



**STATE ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT
DETERMINATION OF NONSIGNIFICANCE
(SEPA DNS)**

Community Planning & Development
601 4th Avenue E. – PO Box 1967
Olympia WA 98501-1967
Phone: 360.753.8314
Fax: 360.753.8087
cpdinfo@ci.olympia.wa.us
www.olympiawa.gov

Project Name: Shoreline Master Program (SMP) Periodic Review - SEPA Review

Project Number: 20-4936

Description of Proposal: Proposed amendments to the SMP to keep it current with changes in state law, changes in adopted City plans and regulations (such as the City's recently adopted Sea Level Rise Response Plan), and other changed local circumstances. These amendments also include revisions to the Critical Areas Ordinance (CAO).

Location of Proposal: City-Wide

Proponent: Joyce Phillips, AICP, Senior Planner, Community Planning and Development, City of Olympia

Lead Agency: City of Olympia

SEPA Official: Nicole Floyd, AICP, Principal Planner. Phone 360.570.3768, Email: nfloyd@ci.olympia.wa.us

Date of Issue: January 22, 2021

Threshold Determination: The lead agency for this proposal has determined that this action is not likely to have a significant adverse impact upon the environment. Therefore, an Environmental Impact Statement is not required under RCW 43.21C.030(2)(C). The environmental review and SEPA threshold determination of this proposed action are based upon the environmental checklist and related information on file with the City. This information is available to the public on request. This DNS is issued under Washington Administrative Code 197-11-340. The applicant shall not begin work until after the appeal deadline has expired and any other necessary permits have been granted.

Comments regarding this Determination of Non-Significance (DNS) should be directed to the SEPA Official at the address above. If conditions are added, deleted or modified during or following the 14-day comment period, a revised threshold determination will be issued.

COMMENT DEADLINE: 4:00 p.m., February 5, 2021

APPEAL PROCEDURE: Pursuant to RCW 43.21C.075(3) and Olympia Municipal Code 14.04.160(A), this DNS may be appealed by any agency or aggrieved person. Appeals must be filed with the Community Planning and Development Department at the address above within twenty-one (21) calendar days of the date of issue. Any appeal must be accompanied by the applicable fees.

Issued by:

Nicole Floyd, Senior Planner, AICP, SEPA OFFICIAL

SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Purpose of checklist:

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

Instructions for applicants:

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

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

Instructions for Lead Agencies:

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

Use of checklist for nonproject proposals: [\[help\]](#)

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

A. Background [\[help\]](#)

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable: [\[help\]](#)

Olympia Shoreline Master Program Periodic Review

2. Name of applicant: [\[help\]](#)

City of Olympia, Community Planning and Development Department

3. Address and phone number of applicant and contact person: [\[help\]](#)

Joyce Phillips, AICP, Senior Planner
(360) 570-3722, jphillip@ci.olympia.wa.us
601 – 4th Ave East
PO Box 1967
Olympia, WA 98507

4. Date checklist prepared: [\[help\]](#)

November 18, 2020

5. Agency requesting checklist: [\[help\]](#)

Department of Ecology

6. Proposed timing or schedule (including phasing, if applicable): [\[help\]](#)

Updates to the Olympia Shoreline Master Program (SMP) will be completed by June 2021.

7. Do you have any plans for future additions, expansion, or further activity related to or connected with this proposal? If yes, explain. [\[help\]](#)

This is a non-project action proposal. The city is updating the policies and regulations of its SMP to ensure consistency with related state and city policies and regulations. Site-specific applications for development within shoreline jurisdiction are considered separate actions and will be reviewed for compliance with the SMP at the time of application.

8. List any environmental information you know about that has been prepared, or will be prepared, directly related to this proposal. [\[help\]](#)

Shoreline Master Program Periodic Update Ecology Checklist, 2020
Gap Analysis Report, Shoreline Master Program Periodic Review, 2020
Olympia Sea Level Rise Response Plan, 2019

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. [\[help\]](#)

This is a non-project action. If there are any property-specific development applications pending they are vested to the current policies and regulations of the SMP.

10. List any government approvals or permits that will be needed for your proposal, if known. [\[help\]](#)

The City of Olympia and the Washington State Department of Ecology must approve the changes to the SMP prior to adoption of this proposal.

