

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

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable:

2021 Rooftop Features Code Amendments

2. Name of applicant:

Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections

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

Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections
700 5th Avenue, Suite 2000
Seattle, WA 98104
206-233-2781

4. Date checklist prepared:

October 11, 2021

5. Agency requesting checklist:

Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections

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

Q1/Q2 2022.

7. Do you have any plans for future additions, expansion, or further activity related to or connected with this proposal? If yes, explain.

No.

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

None except this environmental checklist. The 2020 Energy Code amendments have a relationship to the purpose of this legislation, but the environmental analysis for a Determination of Non-Significance for those amendments only slightly relates to the environmental analysis for this proposal.

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.

No.

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

Approval of the proposal by the Mayor and City 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.)

This is a non-project proposal that would update and amend various provisions of the Land Use Code addressing rooftop features in most zones across the city. The proposal adjusts the code to accommodate possible changes in future building design, relating to Energy Code updates that may lead to greater presence of mechanical equipment on roofs. In addition, amendments are proposed to provisions in

Pioneer Square and Chinatown/International District (CID) zones to give more flexibility and opportunity for: greenhouse additions in both neighborhoods; and new options for penthouse and recreational spaces on rooftops in Pioneer Square.

In most zones across the city, the proposal includes updates to three existing maximum rooftop coverage options from which an applicant may choose. They are expressed in terms of percent coverage of a rooftop's physical area. They address rooftop features typically within the range of greater than 4 feet and up to 15 feet in height, with certain features like mechanical penthouses above elevators allowed to reach higher heights.

1. Increase rooftop coverage limits for Downtown Urban Center buildings:

- In most Downtown zones, increase the percent-rooftop-coverage limit option by 20%, from 55% to 75% for residential towers subject to floor size limits. This would not apply to Chinatown/International District, Pioneer Square, or Pike Place Market zones, which have more specific rooftop development standards.
- Increase the percent-rooftop-coverage limit option by 15%, from 35% to 50% maximum coverage for buildings in the Downtown Urban Center that are not residential towers with floor area limits; but not in Chinatown/International District, Pioneer Square or Pike Place Market zones. These include commercial towers as well as other sizes of residential and non-residential buildings that are not towers.
- Increase the percent-coverage-limit option by 10%, from 15% to 25% in Pioneer Square and Chinatown/International District (CID) zones, which have more specific development standards. With approval of the special review district board, rooftop coverage up to 35% would be possible.

2. Increase rooftop coverage limits for buildings outside Downtown:

- Increase the screening and roof-edge setback limit option by 10%, from 65% to 75% for buildings if mechanical equipment is screened or enclosed, and rooftop features within 10 feet of roof edges do not exceed parapet heights or 5 feet, whichever is higher. This would newly apply in Highrise, Commercial, Neighborhood Commercial, and would modify an existing option in Seattle Mixed zones. For the Seattle Mixed zones only, this option could be used on buildings of any size, while in other zones it could only be used for buildings greater than 120 feet in height.
- Increase the percent-coverage-limit option by 10%, from 25% to 35% for buildings in Midrise, Highrise, Commercial, Neighborhood Commercial, and Yesler Terrace zones (and to 30% in Lowrise zones).
- Increase the percent-coverage-limit option by 15%, from 20% to 35% coverage for buildings in Industrial and Seattle Mixed zones.

The proposal's percent increases in maximum rooftop coverage limits are summarized as:

Maximum rooftop coverage limit for features exceeding height limit more than 4 ft.	Proposed percent increase
Percent-rooftop-coverage limit option	
Up to 30% in LR	+10%
Up to 35% in MR, HR, C, NC, Yesler Terrace	+10%
Up to 35% in SM and Industrial	+15%
Up to 75% for Downtown residential towers,* and 50% for other Downtown buildings	+15-20%
Up to 25% for buildings in Pioneer Square and Chinatown/I.D. zones	+10%
Greenhouse limit option	
<i>For any building height category</i> Up to 60% in most zones, for buildings with a rooftop greenhouse present	+10%
Up to 45% in Pioneer Square and Chinatown/I.D. zones	Newly allowed
Screening and roof-edge setback limit option	
<i>For buildings exceeding 120 feet in height</i> Up to 75% in buildings with screened/enclosed mech. equipment, and with limits on rooftop features near roof edge, in SM, HR, C, NC, Yesler Terrace zones	+10%
<i>For buildings less than 120 feet in height</i> Up to 75% in buildings with screened/enclosed mech. equipment, and with limits on rooftop features near roof edge, in SM zones	+10%

* Downtown residential towers exceed 65-85 feet height, and usually approach the zoned maximum height limit.

