

To: LEGAL NOTICES

Publication Date: March 29, 2013

Issuance Date: March 29, 2013

NOTICE OF DETERMINATION OF NONSIGNIFICANCE (DNS)

The City of Bainbridge Island has received the following land use application:

Date: March 29, 2013
Applicant: City of Bainbridge Island
Owners: Walter Masland (Property A), Blue Moon Land Co. LLC (Property B), and Richard Burke (Property C)
Project Name: City Land Use Map Errors Comprehensive Plan Amendment
File Numbers: CPA 18573
Permit Request: Comprehensive Plan Amendment application requesting an amendment to the Land Use Map of the Comprehensive Plan.
Description of Proposal: This Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposes to correct 3 errors that have been identified on the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map. Property A & and the southern half of Property B were designated Neighborhood Service Center (NSC) in 1997 with the approval of the Lynwood Center Subarea Plan. Those changes were made incorrectly on the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map leaving Property A split-designation of NSC/OSR-2, and less of Property B is designated NSC than was intended by the Subarea Plan. Property C is a shoreline property on the southern side of Eagle Harbor. The City's Shoreline Master Program designations are shown on the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map, and Property C is shown as having a split shoreline designation: Semi-rural & Natural. It is supposed to be designated entirely Semi-rural. The Comprehensive Plan Amendment fixes these 3 errors.

Location of Proposal:
Property A: Tax Acct. # 042402-1-058-2001, 7561 NE Baker Hill Road.
Property B: Tax Acct. # 042402-1-046-2006, 4565 Point White Drive NE
Property C: Tax Acct. # 4165-002-001-0107, 5842 Main Street NE

SEPA Decision: The City of Bainbridge Island (lead agency) has determined that the proposal does not have a probable significant impact on the environment. This DNS is issued under WAC 197-11-340 (2). This determination was made after review of a completed environmental checklist and other information on file with the lead agency. This information is available to the public upon request. An environmental impact statement (EIS) is not required under RCW 43.21C.030 (2) c.

Comments must be submitted by no later than 4:00 p.m. on April 19, 2013.
The lead agency will not act on this proposal for 21 days.

Responsible Official: Katharine Cook, Planning Director
Department of Planning & Community Development
Address: City of Bainbridge Island
280 Madison Avenue North
Bainbridge Island, WA 98110, (206) 842 - 2552

Signature: Katharine Cook

Date: 03-25-13

APPEAL: You may appeal this determination by filing a written appeal and paying the appropriate fee to the City Clerk, at 280 Madison Avenue North, Bainbridge Island, WA 98110, in accordance with the procedures set forth in the Bainbridge Island Municipal Code, Section 16.04.170 **no later than 4:00 p.m. on April 19, 2013. You should be prepared to make specific factual objections. If you have any questions concerning this application, contact:**

Jennifer Sutton, AICP, Special Project Planner
Department of Planning & Community Development
280 Madison Avenue North
Bainbridge Island, WA 98110
(206) 780-3772 Fax: (206) 780-0955
Email: pcd@bainbridgewa.gov

WAC 197-11-960 Environmental checklist.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Purpose of checklist:

The State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), chapter 43.21C RCW, requires all governmental agencies to consider the environmental impacts of a proposal before making decisions. An environmental impact statement (EIS) must be prepared for all proposals with probable significant adverse impacts on the quality of the environment. The purpose of this checklist is to provide information to help you and the agency identify impacts from your proposal (and to reduce or avoid impacts from the proposal, if it can be done) and to help the agency decide whether an EIS is required.

Instructions for applicants:

This environmental checklist asks you to describe some basic information about your proposal. Governmental agencies use this checklist to determine whether the environmental impacts of your proposal are significant, requiring preparation of an EIS. Answer the questions briefly, with the most precise information known, or give the best description you can.

You must answer each question accurately and carefully, to the best of your knowledge. In most cases, you should be able to answer the questions from your own observations or project plans without the need to hire experts. If you really do not know the answer, or if a question does not apply to your proposal, write "do not know" or "does not apply." Complete answers to the questions now may avoid unnecessary delays later.