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.) [\[help\]](#)

This is a non-project action and contains proposed policies and regulations to the City's Shoreline Master Program that are applied citywide within the identified shoreline jurisdiction of the City of Olympia. The project area is the shoreline jurisdiction within city limits. A summary of regulatory changes includes:

- ***Updating the SMP to ensure consistency with changes in policy and regulation affecting shoreline management made by the state legislature since 2015 when the SMP was last updated. These changes are outlined in the Washington State Department of Ecology SMP Periodic Update checklist.***
- ***Updating the SMP and Critical Areas Ordinance (Chapter 18.32 of the Olympia Municipal Code) to ensure consistency with Best Available Science and updated Washington State Department of Ecology guidance for wetland buffers in the Critical Areas Ordinance regulations to be adopted by the City that affect environmentally sensitive areas.***
- ***Updating SMP definitions and zoning code references to reflect current regulations in-place.***
- ***Amended policies and regulations to address the City's Sea Level Rise Response Plan.***
- ***Add clarification on permit review process and shoreline jurisdiction.***
- ***Establish a limit to the total number of live-aboards within a marina.***

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. [\[help\]](#)

This includes the waters and all land within 200 feet landward of the ordinary high-water mark (OHWM) of, Budd Inlet, Grass Lake, Capitol Lake, Ward Lake, Ken Lake, Black Lake Ditch, Percival Creek, and Olympia's marine shoreline areas, plus any associated wetlands, within City limits.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS [\[help\]](#)

1. Earth [\[help\]](#)

a. General description of the site: [\[help\]](#)

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

N/A, this is a non-project action. Answers provided below are intended to give a general description of conditions within SMP jurisdiction.

b. What is the steepest slope on the site (approximate percent slope)? [\[help\]](#)

There is a variety of terrain located within the SMP jurisdiction. There are steep slopes designated within parts of the shoreline jurisdiction (40% or greater slopes, or slopes 15% or more with seeps).

- 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. [\[help\]](#)

Soils within the SMP jurisdiction vary but mostly include sand and gravel, clay, and peat and muck in associated wetlands.

- d. Are there surface indications or history of unstable soils in the immediate vicinity? If so, describe. [\[help\]](#)

N/A, this is a non-project action. According to the Washington Geologic Information Portal, accessed via the Washington State Department of Natural Resources website, there are two seismogenic faults that cross the City of Olympia area. Both run in a diagonal fashion, northwest to southeast and are named Olympia Structure Class B. The portal maps the approximate ground response to earthquakes by identifying liquefaction susceptibility. The majority of the Olympia area is identified as having a low to moderate susceptibility. Portions of the city (primarily near Puget Sound) are identified as having high susceptibility, while other areas are considered low or very low susceptibility.

- 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. [\[help\]](#)

N/A, this is a non-project action, which does not include any filing, excavation, or grading.

- f. Could erosion occur as a result of clearing, construction, or use? If so, generally describe. [\[help\]](#)

N/A, this is a non-project action, which does not include any clearing or construction.

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

N/A, this is a non-project action.

- h. Proposed measures to reduce or control erosion, or other impacts to the earth, if any: [\[help\]](#)

N/A, this is a non-project action. When future projects are submitted, any erosion-related impacts created during clearing and construction activities will be mitigated in compliance with the Ecology 2012 Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington, as amended in December 2014. This requires any erosion-related impacts created during clearing and construction activities to be addressed according to a Temporary Erosion Sedimentation Control Plan (TESC), which is a standard part of engineering review and approval. Additionally, the City

has provisions to protect critical areas, which include geologically hazardous areas (landslide hazard areas), which will apply.

2. Air [\[help\]](#)

- 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. [\[help\]](#)

None, this is a non-project action. None of the questions in this section directly apply.

- b. Are there any off-site sources of emissions or odor that may affect your proposal? If so, generally describe. [\[help\]](#)

No, this is a non-project action, which would not result in any emissions to the air.

- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control emissions or other impacts to air, if any: [\[help\]](#)

None, this is a non-project action and there would be no emissions or other impacts to the air, therefore, no measures are proposed.

