DETERMINATION OF NONSIGNIFICANCE - "DNS"
WAC 197-11-970 and Section 11.10.230(3)
SPOKANE ENVIRONMENTAL ORDINANCE

FILE NUMBER: ZTA-3-2014

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL: An application to amend the Spokane County Zoning Code Chapter 14.300, Definitions; Chapter 14.616, Resource Lands and Chapter 14.618, Rural zones to allow railroad yard intermodal facilities in the Rural and Resource Land zoning categories with associated development regulations.

HEARING DATE AND TIME: February 12, 2015

APPLICANT: Dwight Hume, Land Use Solutions and Entitlement

LOCATION OF PROPOSAL: The proposal is a non-project application that applies to Rural and Resource Lands zoning categories.

LEAD AGENCY: SPOKANE COUNTY BUILDING AND PLANNING DEPARTMENT

DETERMINATION: The lead agency for this proposal has determined that it does not have a probable significant adverse impact on the environment. This decision 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 on request.

This DNS is issued under WAC 197-11-340(2); the lead agency will not act on this proposal for at least 14 days from the date issued (below). Comments regarding this DNS must be submitted no later than 4:00 p.m., February 11, 2015, if they are intended to alter the DNS. All comments should be sent to the contact person listed below.

RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL: By: John Pederson, Planning Director
Spokane County Building and Planning Department
1026 W. Broadway Avenue
Spokane, WA 99260-0220 (509) 477-7200

DATE ISSUED: January 28, 2015 SIGNATURE: John Pederson

COMMENTS REGARDING ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS ARE WELCOME AT THE HEARING.

APPEAL OF THIS DETERMINATION, after it becomes final, may be made to the Spokane County Building and Planning Department, 1st Floor, 1026 W. Broadway, Spokane, WA 99260-0220. The appeal deadline is fourteen (14) calendar days after issuance of this determination. This appeal must be written and the appellant should be prepared to make specific factual objections.
This DNS was mailed to:
1. WA State Department of Ecology (Olympia)
2. Washington State Department of Transportation, Aviation – Carter Timmerman
3. Washington State Department of Commerce, Dave Anderson
5. Washington State Freight and Rail Operations, Bob Westby
6. Washington State Freight and Rail Operations, Barb Ivanov, Freight Systems Director
7. Washington State Department of Natural Resources; Boyde Powers
8. Washington State Department of Ecology; Eastern Regional Office; Jeremy Sikes
9. Washington State Department of Transportation; Greg Figg
10. Washington State Department of Fish & Wildlife, Karin Divens
11. Washington State Department of Health
12. City of Spokane Planning Department, Louis Mueller
13. City of Airway Heights, Derrick Bratten
14. City of Millwood, Tom Richardson
15. City of Medical Lake, Planning Director
16. Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association, John Collins
17. Spokane International Airport, Larry Krauter, Director; Matt Breen, Director of Planning
18. Fairchild Air Force Base, Jeff Johnson; Alec Young, Community Planner; Ronald Daniels, Deputy Base Civil Engineer; Kenneth Walters, Chief of Engineering Department
19. Spokane County Division of Engineering, Transportation Engineering; Scott Engelhard
20. Spokane County Division of Engineering, Development Services; Matt Zarecor
21. Spokane County Division of Engineering, Erik Jenkin - Stormwater
22. Spokane County Division of Utilities; Kevin Cooke
23. Spokane Regional Health District; Steve Holderby
24. Spokane County Building and Planning, Randy Vissia
25. Spokane Regional Transportation Council, Kevin Wallace
26. Spokane County Fire Protection District No. 4
27. Spokane County Fire Protection District No. 9
28. Spokane County Fire Protection District No. 13
29. Spokane County Fire Protection District No. 11
30. Spokane County Fire Protection District No. 8
31. Spokane County Fire Protection District No. 2
32. Spokane County Fire Protection District No. 12
33. Spokane County Fire Protection District No. 3
34. Spokane County Fire Protection District No. 10
35. Spokane County Fire Protection District No. 5
36. Union Pacific Railroad, Terrel Anderson, Regional Manager
37. Union Pacific Railroad, Spokane Office
38. BNSF Railway, Spokane Office
39. BNSF Railway, Johan Hellman
40. Land Use Solutions and Entitlement, Dwight Hume
NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING
BEFORE THE SPOKANE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN by the Spokane County Planning Commission pursuant to Chapter 36.70A RCW, that a public hearing will be held on February 12, 2015 at 9:00 a.m. in the Board of County Commissioner’s Hearing Room, Public Works Building, 1026 W. Broadway, Spokane, WA. The purpose of the public hearing is to consider verbal and written testimony in support of or in opposition to an amendment to the Spokane County Zoning Code Chapter 14.300, Definitions; Chapter 14.616, Resource Lands and Chapter 14.618, Rural zones. The amendment as proposed would allow railroad yard intermodal facilities in the Rural and Resource Land zones with associated development regulations. A full text of the proposed amendment is available at the Spokane County Department of Building and Planning and the Building and Planning website at www.spokanecounty.org/bp. Testimony will be limited to three (3) minutes per speaker. The Planning Commission reserves the right to adjust the time frame allotted to speakers, as well as hearing procedures, prior to the hearing. The Planning Commission will forward a recommendation concerning the proposed amendment to the Zoning Code to the Board of County Commissioners following the public hearing. The Board of County Commissioners may adopt the Planning Commission’s recommendation or decide to hold its own public hearing on the proposal.