Some questions ask about governmental regulations, such as zoning, shoreline, and landmark designations. Answer these questions if you can. If you have problems, the governmental agencies can assist you.

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

Use of checklist for nonproject proposals:

Complete this checklist for nonproject proposals, even though questions may be answered "does not apply." IN ADDITION, complete the SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS (part D).

For nonproject actions, the references in the checklist to the words "project," "applicant," and "property or site" should be read as "proposal," "proposer," and "affected geographic area," respectively.

A. BACKGROUND

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable:
2013 Comprehensive Plan Amendment CPA18573 Land Use Map Corrections
2. Name of applicant:
City of Bainbridge Island
3. Address and phone number of applicant and contact person:
280 Madison Avenue North
Bainbridge Island, WA 98110
Attn: Kathy Cook, Director, Planning & Community Development
4. Date checklist prepared:
Prepared on March 20, 2013; published on March 29, 2013
5. Agency requesting checklist:
City of Bainbridge Island
6. Proposed timing or schedule (including phasing, if applicable):
The proposed date for the City Council to the 2013 Comprehensive Plan Amendments is September 25, 2013.
7. Do you have any plans for future additions, expansion, or further activity related to or connected with this proposal? If yes, explain.
After the Land Use Map of the Comprehensive Plan is amended to make the mapping corrections, the City Council shall correct the City's Official Zoning Map by resolution.

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

The Comprehensive Land Use map corrections for Properties A and B will fix a small error on two adjacent properties, to implement the land use designation approved in by the City Council in 1997 with the approval of the Lynwood Center Subarea Plan. State Environmental Policy Act review was during review of the subarea plan.

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.

The shoreline designation for Property C, owned by Richard Burke, is proposed to be changed entirely to Urban when the City's Shoreline Master Program Update is approved by the City Council, in the near future.

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

City of Bainbridge Island City Council adoption and Washington State Dept. of Commerce approval.

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.)

This Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposes to correct 3 errors that have been identified on the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map. Property A: Tax Acct. # 042402-1-058-2001 (owned by Walter Masland)

Property B: Tax Acct. # 042402-1-046-2006 (owned by Blue Moon Land Co. LLC)

Property C: Tax Acct. # 4165-002-001-0107 (owned by Richard Burke)

Properties A & B are adjacent properties in the Lynwood Center area on the south end of the Island. Through the Lynwood Center Subarea Plan, approved by the City Council in 1997 through Ordinance 97-16, Property A was supposed to be designated entirely "Neighborhood Service Center(NSC)" as was the southern half of Property B (the northern half of Property B was to remain designated Open Space Residential [OSR]-2). Instead, the changes for those properties were never made to the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map and consequently, the City's Official Zoning map, leaving Property A split-zoned NSC/OSR-2, and less of Property B is zoned NSC that was intended by the Subarea Plan. This Comprehensive Plan Amendment fixes those two errors.

Property C is a shoreline property on the southern side of Eagle Harbor. The City's Shoreline Master Program designations are shown on the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map, and Property C is shown as having a split shoreline designation: Semi-rural & Natural. It is supposed to be designated entirely Semi-rural. The Comprehensive Plan Amendment fixes this error.

See attached mapping information

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.

Property A: Tax Acct. # 042402-1-058-2001; 7651 NE Baker Hill Road

Property B: Tax Acct. # 042402-1-046-2006; 4565 Point White Drive NE

Property C: Tax Acct. # 4165-002-001-0107; 5842 Main Street NE

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT

EVALUATION FOR
AGENCY USE ONLY

B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS

1. Earth

a. General description of the site (circle one): Flat, rolling, hilly, steep slopes, mountainous, other.

Properties A and B are basically flat, with a very gradual slope from north to south.

Property C is a shoreline property, sloping down to the water, from south to north, with a 50 foot consistent drop in elevation over 225 feet.

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

The steepest slope on Property C is between 15-20%.

- 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 prime farmland.