3. Water [\[help\]](#)

- 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. [\[help\]](#)

This is a non-project action that would apply to all designated shoreline environments in the City of Olympia. By definition, the SMP addresses marine shorelines, year-round streams with flows over 20 cubic feet per second, lakes equal to or more than 20 acres in size, and associated wetlands and floodplains. Regulated shorelines include Budd Inlet, Grass Lake, Capitol Lake, Ward Lake, Ken Lake, Black Lake Ditch, Percival Creek, and Olympia's marine shoreline areas. The waters of Budd Inlet seaward of extreme low tide are considered Shorelines of Statewide Significance.

- 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. [\[help\]](#)

No, this is a non-project action. Impacts to surface water resources will be evaluated on a project-by-project basis for future construction projects.

- 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. [\[help\]](#)

None, this is a non-project action, which does not include filling or dredging surface water or wetlands.

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

No, this is a non-project action, which would not require surface water withdrawals or diversions.

- 5) Does the proposal lie within a 100-year floodplain? If so, note location on the site plan. [\[help\]](#)

This is a non-project action. However, many shoreline areas in the City are also within floodplains.

- 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. [\[help\]](#)

No, this is a non-project action, which would not discharge any waste materials to surface waters.

b. Ground Water:

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

No, this is a non-project action which would not withdraw groundwater.

- 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. [\[help\]](#)

None, this is a non-project action which would not discharge any waste material into the ground from septic tanks or other sources.

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. [\[help\]](#)

None, this is a non-project action.

- 2) Could waste materials enter ground or surface waters? If so, generally describe. [\[help\]](#)

No, this is a non-project action which would not alter or otherwise affect drainage patterns in the shoreline jurisdiction area.

- 3) Does the proposal alter or otherwise affect drainage patterns in the vicinity of the site? If so, describe. [\[help\]](#)

No, this is a non-project action which would not alter or otherwise affect drainage patterns in the shoreline jurisdiction area.

d. Proposed measures to reduce or control surface, ground, and runoff water, and drainage pattern impacts, if any: [\[help\]](#)

No, this is a non-project action. When future projects are submitted, any water-related impacts created during clearing and construction activities will be mitigated in compliance with the Ecology 2012 Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington, as amended in December 2014 per the City's Engineering Design and Development Standards.

4. Plants [\[help\]](#)

a. Check the types of vegetation found on the site: [\[help\]](#)

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

This is a non-project action. However, a variety of vegetation can be found in the shoreline jurisdiction area including deciduous and conifer trees, shrubs, grass, wet soil plants, water plants, and other native and ornamental vegetation.

b. What kind and amount of vegetation will be removed or altered? [\[help\]](#)

None, this is a non-project action. When a specific application is submitted, the kind and amount of vegetation to be removed or altered will depend on City requirements, which would be reflected in an approved site and landscape plans.

c. List threatened and endangered species known to be on or near the site. [\[help\]](#)

This is a non-project action. It is unknown whether there are any threatened or endangered plant species on or near the shoreline jurisdiction.

d. Proposed landscaping, use of native plants, or other measures to preserve or enhance vegetation on the site, if any: [\[help\]](#)

None, this is a non-project action and no landscaping is proposed to be done. Future projects will be reviewed for compliance with critical areas standards and other zoning and development standards.

- e. List all noxious weeds and invasive species known to be on or near the site. [\[help\]](#)

There are known to be noxious weeds within the City, some of which may be located within 200 feet of shorelines. A review of maps on the Thurston County Noxious Weeds and Lakes Management website shows the following noxious weeds are present in the city and urban growth areas: common fennel, common reed, giant hogweed, gorse, knapweed (meadow), knotweed (Bohemian, giant and Japanese), loosestrife (purple), pampas grass, poison hemlock, shiny geranium, spurge laurel, tansy ragwort, wild chervil, and yellow flag iris.

Additional noxious weeds that are present in Thurston County include: blueweed, Brazilian elodea, bugloss (annual), bugloss (common), butterfly bush, Dalmation toadflax, hawkweed (common, mouseear, orange, wall, yellow, and yellow devil), knapweed (diffuse, spotted), knotweed (Himalyan), parrotfeather, perennial pepperweed, perennial sowthistle, rush skeletonweed, sulfur cinquefoil, thistle (Italian, Scotch, slenderflower, and variable-leaf milfoil.

