exist between regulations, those that provide more substantive protection to the shoreline area shall apply. These interlocking development regulations are intended to make shoreline development responsive to specific design needs and opportunities along the City's shorelines, protect the public's interest in the shorelines' recreational and aesthetic values, and assure, at a minimum, no net loss of ecological functions necessary to sustain shoreline natural resources.

The amendments proposed in this periodic review of the City's SMP are subject to review by the state Departments of Commerce and Ecology to determine consistency with state laws and other regulations. The City will use the amended SMP to ensure that future development activity within the shoreline is compatible with existing and projected land uses and plans.

m. **Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts to agricultural and forest lands of long-term commercial significance, if any:** No impacts to agricultural and forest lands are anticipated as a result of the proposed SMP amendments.

9. *Housing*

a. **Approximately how many units would be provided, if any? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.** None resulting from the proposed amendments to the SMP.

b. **Approximately how many units, if any, would be eliminated? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.** None as a result of the proposed amendments to the SMP.

c. **Proposed measures to reduce or control housing impacts, if any:** None, as no housing impacts are anticipated. Future proposals for development within the shoreline jurisdiction will be evaluated subject to City standards and regulations.

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?** No buildings or other structures are proposed for this non-project legislative action.

- b. **What views in the immediate vicinity would be altered or obstructed?** None as a result of the proposed amendments to the SMP.
- c. **Proposed measures to reduce or control aesthetic impacts, if any:** Relevant aesthetic policies in the current SMP include the following:
- Adequate setbacks and natural buffers from the water should be provided, in addition to ample open space among buildings and structures to protect natural features, preserve views, and minimize use conflicts. Critical area buffers as described in the best available science (BAS) shall be required.
 - Proposed development, uses, and activities on or near the shoreline should preserve shoreline aesthetic characteristics and views.
 - Wherever primary utility facilities and corridors must be placed in a shoreline area, they should be located to protect scenic views. Whenever possible, such facilities should be placed underground or designed to minimize impacts on the aesthetic qualities of the shoreline area.
 - All signs should be designed and placed so that they are compatible with the aesthetic quality of the existing shoreline and adjacent land and water uses.
 - Preservation and enhancement of the public's visual access to all shoreline areas should be encouraged through the establishment of setbacks and height limits that ensure view corridors. Enhancement of views should not be construed to mean excess removal of vegetation that partially impairs views.

No changes to provisions regarding aesthetic impacts are included in the proposed SMP amendments prompted by periodic review.

11. *Light and Glare*

- a. **What type of light or glare will the proposal produce? What time of day would it mainly occur?** None associated with the proposed SMP amendments.
- b. **Could light or glare from the finished project be a safety hazard or interfere with views?** No, not as a result of the proposed SMP amendments.
- c. **What existing off-site sources of light or glare may affect your proposal?** None known.
- d. **Proposed measures to reduce or control light and glare impacts, if any:** Per the SMP, lighting is required to be directed away from wetlands. No changes to light- and glare-related regulations are included in the proposed SMP amendments prompted by periodic review. Any measures to reduce or control light and glare impacts would be determined as a part of project level review and approval.

12. *Recreation*

- a. **What designated and informal recreational opportunities are in the immediate vicinity?** According to the map Figure 13 – Existing Public Access Locations, Gold Bar has three existing public access sites at Salmon Run Park, Evergreen Mini Park, and Railroad Avenue Park. The Shoreline Analysis Report adds that there are numerous informal public

access points through public rights-of-way along the creek and rivers.

b. **Would the proposed project displace any existing recreational uses? If so, describe.**
No, not as a result of the proposed SMP amendments.

c. **Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation, including recreation opportunities to be provided by the project or applicant, if any:** Gold Bar's current SMP contains policies regarding recreational development in the Shoreline Use Policies and Regulations chapter. Recreation facilities in Gold Bar are to be consistent with citywide provisions governing parks and recreation. Specific policies and regulations in the SMP include:

- Physical access for passive recreation (such as interpretive trails) and habitat enhancement should be important objectives for the management of shoreline public access sites.
- Regulations should ensure that the development of active recreational facilities results in no net loss of ecological function. Regulations should address upland concerns, such as the location and design of parking and auxiliary facilities and active play areas, as well as the development of in-water and nearshore structures, such as non-motorized boat launches.
- All buildings and structures associated with a recreational use, except water-dependent structures, shall maintain the standard setback as outlined in the City's critical areas regulations.
- Private and public recreation areas shall protect existing native vegetation in the shoreline area and restore vegetation impacted by development activities. Recreational use and development shall result in no net loss of shoreline ecological functions.
- In approving shoreline recreational developments, the City's Shoreline Administrator shall ensure that the development will maintain, enhance, or restore desirable shoreline features.
- Fragile and unique shoreline areas with valuable ecological functions, such as wildlife habitats, shall be used only for non-intensive recreation activities that do not involve the construction of structures.
- Recreation developments such as playfields that require periodic use of fertilizers, pesticides or other chemicals, or that support high-intensity activities as a primary use, such as sporting events, shall be located outside of the shoreline jurisdiction.

No substantive changes to recreation-related regulations are included in the proposed SMP amendments prompted by periodic review except to adopt the updated 2016 Critical Areas Ordinance by reference.

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.** Per the Shoreline Analysis Report, the Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation has no record of any historic or cultural sites in Gold Bar's shoreline jurisdiction.

- 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.** No such landmarks or evidence are known.
- 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.** Potential impacts have not been assessed for this non-project action, as the proposed amendments to the SMP are not expected to affect cultural and historic resources within the shoreline jurisdiction should they be found to exist.
- 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.** The General Shoreline Provisions chapter addresses historical/cultural areas in the Gold Bar shoreline jurisdiction. Specific regulations include:
- Local developers and property owners shall immediately stop work and notify the City, the DAHP and affected Native American tribes if archaeological resources are uncovered during excavation.
 - A site inspection or evaluation by a professional archaeologist in coordination with affected Native American tribes shall be required for all permits issued in areas documented to contain archaeological resources. Failure to comply with this requirement shall be considered a violation of the Shoreline Permit.
 - Significant archaeological and historic resources shall be preserved permanently for scientific study, education, and public observation. When the City's Shoreline Administrator determines that a site has significant archeological, natural scientific or historical value, a shoreline substantial development permit and/or any other permit authorizing development or land modification shall not be issued which would pose a threat to the site. The City's Shoreline Administrator may require that a site be redesigned or that development be postponed in such areas to allow investigation of public acquisition potential, potential for adaptive new uses or management practices, retrieval and preservation of significant artifacts, or another course of action appropriate for the location and circumstances.
 - In the event that unforeseen factors constituting an emergency as defined in RCW 90.58.030 necessitate rapid action to retrieve or preserve artifacts or data identified above, the project may be exempted from the permit requirement of these regulations. The City's Shoreline Administrator shall notify Ecology, the State Attorney General's Office, and the DAHP of such a waiver in a timely manner.
 - Archaeological sites located both in and outside the shoreline jurisdiction are subject to RCW Chapter 27.44 (Indian Graves and Records) and RCW Chapter 27.53 (Archaeological Sites and Records) and shall comply with WAC Chapter 25- 48 or its successor as well as the provisions of this SMP.

- Identified historical or archaeological resources shall be considered in park, open space, public access, and site planning with access to such areas designed and managed to give maximum protection to the resource and surrounding environment.
- Clear interpretation of significant archaeological and historic resources shall be provided when and where appropriate.

No changes to historic and cultural preservation provisions are included in the proposed SMP amendments prompted by periodic review.

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.**

Major roads and transportation facilities in Gold Bar's shoreline jurisdiction include US 2 and the BNSF railroad. US 2 is the only through-road serving the City. There is one right-of-way crossing of shorelines within the City of Gold Bar, one over May Creek and none over the Wallace River or the Skykomish River. There are six projects identified by the Six Year Transportation Improvement Program, 2016-2021. One of the six projects 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?**

The City of Gold Bar is served by Snohomish County Community Transit Route 270/271, Gold Bar to Everett. The City has five bus stops.

c. **How many additional parking spaces would the completed project or non-project proposal have? How many would the project or proposal eliminate?** None. No development is specifically proposed. The proposal involves a city non-project legislative action that will not change the number of parking spaces that new or modified development is required to provide.

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, none.

e. **Will the project or proposal use (or occur in the immediate vicinity of) water, rail, or air transportation? If so, generally describe.** No; the proposed amendments to the SMP do not affect transportation.

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?** None associated with the proposed amendments to the SMP.