An extensive discussion of the soils and their properties for the Island can be found in the *USDA Soil Survey of Kitsap County*.

Properties A & B: Property A contains Ragnar fine sandy loam, and Property B is split between Ragnar fine sandy loam (eastern half) and Norma fine sandy loam (western half).

Property C: Mostly Kapowsin gravelly loam, 6-15%, with the northeastern portion of the property containing Dystric Xerothents.

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

The soils below Properties A and B qualify as a liquefaction hazard area and the steeper slopes of Property C may qualify as a landslide hazard area under the City's Critical Areas Ordinance, Bainbridge Island Municipal Code (BIMC) Chapter 16.20.

- e. Describe the purpose, type, and approximate quantities of any filling or grading proposed. Indicate source of fill.

No filling or grading is proposed as part of this non-project action.

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

No clearing or construction is proposed as part of this non-project action.

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

No construction is proposed as part of this non-project action. Impervious surfaces are reviewed through the City's stormwater management regulations, BIMC Chapters 15.20 and 15.21.

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

No specific erosion control measures are proposed as part of this non-project action. Any future development projects will be evaluated as part of site-specific project review for compliance with SEPA and applicable stormwater management regulations.

2. Air

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

This non-project action will have no adverse impact on air quality.

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

There are not any off-site sources of emissions/odors that affect this non-project action proposal.

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

This non-project action will have no adverse impacts on air quality. Air quality will be evaluated as part of site-specific project review and SEPA analysis.

3. Water

- a. Surface:

- 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.

Properties A and B are located across Point White Drive, just north of Rich Passage. Property C is a shoreline property on the south side of Eagle Harbor.

- 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.

This non-project action will not require any work over, in or adjacent to these waters.

- 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.

This non-project action will not require any filling or dredging.

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

This non-project action will not require any surface water withdrawals or diversions. Surface water withdrawals will be evaluated as part of site-specific project review and SEPA analysis.

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

Property C is a shoreline property that slopes down to Eagle Harbor. The upland portion of the property is outside the 100-year floodplain. This non-project action does not impact flood areas specifically.

- 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.

This non-project action will not require discharge of materials to surface waters. Surface water quality will be evaluated as part of site-specific project review and SEPA analysis.

b. Ground:

- 1) Will ground water be withdrawn, or will water be discharged to ground water? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.

This non-project action will not require any withdrawal of groundwater or discharge to groundwater. Impacts to groundwater will be evaluated as part of site-specific project review and SEPA analysis.

- 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 non-project action will not require any discharge of waste material to groundwater.

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.

This non-project action will not produce stormwater runoff.

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

This non-project action will not affect discharge of waste materials to ground or surface waters.

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

This non-project action will not have any adverse impact on surface, ground or runoff waters. Water quality impacts would be evaluated as part of site-specific project review and SEPA analysis. Future development shall be reviewed for compliance with the City's surface and stormwater management regulations, BIMC Chapters 15.20 and 15.21.

4. Plants

- a. Check or circle types of vegetation found on the site:

Properties B and C have single-family a residence upon them, and Property A is mostly an undeveloped property with grass and a few trees:

- deciduous tree: alder, maple, aspen, other
- evergreen tree: fir, cedar, pine, other
- shrubs
- grass
- pasture
- crop or grain
- wet soil plants: cattail, buttercup, bullrush, 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?

This non-project action will have no specific effect on vegetation removal or alteration. Vegetation will be evaluated as part of site-specific project review and SEPA analysis.

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

There are no known threatened or endangered plant species on Bainbridge Island.

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

No landscaping is proposed as part of this non-project action.

5. Animals

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

The City of Bainbridge Island is home to the animals underlined below. Property C is a shoreline property, and therefore could be home to the seals, sea lions, fish and skates.

birds: hawk, heron, eagle, songbirds, other:

mammals: deer, bear, elk, beaver, other: river otter, harbor seal, sea lion, muskrat, weasel, raccoon

fish: bass, salmon, trout, herring, shellfish, other: long nose skate, big skate

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

Puget Sound Chinook, Puget Sound Coho, Puget Sound Steelhead, Orca whales, and bald eagles are known to occur on and around Bainbridge Island.