For a list of Noxious Weeds currently present in Thurston County, Washington, visit: <http://www.co.thurston.wa.us/tcweeds/weed-list.htm>

5. Animals [\[help\]](#)

- 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. [\[help\]](#)

Examples include:

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

mammals: deer, bear, elk, beaver, other:

fish: bass, salmon, trout, herring, shellfish, other _____

A variety of birds, mammals, and fish are known to have habitat within shoreline jurisdiction.

- b. List any threatened and endangered species known to be on or near the site. [\[help\]](#)

According to the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife's Priority Habitat and Species Maps, the following wildlife species are present in the City, some of which may be present in the shoreline areas: Mazama Pocket Gopher (habitat in City Limits, habitat and sightings in Urban Growth Area), Oregon Spotted Frog, Olympic Mudminnow, Steelhead, Fall Chinook, Fall Chum, Resident Coastal Cutthroat, Coho, Surf Smelt, Big Brown Bat, Yuma Myotis (bat), California Myotis (bat), Purple Martin, and the Townsend's Big-Eared Bat.

- c. Is the site part of a migration route? If so, explain. [\[help\]](#)

Olympia is located within the Pacific Flyway migration route utilized by waterfowl migrating north into Alaska and northern Canada. The Pacific Flyway extends from Mexico to Canada and Alaska.

d. Proposed measures to preserve or enhance wildlife, if any: [\[help\]](#)

None, this is a non-project action.

e. List any invasive animal species known to be on or near the site. [\[help\]](#)

This is a non-project action which will not impact any invasive species on or near the shoreline jurisdiction in a positive or negative way.

6. Energy and Natural Resources [\[help\]](#)

N/A this is a non-project proposal. None of the questions in this section directly apply.

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. [\[help\]](#)

None.

b. Would your project affect the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties? If so, generally describe. [\[help\]](#)

No.

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: [\[help\]](#)

None.

7. Environmental Health [\[help\]](#)

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. [\[help\]](#)

No, this is a non-project proposal.

1) Describe any known or possible contamination at the site from present or past uses. [\[help\]](#)

No change, this is a non-project proposal. There are areas within the shoreline jurisdiction that have or have had soil contamination from previous land uses.

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. [\[help\]](#)

None, this is a non-project proposal.

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. [\[help\]](#)

None, this is a non-project proposal and there is no associated construction.

- 4) Describe special emergency services that might be required. [\[help\]](#)

None, this is a non-project proposal and no emergency services are required.

- 5) Proposed measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards, if any: [\[help\]](#)

None, this is a non-project action and no measures are necessary to reduce or control environmental health hazards at this time. Future development activity within the City, whether in the shoreline jurisdiction or not, will be reviewed to determine if any soil remediation or other environment protections are necessary.

- b. Noise [\[help\]](#)

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

None, this is a non-project action which would not be affected by any noise in the area.

- 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. [\[help\]](#)

None, this is a non-project action which would not result in any noise.

- 3) Proposed measures to reduce or control noise impacts, if any: [\[help\]](#)

None, this is a non-project action and no measures are needed to reduce or control impacts. All future development will be reviewed for compliance with noise level standards established in Title 18, Unified Development Code, of the Olympia Municipal Code.

8. Land and Shoreline Use [\[help\]](#)

This is a non-project action. Answers provided below are intended to give a general description of conditions within the SMP jurisdiction.

- 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. [\[help\]](#)

Land uses include residential, recreational, industrial, multi-family, public institutional uses, and vacant lands. The proposal is a non-project action and proposes minimal changes to the existing shoreline environment designation standards to align better with underlying zoning or new city plans, such as the Sea Level Rise Response Plan. No additional constraints on land use are proposed at this time.

- 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? [\[help\]](#)

There are no working farmlands or working forest lands in the shoreline jurisdiction area. There may be small agricultural areas and gardens in some portions of the shoreline jurisdiction.

- 1) Will the proposal affect or be affected by surrounding working farm or forest land normal business operations, such as oversize equipment access, the application of pesticides, tilling, and harvesting? If so, how: [\[help\]](#)

No, this is a non-project action. There are no working farmlands or working forest lands in the shoreline jurisdiction area.