Hearing Facilities are accessible to all members of the public. Please contact Steve Davenport, Senior Planner at 477-7221 with questions regarding the proposal. Information with regard to accessibility or notification of an ADA accommodation should be made to Daniela Erickson, Clerk of the Board at (509) 477-2265.

NOTICE IS FURTHER GIVEN that a topic of discussion at the hearing(s) may be any environmental documents that have been prepared in conjunction with the amendment. An Environmental Checklist was prepared as required by the State Environmental Policy Act, Chapter 43.21 RCW, and the Spokane Environmental Ordinance. A Determination of Nonsignificance (DNS) was issued on January 28, 2015 by the Spokane County Department of Building and Planning with a comment and appeal period ending February 11, 2015.

DATED THIS 28TH day of January 2015
SPOKANE COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING AND PLANNING
By: Steve Davenport, Senior Planner
MEMO

To: Steve Davenport
From: Dwight Hume
Date: December 30, 2014
Re: Proposed Text Amendment Intermodal Facilities Rural Zones

Message

I have attached the application fee in the amount of $3581.77 for the processing of this amendment. As we have discussed previously, I will supply you with a county wide map highlighting the three distinct railroad lines; main line, state owned and private. I will also include some visuals of existing intermodal facilities for yours and the planning commissions edification. Please include this on their regularly scheduled February hearing of February 12, 2015.
Proposed Amendment to the Spokane County Zoning Code

Amend Chapter 14.300 (Definitions) as follows:

Add the following definitions to Section 14.300.100:

“RAILROAD YARD, INTERMODAL TRANSFER SITE” A site used to load freight from truck to rail car and transporting these containers on a short line to a Primary Railroad Yard. This could also include accessory uses such as grain elevator(s) and office and includes the rail line to and from the main line.

“RAILROAD YARD, PRIMARY” A site used for switching, loading, unloading, service, maintenance, fueling, and storage of railroad cars and engines.

Amend Chapter 14.616 (Resource Lands) as follows:

14.616.220 Resource Lands Matrix

Add the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utilities/Facilities</th>
<th>Large Tract Agriculture</th>
<th>Small Tract Agriculture</th>
<th>Forest Lands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Yard, Intermodal Transfer Site</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utilities/Facilities</th>
<th>Large Tract Agriculture</th>
<th>Small Tract Agriculture</th>
<th>Forest Lands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Yard, Primary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

XX. **Railroad Yard, Intermodal Transfer Site** (LTA, STA zones)

a. The minimum lot area is 10 acres.

b. The site shall be within 1.5 miles from a State highway and main rail line and/or short main rail line.

c. There shall be a paved access route on-site to the loading/unloading area.

d. Adequate ingress and egress to the site for trucks shall be provided.

e. No hazardous waste shall be transferred at the site.

f. Any office building shall be accessory.

g. The interim staging of off-loaded containers awaiting shipment shall not exceed fourteen (14) days.
h. The site shall be at least 5 miles from another Railroad Yard Intermodal Transfer Site.