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

Puget Sound, including Bainbridge Island, is an important nesting place, feeding area, and wintering ground for thousands of birds in the Pacific Flyway and is a migratory corridor for salmonids and some marine mammals.

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

This non-project action will have no significant adverse impact on animals or birds. Impacts of individual proposals on wildlife and wildlife habitat will be evaluated as part of any future site-specific project review and SEPA analysis.

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 is required for this non-project action.

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

This non-project action will not impact solar energy use.

- 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:

This non-project action does not provide specific energy conservation features.

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.

This non-project action poses no significant threat of environmental health hazards.

- 1) Describe special emergency services that might be required.

This non-project action will not require any special emergency services.

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

No specific measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards are necessary as part of this non-project action. Environmental health impacts of future individual development proposals will be evaluated as part of site-specific project review and SEPA analysis.

b. Noise

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

Properties A and B are located on the western side of the Lynwood Center area, and there is currently a large mixed-use development under construction on the east side of the Lynwood Center area. Property C is located on the opposite side of Eagle Harbor from the Washington State Ferry terminal. This non-project action is not affected by existing noise levels.

- 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.

This non-project action will not create any noise or affect noise levels.

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

Noise levels on Bainbridge Island are regulated under Chapter 16.16 of the Bainbridge Island Municipal Code. Noise impacts of future projects will be evaluated as part of site-specific project review and SEPA analysis.

8. Land and shoreline use

- a. What is the current use of the site and adjacent properties?

Property A is undeveloped, and Property B and C each have a single-family residence upon them. Property A has single-family residences to the south and west, commercial development to the east, and undeveloped property to the north. Property B has commercial to the south, several single-family residences to the west, and mostly undeveloped property to the east. The tanks for the Emerald Heights Water System are to the north, across Baker Hill Road. Property C has marinas on both sides to the east and west, and single-family residences to the south.

- b. Has the site been used for agriculture? If so, describe.

Properties A and B may have been used for agriculture at one time, but there is no evidence to that effect.

- c. Describe any structures on the site.

Property A is undeveloped, but has a few small sheds upon it. Property B has a single-family residence upon it, and accessory outbuildings such as a garage and shed. Property C is also developed with a single-family residence, and has a boathouse.

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

This non-project action requires no demolition.

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

Property A: Split-zoned NSC/R-2

Property B: Split-zoned NSC/R-2

Property C: R-2

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

Property A: Split-designation NSC/OSR-2

Property B: Split-designation NSC/OSR-2

Property C: OSR-2

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

Property A: not applicable

Property B: not applicable

Property C: Split-designation Semi-rural/ Natural

- h. Has any part of the site been classified as an "environmentally sensitive" area? If so, specify.

The soils below Properties A and B qualify as a liquefaction hazard area and the steeper slopes of Property C may qualify as a landslide hazard area under the City's Critical Areas Ordinance, Bainbridge Island Municipal Code (BIMC) Chapter 16.20.

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

No development is proposed as part of this non-project action.

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

This non-project action will have no effect on population displacement.

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

This non-project action will not displace population in any way.

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

This comprehensive plan amendment proposes to fix three small errors that have been discovered on the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map, and therefore is compatible with the existing land use plan. This proposal is a non-project action. Environmental review of impacts associated with land and shoreline use will be performed on a project specific basis, as required.

9. Housing

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

This non-project action will not create additional housing units.

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

This non-project action will not eliminate any housing units.

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

This non-project action does not adversely impact housing. Future impacts to housing will be evaluated as part of site-specific project review and SEPA analysis.

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 new structures are proposed with this non-project action.
- b. What views in the immediate vicinity would be altered or obstructed?
This non-project action will not alter or obstruct any views.
- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control aesthetic impacts, if any:
This non-project action does not adversely impact aesthetic impacts. Future impacts to housing will be evaluated as part of site-specific project review and SEPA analysis.