- c. Describe any structures on the site. [\[help\]](#)

There are multiple structures in place within the shoreline environment, including single family and multifamily homes, restaurants, offices, retail spaces, and recreational structures.

- d. Will any structures be demolished? If so, what? [\[help\]](#)

No, this is a non-project action.

- e. What is the current zoning classification of the site? [\[help\]](#)

Zoning includes Residential 4 - 8 units per acre, Residential 6 - 12 units per acre, Residential Multi-family 18 units per acre, Industrial, Urban Waterfront, Urban Waterfront Housing, Planned Unit Development, General Commercial, Professional Office/Residential Multi-family, Residential Low Impact, Urban Village, Mixed Residential 10-18 units per acre, and Residential Multi-family 18 units per acre.

- f. What is the current comprehensive plan designation of the site? [\[help\]](#)

Comprehensive Plan designations include Low Density Neighborhoods, Medium Density Neighborhoods, Urban Waterfront, Industry, Planned Developments, Professional Office and Multi-family Housing, General Commerce, Auto Services, Mixed Residential, and Neighborhood Centers.

- g. If applicable, what is the current shoreline master program designation of the site? [\[help\]](#)

SMP Designations include Aquatic, Marine Recreation, Natural, Port Marine Industrial, Shoreline Residential, Urban Conservancy, Urban Intensity, and Waterfront Recreation.

- h. Has any part of the site been classified as a critical area by the city or county? If so, specify. [\[help\]](#)

Portions of the SMP jurisdiction include wetlands and priority habitat areas, erosion hazard areas, and steep slope areas. Other critical areas, as defined by the Olympia Municipal Code, may also be present.

- i. Approximately how many people would reside or work in the completed project? [\[help\]](#)

No change, this is a non-project action.

- j. Approximately how many people would the completed project displace? [\[help\]](#)

None, this is a non-project action that would not displace any people.

- k. Proposed measures to avoid or reduce displacement impacts, if any: [\[help\]](#)

None, this is a non-project action and no measures to avoid or reduce displacement impacts are necessary.

- l. Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with existing and projected land uses and plans, if any: [\[help\]](#)

City staff have reviewed the draft amendments in consideration of other adopted or approved city plans, such as the Comprehensive Plan and Sea Level Rise Response Plan. In addition, the Washington State Department of Ecology must approve Shoreline Master Plans, which will help ensure the plan is consistent with the State's Shoreline Management Act.

- m. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts to agricultural and forest lands of long-term commercial significance, if any: [\[help\]](#)

None, this is a non-project action, and no measures are necessary to reduce or control impacts to agricultural and forest lands of long-term commercial significance

9. Housing [\[help\]](#)

N/A, this is a non-project action. None of the questions in this section directly apply.

- a. Approximately how many units would be provided, if any? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing. [\[help\]](#)

None. The proposed amendments would specify that up to twenty (20) percent of slips within marinas could be used for live-aboards (houseboats). Live-aboard homes could be low, medium, or high income housing.

- b. Approximately how many units, if any, would be eliminated? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing. [\[help\]](#)

None. Adoption of revisions to the Shoreline Master Program will not result in the elimination of any housing units.

- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control housing impacts, if any: [\[help\]](#)

The proposed amendments for live-aboards within marinas is intended to support the existing level of marina slips used for housing and may allow for slightly more houseboats at some marinas. Without the added provisions, marinas would be required to use the State's default of ten (10) percent of total slips being available for live-aboards when the marina renews its lease agreement with the state. The added provisions are intended to allow for the retention of live-aboards in our community, and to provide more variety in the housing types allowed within the City.

10. Aesthetics [\[help\]](#)

N/A, this is a non-project action. None of the questions in this section directly apply.

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

No changes to heights are proposed.

- b. What views in the immediate vicinity would be altered or obstructed? [\[help\]](#)

There are no changes that should affect views proposed at this time.

- b. Proposed measures to reduce or control aesthetic impacts, if any: [\[help\]](#)

None at this time. Any future development proposals will be reviewed for compliance with city standards in place at the time the application is deemed complete.

11. Light and Glare [\[help\]](#)

N/A, this is a non-project action. None of the questions in this section directly apply.