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. No change to the movement of such products is anticipated as a result of the proposed amendments to the SMP.

h. Proposed measures to reduce or control transportation impacts, if any: The Shoreline Use Provisions chapter addresses transportation facilities in the Gold Bar shoreline jurisdiction. Policies state that new roads in the shoreline jurisdiction should be minimized, they should be planned to fit topographical characteristics of the shorelines to avoid alterations of natural conditions, trail and bicycle systems should be encouraged, and joint use of corridors for transportation and utilities is encouraged. Transportation-specific regulations include:

- New transportation facilities in the shoreline jurisdiction shall be minimized and allowed only when related to and necessary for the support of permitted shoreline activities.
- All proposed transportation facilities must demonstrate how they have been planned, located, and designed where routes will have the least possible adverse effect on unique or fragile shoreline features.
- Development of transportation facilities shall result in no net loss of shoreline ecological functions. Mitigation shall be provided as necessary to meet this requirement. Failure to meet this standard will result in permit denial.
- Any road expansion affecting streams and waterways shall be designed to allow fish passage and minimum impact to habitat.
- New river and stream crossings associated with transportation uses shall be avoided if possible and shall be minimized in number and total area affected (e.g. perpendicular crossings). Culverts and bridges shall be designed to allow passage of adult and juvenile salmon pursuant to WDFW Fish Passage Guidelines and accommodate the flow of water, sediment, and woody debris during the 100-year return storm event. Bridge abutments shall be located outside of floodplains and CMZs if feasible.
- Expansion of existing transportation facilities within the shoreline jurisdiction shall be allowed only when the proponent demonstrates that:
 - No alternative route is feasible;
 - The roadway is constructed and maintained to cause the least possible adverse impact on the land and water environment; and
 - The roadway is found to be in the public interest.
- Transportation and primary utility facilities shall be required to make joint use of rights-of-way, and to consolidate crossings of water bodies to minimize adverse impacts to the shoreline.
- Developers of roads must be able to demonstrate that efforts have been made to coordinate with existing land use plans including the SMP and the City's Comprehensive Plan.
- All debris and other waste materials from construction of transportation facilities shall be disposed of in such a way as to prevent their entry into any water body.
- Road designs must provide safe pedestrian and non-motorized vehicular crossings where public access to shorelines is intended.

- Circulation system plans shall include systems for pedestrian, bicycle, and public transportation where appropriate.
- Streets within the shoreline jurisdiction shall be designed with the minimum pavement area required. Pervious materials shall be used where feasible for pathways and road shoulders to minimize the amount of impermeable surfaces and help to maintain a more natural appearance.

No changes to provisions regarding transportation and its impacts are included within the proposed SMP amendments prompted by periodic review.

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 change anticipated as a result of the proposed SMP amendments.
- b. **Proposed measures to reduce or control direct impacts on public services, if any.**
None proposed; no impact anticipated.

16. Utilities

- a. **Circle utilities currently available at the site:**
electricity, natural gas, water, refuse service, telephone, sanitary sewer, septic system,
other _____
- d. **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.** None associated with this non-project proposal.

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: Talia R Tittelfitz
Name of signee Talia R Tittelfitz
Position and Agency/Organization Senior Planner, BHC Consultants, LLC
Date Submitted: February 27, 2019

D. Supplemental sheet for non-project 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 to adopt amendments to the existing Gold Bar Shoreline Master Program does not directly cause increases to discharges to water, emissions to air,

productions, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or production of noise. However, future development projects regulated under the SMP, such as limited new residential development, could potentially cause a slight increase in the levels of air emissions and noise production.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are: Future development projects would be subject to the Policies and Regulations of the SMP and the Gold Bar Municipal Code as well as SEPA. Project-level approval will be conditioned in accordance with City review and appropriate additional environmental analysis to be determined at the time of application. Certain mitigation standards are contained in the SMP regulations and other mitigation measures will be identified and applied during the project review for individual development projects.

2. How would the proposal be likely to affect plants, animals, fish, or marine life? The purpose of the SMP Gold Bar shoreline environment designations is to provide for protection of the shoreline area consistent with the Shoreline Management Act and the SMA Guidelines for no net loss of ecological functions. Although the proposed amendments to the SMP do not affect mitigation or restoration procedures, the current SMP provides for potential adverse impacts to plants, animals, fish, and marine life to be mitigated through established sequencing procedures and for the facilitation of restoration activities intended to enhance plants, animals, fish, and marine life within the shoreline jurisdiction.