11. Light and glare

- a. What type of light or glare will the proposal produce? What time of day would it mainly occur?
This non-project action will not produce light or glare.
- b. Could light or glare from the finished project be a safety hazard or interfere with views?
This non-project action will not produce light or glare.
- c. What existing off-site sources of light or glare may affect your proposal?
This non-project action will not be affected by any light or glare.
- d. Proposed measures to reduce or control light and glare impacts, if any:
This non-project action will not produce light or glare. Light and glare impacts will be evaluated as part of any future site-specific project review and SEPA analysis.

12. Recreation

- a. What designated and informal recreational opportunities are in the immediate vicinity?
Bainbridge Island has state and municipal parks in addition to shoreline access from many city-owned road ends. There are golf courses, tennis courts, and youth play fields on the island. The Bainbridge Metro Park and Recreation District owns the Schel-Chleb estuary open space located west of Properties A and B. Pritchard Park is located to the east of Property C. This non-project action will have no effect on the recreational uses on Bainbridge Island.
- b. Would the proposed project displace any existing recreational uses? If so, describe.
This non-project action will not displace any existing recreational uses.
- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation, including recreation opportunities to be provided by the project or applicant, if any:
This non-project action will not adversely impact recreation. Displacement of any existing recreational facilities will be evaluated as part of any future site-specific project review and SEPA analysis.

13. Historic and cultural preservation

- a. Are there any places or objects listed on, or proposed for, national, state, or local preservation registers known to be on or next to the site? If so, generally describe.
Properties B and C have residences that were original constructed in 1930 and 1920, respectively, and are therefore in the City's historic resources inventory, *All Historic Resources Survey of Bainbridge Island, March, 1987*, Boyle Waggoner Architects.

- b. Generally describe any landmarks or evidence of historic, archaeological, scientific, or cultural importance known to be on or next to the site.

In the vicinity of all three properties, there are a number of pre-1920s structures, which are included in the City's inventory of historic resources, but there are not any landmarks or other evidence of cultural importance on or next to the subject properties.

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

This non-project action does not specifically impact resources of historic, cultural, archaeological or scientific importance. Impacts to such resources will be evaluated as part of any future site-specific project review and SEPA analysis.

14. Transportation

- a. Identify public streets and highways serving the site, and describe proposed access to the existing street system.

Show on site plans, if any.

Properties A and B are served by Baker Hill Road, and Property B is also served by Point White Drive. Property C is served by Ewing Street, off of Ward Avenue.

- b. Is site currently served by public transit? If not, what is the approximate distance to the nearest transit stop?

Bainbridge Island is served by Kitsap Transit and the Washington State Ferry Service. Kitsap Transit operates a commuter system which is coordinated with the ferry schedule in addition to a dial-a-ride service. Transit stops are located ½ mile apart. All three subject properties are within walking distance to a Kitsap Transit bus stop.

- c. How many parking spaces would the completed project have? How many would the project eliminate?

This non-project action does not construct or eliminate any parking spaces. The impacts of new or lost parking spaces would be evaluated as part of any future site-specific project review and SEPA analysis.

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

This non-project action does not affect roads or driveways, or propose improvements to existing roads or driveways, or require new roads or streets.

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

This non-project action will not affect transportation.

- f. How many vehicular trips per day would be generated by the completed project? If known, indicate when peak volumes would occur.

This non-project action will not generate any vehicular trips per day.

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

This non-project action will not have adverse transportation impacts. Future development proposals will assess potential impacts associated with transportation and parking through future site-specific project review and SEPA analysis.

15. Public services

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

This non-project action will not increase the need for public services.

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

This non-project action will have no significant adverse effect on public services. Specific measures to reduce or

control the impact on public services will be evaluated as part of future site-specific project review and SEPA analysis.

16. Utilities

- a. Describe utilities currently available at the site: Island utilities include electricity, natural gas, refuse service, telephone. Properties A and B are served by sanitary sewer and public water. Property C is on a septic system and private well.
- b. Describe the utilities that are proposed for the project, the utility providing the service, and the general construction activities on the site or in the immediate vicinity which might be needed.