**Amend Chapter 14.618 (Rural Zones) as follows:**

14.618.220 Rural Zones Matrix

Add the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utilities/Facilities</th>
<th>Rural-5</th>
<th>Rural Traditional</th>
<th>Rural Activity Center</th>
<th>Urban Reserve</th>
<th>Rural Conservation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Yard, Primary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utilities/Facilities</th>
<th>Rural-5</th>
<th>Rural Traditional</th>
<th>Rural Activity Center</th>
<th>Urban Reserve</th>
<th>Rural Conservation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Yard, Intermodal Transfer Site</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

XX. **Railroad Yard, Intermodal Transfer Site** (RT, RAC, RC zones)

a. The minimum lot area is 10 acres.
b. The site shall be within 1.5 miles from a State highway and main rail line and/or short main rail line.
c. There shall be a paved access route on-site to the loading/unloading area.
d. Adequate ingress and egress to the site for trucks shall be provided.
e. No hazardous waste shall be transferred at the site.
f. Any office building shall be accessory.
g. The interim staging of off-loaded containers awaiting shipment shall not exceed fourteen (14) days.
h. The site shall be at least 5 miles from another Railroad Yard Intermodal Transfer Site.
SPOKANE ENVIRONMENTAL ORDINANCE

(WAC 197-11-960) Section 11.10.230(1)

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 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: Zoning Text Amendment

2. Name of applicant: Dwight Hume, Land Use Solutions and Entitlement

3. Address and phone number of applicant or contact person: 9101 N. Mountain View Lane, Spokane, WA 99218. (509) 435-3108

4. Date checklist prepared: January 15, 2015
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5. Agency requesting checklist: Spokane County

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

7. a. Do you have any plans for future additions, expansions, or further activity related to or connected with this proposal? If yes, explain: Applicant proposes revised zoning text to allow construction of rail yards/intermodal facilities in rural and resource lands zoning categories. A site specific proposal was not submitted with the application.

   b. Do you own or have options on land nearby or adjacent to this proposal? If yes, explain: NA

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

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 applicant did not submit any site specific projects related to the proposed zoning code amendment.

10. List any government approvals or permits that will be needed for your proposal, if known: Adoption of zoning text amendments by Spokane County Board of Commissioners. Site specific projects allowed with this zone change may require additional permits or approvals.

11. Give brief, complete description of your proposal, including the proposed uses and the size of the project and site. There are several questions late in this checklist that ask you to describe certain aspects of your proposal. You do not need to repeat those answers on this page. This is a non-project action. The proposal is an amendment to the Spokane County Zoning Code to allow railroad yard/intermodal transfer sites in rural and resource lands zoning categories. The proposed amendment wording is attached.

12. Location of the proposal: Give sufficient information to 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 application related to this checklist. This is a non-project action that will affect all lands with rural and resource land zoning categories. These zones cover a large portion of the County.

13. Does the proposed action lie within the Aquifer Sensitive Area (ASA)? The General Sewer Service Area? The Priority Sewer Service Area? The City of Spokane? (See Spokane County's ASA Overlay Zone Atlas for boundaries.) Public sewer service is not allowed in rural and resource lands zoning categories. Rail yards that could be permitted with the amendment could be located in airfield overlay zones.

14. The following questions supplement Part A:
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a. Critical Aquifer Recharge Area (CARA)/Aquifer Sensitive Area (ASA):

   1. Describe any systems, other than those designed for the disposal of sanitary waste; installed for the purpose of discharging fluids below the ground surface (includes systems such as those for the disposal of stormwater or drainage from floor drains.) Describe the type of system, the amount of material to be disposed of through the system and the types of material likely to be disposed of (including materials which may enter the system inadvertently though spills or as a result of firefighting activities.) This is a non-project action. Rail yards that could be built with the change to the zoning code could present some risk for spills.