Proposed measures to protect or conserve plants, animals, fish, or marine life are: The updated Critical Areas Ordinance, adopted in 2016, is proposed to be adopted into the SMP by reference. Generally, the SMP contains regulations which strive to allow for the safe and unobstructed passage of fish and wildlife in the shoreline jurisdiction, to control non-native plants and weeds that are proven harmful to native vegetation or habitats, to avoid and mitigate adverse impacts to water quality, and to afford priority for land acquisition to open space that provides wildlife habitat within the shoreline jurisdiction. All shoreline development projects are to be located, designed, constructed, and managed to avoid disturbance of and minimize adverse impacts to wildlife resources, including spawning, nesting, rearing and habitat areas and migratory routes.

3. How would the proposal be likely to deplete energy or natural resources? Demands for energy and natural resources will increase along with population growth and associated development irrespective of the subject proposal to adopt the periodic review amendments to this SMP. Individual development proposals will be reviewed and potentially mitigated on a project level with regard to energy and natural resources impacts.

Proposed measures to protect or conserve energy and natural resources are: Concentration of high-intensity water-oriented commercial, transportation, and industrial development under the Shoreline Master Program environment designation High Intensity, and concentration of residential development in the Shoreline Residential environment, will enable the conservation of natural resources in shoreline areas that

are characterized by open space, floodplain, and other sensitive lands or otherwise intended to be protected from human influence and development.

The SMP also requires circulation system plans to include systems for pedestrian, bicycle, and public transportation where appropriate.

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?** Chapter 3 – General Shoreline Provisions addresses critical areas, archaeological and historic resources, public access, and restoration. The updated Critical Areas Ordinance, adopted in 2016, is proposed to be adopted into the SMP by reference. This would ensure that any development proposals in the shoreline jurisdiction comply with the increased standards for protection of plants, animals, fish, and marine life as found in the CAO and otherwise compliant with the requirements of the Endangered Species Act. Another proposed amendment prompted by periodic review is to delineate wetlands in accordance with the approved federal wetland delineation manual.

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

The proposed amendments to the SMP are not expected to adversely affect environmentally sensitive areas. Rather, these proposed clerical revisions would make it easier to coordinate the protection of habitat and environmentally sensitive areas by ensuring that all references to local, state, and federal plans and regulations associated with the administration of the SMP are consistent and up-to-date.

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 amendments to the existing Gold Bar SMP were written to retain the document's internal consistency and compatibility with existing plans and regulations, namely the City's adopted Comprehensive Plan and development regulation, in addition to complying with the provisions of the Shoreline Management Act.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce shoreline and land use impacts are: The Gold Bar SMP is intended to avoid and reduce impacts to the shoreline area by providing protection of the shoreline's ecological functions. Future development will be evaluated for potential impacts to the shoreline and those proposals must be consistent with the City of Gold Bar's 2015 Comprehensive Plan, the City's 2016 Critical Areas Ordinance, the Shoreline Management Act, the Growth Management Act, and regulatory reform legislation. Measures to avoid or reduce shoreline and land use impacts are embodied in the policies and development regulations of Gold Bar's current SMP and other City codes.

6. **How would the proposal be likely to increase demands on transportation or public services and utilities?** Unlikely. The proposed amendments to the SMP will not directly cause an increase on demand for transportation, public services and utilities.

Proposed measures to reduce or respond to such demand(s) are: The Shoreline Use Policies and Regulations chapter of the SMP includes policies and regulations for managing the provision of public services and utilities to assure concurrency and joint use of existing facilities. Relevant policies and regulations include:

- New primary utilities should be located outside of the SMA jurisdiction unless no other feasible option exists. Where allowed they should utilize existing transportation and utility sites, rights-of-way and corridors whenever possible, rather than creating new corridors. Joint use of rights-of-way and corridors should be encouraged.
- Through coordination with the City, utility development shall provide for compatible, multiple uses of sites and rights-of-way. Such uses include shoreline access points, trail systems and other forms of recreation and transportation, providing such uses will not unduly interfere with utility operations, endanger public health and safety, or create a significant and disproportionate liability for the owner.

7. **Identify, if possible, whether the proposal may conflict with local, state, or federal laws or requirements for the protection of the environment.** None identified. The proposed amendments to the SMP are minor procedural changes largely intended to update references to state and federal laws as directed by Ecology. The proposed SMP amendments also include adopting the City's 2016 Critical Areas Ordinance by reference. Per the SMP, in any case where the SMP's policies or regulations conflict with those of another applicable City, state, or federal requirement, the policies and regulations that provide more substantive protection to the shoreline area shall apply.