- a. What type of light or glare will the proposal produce? What time of day would it mainly occur? [\[help\]](#)

None, this is a non-project action.

- b. Could light or glare from the finished project be a safety hazard or interfere with views? [\[help\]](#)

No, this is a non-project action.

- c. What existing off-site sources of light or glare may affect your proposal? [\[help\]](#)

None, this is a non-project action.

- d. Proposed measures to reduce or control light and glare impacts, if any: [\[help\]](#)

None, this is a non-project action. Any future development proposals will be reviewed for compliance with city standards in place at the time the application is deemed complete.

12. Recreation [\[help\]](#)

- a. What designated and informal recreational opportunities are in the immediate vicinity? [\[help\]](#)

Olympians are fortunate to have multiple recreational opportunities within the shoreline jurisdictions in the City, with portions of the following parks and open spaces located in the shoreline jurisdiction:

- **Priest Point Park**
- **East Bay Waterfront**
- **Percival Landing**
- **Heritage Park**
- **Marathon Park**
- **West Bay Park**
- **Isthmus Park**

- b. Would the proposed project displace any existing recreational uses? If so, describe. [\[help\]](#)

No, this is a non-project action. As such, the project 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: [\[help\]](#)

This is a non-project action. As such, no measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation will be needed at this time. The proposed amendments would identify camping facilities as a recreational use allowed in the Marine Recreation shoreline environment. As noted in the proposed definition, camping facilities are identified as “Short-term overnight accommodations (generally 1-15 nights per guest) in organized facilities with amenities designed for guests and their enjoyment of the waterfront. Such facilities require amenities such as restrooms and may include opportunities for cooking, connection to electricity, and potable water. Amenities should be appropriate for the proposed use, such as electricity for recreational vehicles.”

13. Historic and cultural preservation [\[help\]](#)

- 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. [\[help\]](#)

Registered historic sites and structures within the shoreline planning area include two cemeteries, Weyerhauer South Bay Log Dump Rural Historic Landscape, and the Johnson House. There are additional locations of significance, such as Priest Point Park, within the shoreline jurisdiction. Any sites proposed for future development will be reviewed individually for potential impacts and mitigation measures.

- 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. [\[help\]](#)

Native American families of Coastal Salish tribes, including those of the Nisqually, Duwamish, and Squaxin Tribes, have historically used the present-day Budd Inlet for gathering shellfish. As such, there may be evidence, artifacts, or areas of cultural importance within shoreline jurisdiction.

- 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. [\[help\]](#)

None, this is a non-project action, which would not result in impacts to cultural and historic resources on or near the project site.

- d. Proposed measures to avoid, minimize, or compensate for loss, changes to, and disturbance to resources. Please include plans for the above and any permits that may be required. [\[help\]](#)

None, this is a non-project action. Development that is authorized consistent with the City's SMP will be required to comply with City, State, and Federal requirements regarding cultural preservation.

14. Transportation [\[help\]](#)

- 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. [\[help\]](#)

None specifically, as this is a non-project action. However, parks and open spaces areas are generally accessed by city streets.

- 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? [\[help\]](#)

Some shoreline areas, especially those located in close proximity of the Downtown, are within walking distance of public transit facilities and stops.

- c. How many additional parking spaces would the completed project or non-project proposal have? How many would the project or proposal eliminate? [\[help\]](#)

None, this is a non-project action which would not add or eliminate any parking spaces.

- 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). [\[help\]](#)

No, this is a non-project action so there would be no need for any new or improved roads, streets, pedestrian, bicycle or state transportation facilities.

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

No, this is a non-project action.

- 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? [\[help\]](#)

None, this is a non-project action which would not generate any additional vehicular trips per day.

- 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. [\[help\]](#)

No, this is a non-project action and will not affect movement of agricultural or forest products.

- h. Proposed measures to reduce or control transportation impacts, if any: [\[help\]](#)

None, this is a non-project action and there is no need for any measures to reduce or control transportation impacts at this time. All future development proposals will be reviewed for conformance with the comprehensive plan, shoreline master program, and the engineering design and development standards for transportation requirements.

15. **Public Services** [\[help\]](#)

- 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. [\[help\]](#)

No, this is a non-project action which would not result in the need for increased public services such as fire protection, police protection, public transit, health care, and schools.