   2. Will any chemicals (especially organic solvents or petroleum fuels) be stored in above ground or under ground storage tanks? If so, what types and quantities of material will be stored? The proposed amendment would allow railroad yards/intermodal transfer facilities that could include rail cars with chemical materials. The transfer of hazardous waste would not be allowed at the proposed intermodal facilities.

   3. What protective measures will be taken to insure that leaks or spills of any chemicals stored or used on site will not be allowed to percolate to groundwater? This includes measures to keep chemicals out of disposal systems. This is a non-project action. The proposal would prohibit transfer of hazardous waste at intermodal facilities, however the transfer of chemicals would be allowed. Site specific projects that would result from this amendment may be subject to additional permits.

   4. Will any chemicals be stored, handled or used on the site in a location where a spill or leak will drain to surface or groundwater or to a stormwater disposal system discharging to surface or groundwater? This is a non-project action. The proposal would allow chemicals to be stored and handled at rail yard/intermodal sites. Site specific projects that would result from this amendment could include storage of chemicals with potential for spills or leaks to surface or ground water. Subsequent permitting requirements for site specific uses may be required for these facilities.

b. Stormwater

   1. What are the depths on the site to groundwater and to bedrock (if known)? Not known, non-project permit.

   2. Will stormwater be discharged into the ground? If so, describe any potential impacts. Projects that could result from the proposed zoning amendment would likely create storm water runoff that would be discharged into the ground.

To Be Completed By Applicant

ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS

1. Earth
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1. General description of the site (circle one):
   - flat, rolling, hilly, steep slopes, mountains, other: Not known, non-project permit.

2. What is the steepest slope on the site? (Approximate percentage slope?)
   - Not known, non-project permit.

3. What general types of soils are found on the site? (i.e. clay, sand, gavel, peat, muck?) If you know the classification of agricultural soils specify them and not any prime farmland. Not known, non-project permit.

4. Are there surface indications or history of unstable soils in the immediate vicinity? If so, describe: Not known, non-project permit.

5. Describe the purpose, type and approximate quantities of any filling or grading proposed. Indicate source of fill: This is a non-project proposal. Projects that could result from the proposal may require filling or grading depending on future site location. Not known, non-project permit.

6. Could erosion occur as a result of clearing, construction, or use? If so, generally describe: Not known, non-project permit.

7. About what percentage of the site will be covered with impervious surfaces after project construction? (i.e., asphalt or buildings?) This is a non-project proposal. Projects that could result from the proposal would include impervious surfaces.

8. Proposed measures to reduce or control erosion or other impacts to the earth, if any: None proposed. Site specific projects would be subject to existing regulations to control erosion.

2. Air
   a. What type of emissions to the air would result from the proposal (i.e. dust, automobile, odors, industrial, wood smoke) during construction and when the project is completed? If any, generally describe and give approximate quantities if known: This is a non-project proposal. Projects that would be allowed based on this amendment could potentially include emissions to the air.

   b. Are there any off-site sources of emissions or odor that may affect your proposal? If so, generally describe: Not known, non-project permit.

   c. Proposed measures to reduce or control emissions or other impacts to air, if any: None. Site specific projects related to the zoning amendment would be subject to existing regulations.

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 or wetlands)? If yes, describe type and provide names. If appropriate, state what stream or river it flows into: This is a non-project proposal. Future projects allowed by this amendment could be sited near surface water bodies.
2. Will the project require any work over, in or adjacent to the described waters (within 200 feet)? If yes, please describe and attach available plans. This is a non-project proposal. Future projects allowed by this amendment could be sited near surface water bodies.

3. Estimate the amount of fill and dredge material that would be placed in or removed from the surface water or wetlands and indicate the area of the site that would be affected. Indicate the source of fill material. This is a non-project proposal. Future projects allowed by this amendment could require filling and dredging.

4. Will the proposal require surface water withdrawals or diversions? Give general description, purpose an approximate quantities if known: No

5. Does the proposal lie within a 100-year floodplain? If so, note location on the site plan. This is a non-project proposal. Future projects allowed by this amendment could be located in floodplains.

