

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:

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:
Pierce County 2023 Comprehensive Plan Amendments
2. Name of applicant:
Pierce County Planning and Public Works Department

3. Address and phone number of applicant and contact person:
Erika Rhett Hunt, Long Range Planning Supervisor, Pierce County PPW. 2401 S. 35th Street Tacoma, WA 98409. Erika.rhett@piercecountywa.gov.
4. Date checklist prepared:
12/14/2022
5. Agency requesting checklist:
Pierce County Planning and Public Works Department
6. Proposed timing or schedule (including phasing, if applicable). Describe the planning process schedule/timeline.
January 2023: Recommendation by Pierce County Planning Commission at a public hearing
February 2023: Recommendation by Pierce County Council Community Development Committee
March 2023: Adoption by Pierce County Council
7. Do you have any plans for future additions, expansion, or further activity related to or connected with this proposal? If yes, explain.
None known at this time.
8. List any environmental information you know about that has been prepared, or will be prepared, directly related to this proposal.
None
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
10. List any government approvals or permits that will be needed for your proposal, if known.
Recommendation by Pierce County Planning Commission
Adoption by Pierce County Council
11. Give brief, complete description of your proposal, including the proposed uses and the size of the project and site. There are several questions later in this checklist that ask you to describe certain aspects of your proposal. You do not need to repeat those answers on this page. (Lead agencies may modify this form to include additional specific information on project description.)
The proposal would amend the Pierce County Comprehensive Plan and applicable community plans as part of the biennial Comprehensive Plan Amendment cycle for 2023. The proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments are listed below.

Proposed 2023 Comprehensive Plan Amendments

APPLICANT	DESCRIPTION	APPLICATION NO.	Land Use Action No.
Cross Creek Partners, Collins Park LLC and Scott Edwards	Two applications. One is a text amendment to the Mid-County Community Plan to eliminate the High-Density Residential (HRD) Designation from the Plan area. Second is an area-wide Map Amendment to redesignate 14 parcels totaling 38.5 acres from High Density Residential to Corridor (C) (implemented with Employment Corridor (ECOR) zoning) in the Mid-County Community Plan.	993797 993798	994135 994137
Tacoma Water	Two applications. First is a text amendment to the South Hill Community Plan to establish the Public Institution (PI) designation within the Plan Area. Second proposal is an area-wide Map Amendment to redesignate 3 parcels totaling 95.09 acres from Moderate Density Single Family to Public Institution within the South Hill Community Plan.	994599 994600	994728 994729
Momentum Civil LLC	Graham Community Plan Text Amendment would authorize the permitted size of agricultural supply sale structures in the Rural Neighborhood Center (RNC) and Rural Ten (R-10) zones based on the parcel size and compatibility with neighboring uses.	994698	994731
9421 Graham LLC	Area-wide Map Amendment to redesignate one parcel totaling 1.5 acres from Moderate Single Family (MSF) to Mixed Use District (MUD_ (implemented with Moderate High Density Residential (MHR) zoning) in the Graham Community Plan.	993438	993730
Pierce County Planning and Public Works Department	Area-wide Map Amendment to correct a map error that occurred in 2020. The application is to redesignate three parcels totaling 2.25 acres from the High Density Single Family (HSF) designation to the High Density Residential (HRD) designation with a Moderate-High Density Residential (MHR) zone classification in the South Hill Community Plan.	994554	994726

12. Location of the proposal. Describe the jurisdiction or area where the proposal is applicable. (Attach a map(s) if appropriate). 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.

Application No. 993797 / Land Use Action No. 994137: 1807 to 2115 121st St E in Mid-County Community Plan Area

Application No. 993798 / Land Use Action No. 994137: Mid-County Community Plan Area

Application No. 994599 / Land Use Action No. 994728: South Hill Community Plan Area

Application No. 994600 / Land Use Action No. 994729: 13004 Reservoir Rd E in South Hill Community Plan Area

Application No. 994698 / Land Use Action No. 994731: Graham Community Plan Area

Application No. 993438 / Land Use Action No. 993730: 9925 204th St E in Graham Community Plan Area

Application No. 994554 / Land Use Action No. 994726: 12007 to 12125 125th Ave Ct E in South Hill Community Plan Area

13. OPTIONAL: What is the legal authority for the proposal?

Washington State Planning Enabling Act (RCW 36.70) provides the authority for, and the procedures to be followed in, guiding and regulating the physical development of a county or region through correlating both public and private projects and coordinating their execution with respect to all subject matters utilized in developing and servicing land.

Washington State Growth Management Act (RCW 36.70A) requires Pierce County to develop plans and policies to manage growth and to adopt regulations to implement those plans.

14. OPTIONAL: Identify any other future nonproject actions believed necessary to achieve the objectives of this action.

As necessary, Pierce County Council adoption of development regulations and Zoning Atlas maps that implement Comprehensive Plan Amendments.


B. Environmental Elements [\[HELP\]](#)

PART B QUESTIONS EXCLUDED BY LEAD AGENCY

Questions do not meaningfully contribute to analysis of the nonproject action.

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: Erika Rhett Hunt

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 proposal would not likely affect the above identified resources. For applications that propose a land use redesignation of specific sites, any site-specific impacts including a project level SEPA review would be assessed at the time of application submittal.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are:

None. Project-specific impacts including a project level SEPA review would be assessed at the time of application submittal.

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

The proposal would not likely affect the above identified resources and does not propose changes to existing environmental development regulations. For applications that propose a land use redesignation of specific sites, any site-specific impacts including a project level SEPA review would be assessed at the time of application submittal.

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

None. Project-specific impacts including a project level SEPA review would be assessed at the time of application submittal.

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

The proposal would not likely affect the above identified resources. For applications that propose a land use redesignation of specific sites, any site-specific impacts including a project level SEPA review would be assessed at the time of application submittal.