This non-project action does not propose any utilities, and there is not any construction proposed.

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: Jennifer E. Sutter
Date Submitted: 3/19/13

D. SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS

(do not use this sheet for project actions)

Because these questions are very general, it may be helpful to read them in conjunction with the list of the elements of the environment.

When answering these questions, be aware of the extent the proposal or the types of activities likely to result from the proposal, would affect the item at a greater intensity or at a faster rate than if the proposal were not implemented. Respond briefly and in general terms.

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

This proposal is to make three small corrections to the Land Use Map of the Comprehensive Plan, and does not propose any new development. The correction to the land use designation for Properties A and B would take approximately 0.4 acres currently designated OSR-2 (residential) and designate in Neighborhood Service Center, and small-scale commercial and mixed-use district. Eventual development proposals allowed under the NSC designation could increase the level of noise, pollution, or discharge compared to a residential development. This Comprehensive Plan Amendment will not have any impact on discharge to water; emissions to air; production, storage, or release of toxic/hazardous substances; or production of noise. Specific impacts on discharge to water; emissions to air; production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or production of noise will be reviewed as part of site-specific review and SEPA analysis and/or future building permits.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are:

Specific measures to reduce or control the impact of environmental emissions will be evaluated as part of future site-specific project review and SEPA analysis.

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

This Comprehensive Plan Amendment to make three corrections to the Land Use Map of the Comprehensive Plan will have no effect on plants, animals, fish or marine life.

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

This is a non-project action that does not require any mitigation measures. Impacts to plants, animals, fish or marine life will be reviewed as part of site-specific review and SEPA analysis and/or future building permits.

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

This Comprehensive Plan Amendment to make three corrections to the Land Use Map of the Comprehensive Plan will have no effect on energy or natural resources.

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

This amendment is a non-project action that does not require any mitigation measures. Impacts to energy and natural resources will be reviewed as part of site-specific review and SEPA analysis and/or future building permits.

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?

This non-project action does not affect environmentally sensitive areas. These areas are protected through other regulations, such as the Critical Areas Ordinance (BIMC Chapter 16.20). The soils below Properties A and B qualify as a liquefaction hazard area and the steeper slopes of Property C may qualify as a landslide hazard area under the City's Critical Areas Ordinance, BIMC Chapter 16.20.

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

No adverse impact is anticipated from this non-project action.

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?

This comprehensive plan amendment proposes to fix three errors that have been discovered on the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map, and therefore is compatible with the existing Comprehensive Plan. This proposal is a non-project action. Environmental review of impacts associated with land and shoreline use will be performed on a project specific basis, as required. Project-specific development must comply with the City's Shoreline Management Master Program (SMP, BIMC Chapter 16.12), the City's Critical Areas Ordinance (BIMC Chapter 16.20), Title 18 Zoning, and the State Environmental Policy Act.

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

This is a non-project action that proposes to fix three errors on the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map. Any development project would have to go through a building permit, shoreline permit, Site Plan Review or Conditional Use Permit process and impacts would be mitigated through this site-specific analysis. Project-specific development must comply with the City's Shoreline Management Master Program (SMP, BIMC Chapter 16.12), BIMC Title 18 Zoning, the City's *Critical Areas Ordinance* (BIMC Chapter 16.20), and the State Environmental Policy Act.

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

This non-project action will have no impacts on transportation and public services. Although increasing the amount of land designated NSC by approximately 0.4 acres could eventually lead to an increase in residential and/or commercial development, the current proposal does not propose any new development.

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

This non-project action is not expected to increase in demand on transportation, public services, or utilities.

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

This Comprehensive Plan Amendment does not conflict with local, state or federal requirements for the protection of the environment. Any development project proposed on any of the three subject properties must comply with the City's Critical Areas Ordinance, BIMC Chapter 16.20, and complete project specific SEPA review, if necessary.