6. Does the proposal involve any discharge of waste materials to surface waters? If so, describe the type of waste and anticipated volume of discharge. No

b. Ground

1. Will groundwater be withdrawn or will water be discharged to groundwater? Give general description, purpose and approximate quantities if known: This is a non-project proposal. Future projects allowed by this amendment could be served by wells and runoff could be discharged through ground treatment.

2. Describe waste material that will be discharged into the ground from septic tanks or other sanitary waste treatment facility. Describe the general size of the system, the number of houses to be served (if applicable) or the number of persons the system(s) are expected to serve: This is a non-project proposal. Future projects allowed by this amendment could utilize septic tanks and drainfields for waste disposal.

c. Water runoff (including stormwater)

1. Describe the source of runoff (including stormwater) and method of collection and disposal, if any. (Include quantities, if known). This is a non-project proposal. Projects that would be allowed with this amendment may produce runoff. Runoff would be addressed through existing regulations.

2. Could waste materials enter ground or surface waters? If so, generally describe: Projects that would be allowed with this amendment may produce runoff and waste materials could potentially enter ground or surface waters. Mitigation would rely on existing regulations.

d. Proposed measures to reduce or control surface, ground and runoff water impacts, if any: None. Mitigation at the project level would rely on existing regulations.
4. Plants
   a. Check or circle type of vegetation found on the site:
      □ 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
         *All of the above are found in rural Spokane County*
   b. What kind and amount of vegetation will be removed or altered? Not known, non-project application.
   c. List threatened or endangered species known to be on or near the site. Not known, non-project application.
   d. Proposed landscaping, use of native plants, or other measures to preserve or enhance vegetation on the site, if any: None. Mitigation at the project level would rely on existing regulations.

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: Non-project application. Impacts to animals for future projects allowed by this amendment will consider impacts and mitigation to animals.
      Birds: hawk, heron, eagle, songbirds, other.
      Mammals: deer, bear, elk, beaver, other.
      Fish: bass, salmon, trout, herring, shellfish, other.
      Other:
   b. List any threatened or endangered species known to be on or near the site: Not known, non-project application.
   c. Is the site part of a migration route? If so, explain: Not known, non-project application
   d. Proposed measures to preserve or enhance wildlife, if any: None. Mitigation at the project level would rely on existing regulations.

6. Energy and Natural Resources
   a. What kinds of energy (electric, natural gas, wood stove, solar, etc.) will be used to meet the completed project's energy needs? Describe whether it will be used for heating, manufacturing, etc.: Not known, non-project application
b. Would your project affect the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties? If so, generally describe: Not known, non-project application.

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: The proposal requires rail yards/intermodal facilities to be located within 1.5 miles of a state highway and main rail line and/or short main rail line.

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 is a non-project proposal. Future projects allowed by this amendment could include environmental health hazards.

1. Describe special emergency services that might be required. Police, fire, ambulance.

2. Proposed measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards, if any: The transfer of hazardous wastes is prohibited by the proposed zoning code amendment, however the transfer of chemicals would be allowed at rail yard/intermodal sites.

b. Noise:

1. What types of noise exist in the area which may affect your project? (i.e., traffic, equipment, operation, other): Not known, non-project application.

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? (i.e., traffic, construction, operation, other). Indicate what hours noise would come from the site: This is a non-project proposal. Future projects allowed by this amendment could include noise impacts from construction and long term impacts from rail yard operations. The impacts would be evaluated at time of project permit approval.

3. Proposed measures to reduce or control noise impacts, if any: None. Mitigation at the project level would rely on existing regulations.

8. Land and Shoreline Use

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

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

c. Describe any structures on the site:

d. Will any structures be demolished? If so, which?

e. What is the current Zoning Classification of the site?

f. What is the current Comprehensive Plan designation of the site?
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g. If applicable, what is the current Shoreline Master Program designation of the site?

h. Has any part of the site been classified as a Critical Area? If so, specify:

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

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

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

l. Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with existing and projected land uses and plans, if any: None

Response. The proposal is a non-project application. Site specific impacts and mitigation for project that would be allowed by this amendment would be subject to existing regulations.