3. For buildings with rooftop greenhouses, increase the rooftop coverage limit by 10%, from 50% to 60% in most zones except Lowrise, Pioneer Square and CID zones (proposed as 45% in the latter two zone types).

- This greenhouse limit option applies if a rooftop greenhouse is proposed. It is a higher limit to allow enough space for the greenhouse and all other rooftop features. It also incentivizes greenhouses: features promoting environmental sustainability and resilience through plant cultivation and food production.

4. Add the ability to have lodging uses and eating and drinking establishments as penthouse uses on rooftops in Pioneer Square zones, and revise a minimum building height requirement for all kinds of penthouses to 40 feet:

- Add these uses to the current list of penthouse uses that includes office and residential uses
- Allow all kinds of penthouses to be added to existing buildings 40 feet or greater in height. This revises an existing minimum 60-foot height and deletes a minimum 10,000 square foot building footprint requirement for office penthouses.

5. Add the ability to put enclosed recreational facility spaces on certain newer buildings in Pioneer Square zones:

- Extend a code allowance for these recreational spaces that are conditionally allowed on new structures to be added to existing structures built after January 19, 2008.
- Allow these rooftop spaces to extend up to 15 feet above the height limit (20 feet for elevator equipment).
- Eligible newer buildings would be required to meet standards for these spaces, including

green building, Green Factor vegetation, and 30-foot setbacks from streets.

6. Increase consistency in the use of terms and in the list of what is counted toward rooftop coverage limits for most zones:

- Update and add terms such as “covered or enclosed common recreation area” and “eaves and canopies.”
- Clarify references to wind power and solar power equipment.
- Make grammatical edits to consistently list what is counted toward rooftop coverage limits and simplify the text.
- Consolidate references to greenhouses and solariums.
- Correct typographical errors and outdated references.

The “Design Review” process will continue to be required for all buildings that would make use of the proposal’s rooftop coverage limits. Design Review is a part of the permit-review process that uses volunteer review boards and design guidelines to help address the quality of varied design elements in a building development. This will continue to be used to help relate the design of tops of buildings to the overall building form, and will address how such buildings should be designed to fit within their immediate setting.

The proposal maintains the current code regulations on telecommunications, elevator/stair penthouse height allowances, retaining solar access for adjacent buildings, and roof setback rules for Chinatown/International District, Pioneer Square, and Pike Place Market.

12. Location of the proposal. Give sufficient information for a person to understand the precise location of your proposed project, including a street address, if any, and section, township, and range, if known. If a proposal would occur over a range of area, provide the range or boundaries of the site(s). Provide a legal description, site plan, vicinity map, and topographic map, if reasonably available. While you should submit any plans required by the agency, you are not required to duplicate maps or detailed plans submitted with any permit applications related to this checklist.

The proposal is a non-project action that will affect at least a portion of future new buildings in most zone categories in the City of Seattle, with respect to rooftop features. A majority of the proposed amendments would update regulations in Lowrise, Midrise, Highrise, Commercial, Neighborhood Commercial, Seattle Mixed, Downtown zones (also including certain updates in Pioneer Square and CID special review districts), and Industrial zones. Some of the proposed updates relate to buildings greater than 120 feet, and some to buildings of other height categories.

B. Environmental Elements

1. *Earth*

a. General description of the site:

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

This non-project proposal has no particular site. The City of Seattle includes a wide range of earth forms, ranging from flat to steep hills.

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

This non-project proposal has no particular site. The City of Seattle includes a wide range of slopes, including some shear cliffs.

c. What general types of soils are found on the site (for example, clay, sand, gravel, peat, muck)? If you know the classification of agricultural soils, specify them and note any agricultural land of long-term commercial significance and whether the proposal results in removing any of these soils.

This non-project proposal has no particular site. The City of Seattle includes a wide range of soils, ranging from colluvial drift to glacial till.

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

This non-project proposal has no particular site. The City of Seattle includes unstable soils in several areas. The City of Seattle requires prevention and mitigation to prevent erosion.

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.

This non-project proposal has no particular site. A wide variety of projects are constructed within the City of Seattle.

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

This non-project proposal has no particular site. No, no net differences in potential erosion with future development are identified.

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

This non-project proposal has no particular site. The proposal is not a single project.

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

None proposed.

2. Air

a. What types of emissions to the air would result from the proposal during construction, operation, and maintenance when the project is completed? If any, generally describe and give approximate quantities if known.

This non-project proposal has no particular site. The non-project proposal would not adversely impact construction-phase emissions in a significant manner.

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

No.

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

None proposed.