- b. Proposed measures to reduce or control direct impacts on public services, if any. [\[help\]](#)

None, this is a non-project action and there is no need to reduce or control impacts on public services.

16. **Utilities** [\[help\]](#)

This is a non-project action. None of the questions in this section directly apply.

- a. Circle utilities currently available at the site: [\[help\]](#) electricity, natural gas, water, refuse service, telephone, sanitary sewer, septic system, other _____

City and private utilities and septic systems occur within the shoreline jurisdiction.

- 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. [\[help\]](#)

No utility improvements are proposed as part of these proposed text amendments.

C. Signature [\[help\]](#)

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

Signature: 

Name of signee Joyce Phillips

Position and Agency/Organization Senior Planner, Olympia Community Planning and Development

Date Submitted: November 18, 2020, Revised January 19, 2021

D. Supplemental Sheet for Nonproject Actions [\[help\]](#)

(IT IS NOT NECESSARY to 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?

The proposed amendments associated with the periodic review of the City's SMP are not anticipated to increase any of the above potential impacts. The proposed amendments are primarily concerned with keeping the SMP current with amendments to state laws, making usability improvements and clarifications, and ensuring consistency with the City's other plans and development regulations.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are:

The existing SMP includes restrictions on uses, activities, and development within SMP jurisdiction that prevent the discharge of water or release of toxic or hazardous substances into the water. The standard requires no net loss of environmental functions within the shoreline.

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

The proposed amendments associated with the periodic review of the City's SMP are not anticipated to negatively affect plants, animals, fish or marine life. The proposed amendments are primarily concerned with keeping the SMP current with amendments to state laws, making usability improvements and clarifications, and ensuring consistency with the City's other development regulations.

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

Proposed amendments to protect or conserve plants, animals, fish, or marine life include encouraging ecological restoration below the ordinary high water mark in Aquatic environment policies and ensuring dredging and dredge disposal activities employ best management practices to prevent water quality degradation.

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

The proposed amendments associated with the periodic review of the City's SMP are not anticipated to affect or deplete energy or natural resources. The proposed amendments are primarily concerned with keeping the SMP current with amendments to state laws, making usability improvements and clarifications, and ensuring consistency with the City's other plans and development regulations.

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

The proposal will have no effect on energy conservation but is strongly linked to protecting remaining intact natural resources along the shoreline not already impacted by development. It encourages the retention and restoration of natural resources.

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

The proposed amendments associated with the periodic review of the City's SMP include adopting by reference the City-wide critical areas regulations, once these new amendments are adopted. The SMP contains exclusions where critical areas regulations do not apply, such as exempt activities, permitted alterations, and reasonable use exception variance sections in the Critical Areas Ordinance. The amended standards are anticipated to continue to ensure no net loss of shoreline ecological functions.

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

The existing SMP establishes a standard of no net loss of environmental functions within the shoreline. This is intended to preserve and protect environmentally sensitive and protected areas through the policies and regulations in the SMP. Provisions of the SMP also encourage the restoration and enhancement of ecological functions that should positively affect environmentally sensitive and protected areas.

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 proposed amendments associated with the periodic review of the City's SMP would slightly alter the land and shoreline uses allowed to be more consistent with existing City plans, zoning, and development regulations or provide more clarity. The proposed amendments are primarily concerned with keeping the SMP current with amendments to state laws, making usability improvements and clarifications, and ensuring consistency with the City's other plans and development regulations.

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

The proposal itself aims to improve the compatibility of land use and shoreline plans.

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

The proposed amendments associated with the periodic review of the City's SMP are not anticipated to increase demands on transportation or public services and utilities. The proposed amendments are primarily concerned with keeping the SMP current with amendments to state laws, making usability improvements and clarifications, and ensuring consistency with the City's other development regulations.

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

No such measures are needed at this time. Any future development or redevelopment will be reviewed under the regulations in place at the time, which may result in improvements to transportation, public services, or utilities being required at that time.

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

This non-project proposal includes amendments associated with the periodic review of the City's SMP, which the City is required to complete under the Washington State Shoreline Management Act. Aims of the periodic review include keeping the SMP current with amendments to state laws and changes to local plans and regulations.