9. Housing

a. Approximately how many housing units would be provided, if any? Indicate whether high, middle or low-income housing: Not known

b. Approximately how many units, if any, would be eliminated? Indicate whether high, middle or low-income housing: Not known

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control housing impacts, if any: None

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? Future projects based on the approval of this zoning amendment could include structures of varying heights. The proposal is a non-project application. Structure heights for projects that would be allowed under this proposal are unknown but would be restricted by height limitations within the zoning code.

b. What views in the immediate vicinity would be altered or obstructed? Future projects based on the approval of this zoning amendment could affect views for surrounding areas. The proposal is a non-project application. Impacts to views for projects that would be allowed under this proposal are unknown.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control aesthetic impacts, if any: None

11. Light and Glare

a. What type of light or glare will the proposal produce? What time of day would it mainly occur? The proposal is a non-project application. Site specific projects that would be allowed by this amendment could produce light and glare.
b. Could light or glare from the finished project be a safety hazard or interfere with views? Impacts are unknown. Future site specific proposals would be subject to existing regulations.

c. What existing off-site sources of light or glare may affect your proposal? Unknown at non-project level.

d. Proposed measures to reduce or control light and glare impacts, if any: None

12. Recreation

a. What designated and informal recreational opportunities are in the immediate vicinity? Unknown at non-project level.

b. Would the proposed project displace any existing recreational uses? If so describe: Unknown at non-project level.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation, including recreation opportunities to be provided by the project or applicant, if any: None

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: Unknown at non-project level.

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

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts, if any: None

14. Transportation

a. Identify public streets and highways serving the site, and describe proposed access to the existing street system. Show on site plants, if any. Unknown, non-project application.

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

c. How many parking spaces would the completed project have? How many would the project eliminate? Unknown, non-project application.

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): The proposal is a non-project action. Construction of future rail yards based on this amendment could require new roads.

e. Will the project use (or occur in the immediate vicinity of) water, rail or
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air transportation? If so, generally describe: The proposal is a non-project action. Construction of future rail yards based on this amendment will be adjacent to existing rail lines and may be adjacent to air transportation facilities.

f. How many vehicular trips per day would be generated by the completed project? If known, indicate when peak would occur. Unknown, non-project action. Vehicle trips for rail yards permitted under this amendment would be considered under existing regulations.

g. Proposed measures to reduce or control transportation impacts, if any: The proposal requires rail yard/intermodal sites to be within 1.5 miles of a state highway and main rail line and/or short main rail line.

15. Public Services

a. Would the project result in an increased need for public services? (i.e., fire protection, police protection, health care, schools, other) If so, generally describe: The proposal is a non-project action. Construction of future rail yards based on this amendment could result in an increased need for public services.

b. Proposed measures to reduce or control direct impacts on public services, if any: None

16. Utilities

a. Circle utilities currently available at the site: Unknown, non-project action
   ☐ Electricity
   ☐ Natural gas
   ☐ Water
   ☐ Refuse service
   ☐ Telephone
   ☐ Sanitary Sewer
   ☐ Septic system
   ☐ Other

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. Unknown at non-project level.
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C. SIGNATURE

I, the undersigned, swear under penalty of perjury that the above responses are made truthfully and to the best of my knowledge. I also understand that, should there be any willful misrepresentation or willful lack of full disclosure on my part, the agency must withdraw any Determination of Nonsignificance that it might issue in reliance upon this checklist.

Date: January 15, 2015
Print Name: Steve Davenport
Signature: 

Proponent Name: Dwight Hume
Address: 9101 N. Mt. View Lane, Spokane, WA 99218
Phone Number(s): (509) 435-3108
Email Address: dhume@spokane-landuse.com

Name of person completing form: Steve Davenport
Address of person completing form: Dept. of Building and Planning, 1026 W Broadway Avenue, Spokane, WA 99260
Phone number(s) of person completing form: (509) 477-7221

FOR STAFF USE ONLY

Staff member(s) reviewing checklist: 

Based on this staff review of the Environmental Checklist and other pertinent information, the staff concludes that:

_____ A. There are no probable significant adverse impacts and recommends a Determination of Nonsignificance.

_____ B. Probably significant adverse environmental impacts do exist for the current proposal and recommends a Mitigated Determination of Nonsignificance with condition.