3. *Water*

a. **Surface Water:**

1) Is there any surface water body on or in the immediate vicinity of the site (including year-round and seasonal streams, saltwater, lakes, ponds, wetlands)? If yes, describe type and provide names. If appropriate, state what stream or river it flows into.

No. This non-project proposal has no particular site.

2) Will the project require any work over, in, or adjacent to (within 200 feet) the described waters? If yes, please describe and attach available plans.

No. This non-project proposal has no particular site.

3) Estimate the amount of fill and dredge material that would be placed in or removed from surface water or wetlands and indicate the area of the site that would be affected. Indicate the source of fill material.

None. This non-project proposal has no particular site.

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

No. This non-project proposal has no particular site.

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

This non-project proposal has no particular site. Areas affected by the non-project proposal include areas within a 100-year floodplain, most notably industrial zones.

6) Does the proposal involve any discharges of waste materials to surface waters? If so, describe the type of waste and anticipated volume of discharge.

No.

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.

No.

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.

None.

c. **Water runoff (including stormwater):**

1) Describe the source of runoff (including storm water) and method of collection and disposal, if any (include quantities, if known). Where will this water flow? Will this water flow into other waters? If so, describe.

This non-project proposal has no particular site. The non-project proposal will not cause water runoff. See Section D of this checklist for discussion of potential impact concerns related to the non-project proposal.

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

This non-project proposal has no particular site. No.

3) Does the proposal alter or otherwise affect drainage patterns in the vicinity of the site? If so, describe.

This non-project proposal has no particular site. No.

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

None proposed.

4. Plants

a. Check the types of vegetation found on the site:

deciduous tree: alder, maple, aspen, other

evergreen tree: fir, cedar, pine, other

shrubs

grass

pasture

crop or grain

Orchards, vineyards or other permanent crops.

wet soil plants: cattail, buttercup, bullrush, skunk cabbage, other

water plants: water lily, eelgrass, milfoil, other

other types of vegetation

This non-project proposal has no particular site. The City of Seattle includes a wide variety of vegetation.

b. What kind and amount of vegetation will be removed or altered?

This non-project proposal has no particular site. None.

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

This non-project proposal has no particular site. Seattle has the presence of a wide variety of species. See Section D of this checklist for discussion of potential impact concerns related to the non-project proposal

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

None proposed.

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

This non-project proposal has no particular site. The City of Seattle includes a wide variety of noxious weeds.

5. *Animals*

- a. List any birds and other animals which have been observed on or near the site or are known to be on or near the site.**

Examples include:

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

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

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

This non-project proposal has no particular site. The City of Seattle includes a wide variety of animals.

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

This non-project proposal has no particular site. The City of Seattle includes a wide variety of species. See Section D of this checklist for discussion of potential impact concerns related to the non-project proposal.

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

This non-project proposal has no particular site. The City of Seattle includes a wide variety of birds.

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

None proposed.

- e. List any invasive animal species known to be on or near the site.**

This non-project proposal has no particular site. The City of Seattle includes a wide variety of species. See Section D of this checklist for discussion of potential impact concerns related to the non-project proposal.

6. *Energy and Natural Resources*

- a. What kinds of energy (electric, natural gas, oil, wood stove, solar) will be used to meet the completed project's energy needs? Describe whether it will be used for heating, manufacturing, etc.**

This non-project action has no project-specific energy needs. It would help future new buildings to accommodate installation of energy-related features to meet the new Energy Code, and would accommodate newer technologies and equipment that would support energy efficiency at the City level. See Section D of this checklist for discussion of potential impact concerns related to the non-project proposal.

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

No. This non-project action has no particular project site. This non-project action will not impact the use of solar energy on adjacent properties. The proposal addresses code content that would regulate solar energy features and solar access. However, it would maintain regulatory protections relating to preserving solar access for solar energy users on adjacent properties.

c. What kinds of energy conservation features are included in the plans of this proposal?

This non-project proposal is not a project proposal and has no plans for particular energy conservation features. See the response to Questions 6.a and 6.b above.

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.

1) Describe any known or possible contamination at the site from present or past uses.

This non-project action has no particular project site. The City of Seattle includes a wide variety of sites, some of which include environmental health hazards. Such conditions are regulated by other City and State environmental laws and standards. This non-project action has no particular project site, and would not result in additional environmental health hazards.

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.

The City of Seattle includes a wide variety of sites, some of which include hazardous chemicals and conditions. Such conditions are regulated by other City and State environmental laws and standards. This non-project action has no particular project site, and would not result in additional hazardous chemicals or related conditions.

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.

See the response to Question 7.a.2 above.

4) Describe special emergency services that might be required.

The City of Seattle includes a wide variety of sites. This non-project action has no particular site, and would not generate added demands for special emergency services.