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

None. Project-specific mitigation including a project level SEPA review would be assessed at the time of application submittal and time of approval.

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 proposal would not likely affect the above identified resources. For applications that propose a land use redesignation of specific sites, any site-specific impacts including a project level SEPA review would be assessed at the time of application submittal.

Proposed measures to protect such resources or to avoid or reduce impacts are:
None. Project-specific mitigation including a project level SEPA review would be assessed at the time of application submittal and time of approval.

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?
Application No. 993797 / Land Use Action No. 994137: The proposal to redesignate 38.5 acres from High Density Residential to Employment Corridor would result in less land being used for residential purposes, thereby reducing the County's residential growth capacity. In contrast, the proposal would increase land available for commercial and employment uses, increasing the County's overall economic and job capacity. The redesignation is not expected to result in land or shoreline uses incompatible with existing plans.

Application No. 994600 / Land Use Action No. 994729: The proposal to redesignate 95 acres from Moderate Density Single Family to Public Institution would result in less land available for residential purposes. However, the existing site is occupied by a water reservoir and so the proposed change is not expected to result in any effect on land use. The redesignation is not expected to result in land or shoreline uses incompatible with existing plans.

Application No. 993438 / Land Use Action No. 993730: The proposal to redesignate 1.5 acres from Moderate Density Single Family to Mixed Use District would result in land available for more commercial uses as well as for greater densities of residential uses such as multifamily apartments. The redesignation is not expected to result in land or shoreline uses incompatible with existing plans.

Application No. 994554 / Land Use Action No. 994726: The proposal would correct a land use designation mapping error that unintentionally redesignated the properties from High Density Residential to High Density Single Family, thus returning the properties to the

original High Density Residential land use designation. Therefore, the proposal is neither expected to affect land use, nor result in land or shoreline uses incompatible with existing plans.

The remaining proposal applications would not likely affect the above identified resources.

Project-specific impacts including a project level SEPA review would be assessed at the time of application submittal.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce shoreline and land use impacts are:
None. Project-specific mitigation including a project level SEPA review would be assessed at the time of application submittal and time of approval.

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

Application No. 993797 / Land Use Action No. 994137: The proposal to redesignate 38.5 acres from High Density Residential to Employment Corridor would result in less land being used for residential purposes, thereby reducing the County's residential growth capacity. In contrast, the proposal would increase land available for commercial and employment uses, increasing the County's overall economic and job capacity. Therefore, the proposal is not expected to significantly affect demand on transportation or public services and utilities.

Application No. 994600 / Land Use Action No. 994729: The proposal to redesignate 95 acres from Moderate Density Single Family to Public Institution would result in less land available for residential purposes. However, the existing site is occupied by a water reservoir and so the proposed change is not expected to result in any increased demand on transportation or public services and utilities.

Application No. 993438 / Land Use Action No. 993730: The proposal to redesignate 1.5 acres from Moderate Density Single Family to Mixed Use District would result in land available for more commercial uses as well as for greater densities of residential uses such as multifamily apartments. While the redesignation of 1.5 acres may result in increased demand on transportation and public services and utilities, the increase is expected to be minimal and adequately accommodated by existing or planned services. However, the proposal is requesting to increase residential capacity in a geography that 2044 growth targets have been limited to vested and current pipeline projects.

Application No. 994554 / Land Use Action No. 994726: The proposal would correct a land use designation mapping error that unintentionally redesignated the properties from High

Density Residential to High Density Single Family, thus returning the properties to the original High Density Residential land use designation. Therefore, the proposal is not expected to affect demand on transportation or public services and utilities.

The remaining proposal applications would not likely affect the above identified resources.

Project-specific impacts including a project level SEPA review would be assessed at the time of application submittal.

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

None. Project-specific mitigation including a project level SEPA review would be assessed at the time of application submittal and time of approval.

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

The proposal would not conflict with local, state, or federal laws for the protection of the environment.

8. OPTIONAL: How has equity been incorporated into formulating the proposal? How would the proposal be likely to affect equity outcomes? Describe, as applicable, the equity outcomes with respect to livability, accessibility, economy, education, and environmental health. Is the proposal likely to affect any specific geographic areas? Is the proposal likely to affect any underrepresented, underserved, or vulnerable populations, or any other communities of concern? How?

Application No. 993798 / Land Use Action No. 994137, Application No. 994554 / Land Use Action No. 994726, and Application No. 993438 / Land Use Action No. 993730: These proposals have minimal equity impacts or influence on the equity indicators defined by the County's Equity Index.

Application No. 993797 / Land Use Action No. 994137: This amendment is likely to have positive impacts on the economy index, as it would allow further job growth on the rezoned parcels, improving equity through increased employment opportunities. The rezone may have negative impacts on the environmental health indicator as increased industrial and commercial activity could potentially affect environmental health but existing environmental protections would be required at the time of project application approval. This would also be potentially offset by removing the potential for future housing away from heavy industrial activities.

Application No. 993438 / Land Use Action No. 993730 is a unique case where an area-wide rezone considers a change for only one parcel and the proposal is against the wishes of the property owner, and would likely result in an increased property value and property tax that would make it unaffordable for the resident on fixed income to continue residing on the property and limiting the ability to age in place.

Application No. 994599 / Land Use Action No. 994728 and Application No. 994600 / Land Use Action No. 994729: These companion proposals should have no negative impact on equity. Maintaining a high quality and adequate volume of water supply may even improve livability, economy, and education scores.

Application No. 994698 / Land Use Action No. 994731: This proposal could improve economic and livability equity scores, as allowing a agricultural supply store of limited size in an area that currently lacks such a store, would provide new and more convenient goods, resources, sales, and employment.