_____ C. There are probably significant adverse environmental impacts and recommends a Determination of Significance.
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 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?

Rail yard projects that would be allowed by this zoning amendment could potentially increase discharge to water; emissions to air; storage or release of toxic or hazardous substances and production of noise

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are: The proposal prohibits the transfer of hazardous waste at intermodal transfer sites in rural and resource lands zones, however the transfer of toxic or hazardous substances would be allowed. At the project level mitigation would rely on existing regulations.

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

Rail yard projects that would be allowed by this zoning amendment could potentially affect plants and animals by displacing natural habitat and creating environmental impacts with increased traffic, noise and glare.

Proposed measures to protect or conserve plants, animals, fish or marine life are: None. At the project level, mitigation would rely on existing regulations.

3. How would the proposal be likely to deplete energy or natural resources? The proposal is a non-project application. Site specific impacts for projects that would be allowed by this amendment would include expenditure of energy resources and siting of projects could displace agricultural or forestry resources.

Proposed measures to protect or conserve energy and natural resources are: None.

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, flood plains or prime farmland?

Rail yard projects that would be allowed by this zoning amendment could potentially affect environmentally sensitive areas by displacing open space or agricultural/forestry land and increase impacts from noise, glare and increased transportation.
Proposed measures to protect such resources or to avoid or reduce impacts are: The proposed amendment limits the size of intermodal transfer facilities and requires those facilities to be within 1.5 miles of a state highway or main rail line. At the project level, mitigation would rely on existing regulations.

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 proposal is a non-project action. Rail yards that would be allowed based on the proposal could be sited near shoreline areas and would be subject to the Shoreline Management Act. The proposal may be inconsistent with some Comprehensive Plan policies which prohibit non-resource related activities in rural and resource lands.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce shoreline and land use impacts are: The proposed amendment limits the size of intermodal transfer facilities and requires those facilities to be within 1.5 miles of a state highway or main rail line.

6. How would the proposal be likely to increase demands on transportation or public services and utilities? There would be incremental increase in demand adjacent to the proposed facilities.

Proposed measures to reduce or respond to such demand(s) are: The proposed amendment limits the size of intermodal transfer facilities and requires those facilities to be within 1.5 miles of a state highway or main rail line.

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 may be inconsistent with Comprehensive Plan policies that prohibit non-rural and resource related uses in rural and resource lands comprehensive plan categories.

C. Signature

I, the undersigned, swear under penalty of perjury that the above responses are made truthfully and to the best of my knowledge. I also understand that, should there be any willful misrepresentation or willful lack of full disclosure on my part, the agency must withdraw any Determination of Nonsignificance that it might issue in reliance upon this checklist.

Date: January 15, 2015  Print Name: Steve Davenport, Senior Planner, Spokane County
Signature: [Signature]
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Proponent Name: Dwight Hume, Land Use Solutions and Entitlement
Address: 9101 N. Mt. View Lane, Spokane, WA 99218
Phone Number(s): 509-435-3108
Email Address: dhume@spokane-landuse.com

Name of person completing form: Steve Davenport, Senior Planner, Spokane County
Address of person completing form: Department of Planning, 1026 W Broadway Avenue,
Spokane, WA 99260
Phone number(s) of person completing form: 509-477-7221

FOR STAFF USE ONLY

Staff member(s) reviewing checklist: [Signature]

Based on this staff review of the Environmental Checklist and other pertinent information, the staff concludes that:

___ A. There are no probable significant adverse impacts and recommends a Determination of Nonsignificance.

___ B. Probably significant adverse environmental impacts do exist for the current proposal and recommends a Mitigated Determination of Nonsignificance with conditions.

___ C. There are probably significant adverse environmental impacts and recommends a Determination of Significance.