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

None proposed.

b. Noise

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

The proposal does not have a particular project site. This non-project action is not likely to be affected by area noise phenomenon.

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.

The proposal does not have a particular project site, and thus no potential for site-based noise impacts. See Section D of this checklist for discussion of potential impact concerns related to the non-project proposal.

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

None proposed.

8. Land and Shoreline Use

a. What is the current use of the site and adjacent properties? Will the proposal affect current land uses on nearby or adjacent properties? If so, describe.

The non-project action has no particular project site. See Section D of this checklist for discussion of potential impact concerns related to the non-project proposal.

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?

No. The non-project action has no particular project site.

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:

No.

c. Describe any structures on the site.

The non-project action has no particular project site.

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

No.

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

This non-project action has no particular project site. The City of Seattle includes a wide variety of zoning classifications. See Section D of this checklist for discussion of potential impact concerns related to the non-project proposal.

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

The non-project action has no particular project site. The City of Seattle includes a wide variety of sites with varying comprehensive plan designations, which are Urban uses.

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

The non-project action has no particular project site.

h. Has any part of the site been classified as a critical area by the city or county? If so, specify.

The non-project action has no particular project site. The City of Seattle includes a wide variety of sites some of which are within critical areas.

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

The non-project action has no particular project site, and so the question is not relevant to the proposal.

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

None.

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

None.

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

None proposed.

m. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts to agricultural and forest lands of long-term commercial significance, if any:

None proposed.

9. Housing

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

The non-project action has no particular project site and does not provide housing units.

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

The non-project action has no particular project site and does not eliminate any housing units.

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

None proposed.

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?

The non-project proposal has no particular project site. See Section D of this checklist for discussion of potential impact concerns related to the non-project proposal.

b. What views in the immediate vicinity would be altered or obstructed?

The non-project proposal does not alter or obstruct protected views. See Section D of this checklist for discussion of potential impact concerns related to the non-project proposal.

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

None proposed.

11. Light and Glare

a. What type of light or glare will the proposal produce? What time of day would it mainly occur?

The non-project proposal would not produce light or glare impacts as a result of its effect on future development.

b. Could light or glare from the finished project be a safety hazard or interfere with views?

No.

c. What existing off-site sources of light or glare may affect your proposal?

None.

d. Proposed measures to reduce or control light and glare impacts, if any:

None proposed.

12. Recreation

a. What designated and informal recreational opportunities are in the immediate vicinity?

There are a variety of designated and informal recreational opportunities in the city. The non-project proposal has no particular project site. See Section D of this checklist for discussion of potential impact concerns related to the non-project proposal.

b. Would the proposed project displace any existing recreational uses? If so, describe.

No.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation, including recreation opportunities to be provided by the project or applicant, if any:

None proposed.

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.

The non-project proposal has no particular project site, but includes changes affecting the Pioneer Square Preservation District and International Special Review District. See Section D of this checklist for discussion of potential impact concerns related to the non-project proposal.

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.

The non-project proposal has no particular project site, but includes changes affecting the Pioneer Square Preservation District and International Special Review District. See Section D of this checklist for discussion of potential impact concerns related to the non-

project proposal.

- 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.**

The non-project proposal has no particular project site. See Section D of this checklist for discussion of potential impact concerns related to the non-project proposal.

- d. Proposed measures to avoid, minimize, or compensate for loss, changes to, and disturbance to resources. Please include plans for the above and any permits that may be required.**

The non-project proposal has no particular project site. None proposed.

14. Transportation

- a. Identify public streets and highways serving the site or affected geographic area and describe proposed access to the existing street system. Show on site plans, if any.**

The non-project proposal has no particular project site. See Section D of this checklist for discussion of potential impact concerns related to the non-project proposal.

- b. Is the site or affected geographic area currently served by public transit? If so, generally describe. If not, what is the approximate distance to the nearest transit stop?**

The non-project proposal has no particular project site. See Section D of this checklist for discussion of potential impact concerns related to the non-project proposal.

- c. How many additional parking spaces would the completed project or non-project proposal have? How many would the project or proposal eliminate?**

The non-project proposal has no particular project site. See Section D of this checklist for discussion of potential impact concerns related to the non-project proposal.

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

No. The non-project proposal has no particular project site. See Section D of this checklist for discussion of potential impact concerns related to the non-project proposal.

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

No. The non-project proposal has no particular project site. See Section D of this checklist for discussion of potential impact concerns related to the non-project proposal.

- f. How many vehicular trips per day would be generated by the completed project or proposal? If known, indicate when peak volumes would occur and what percentage of the volume would be trucks (such as commercial and nonpassenger vehicles). What data or transportation models were used to make these estimates?**

None. The proposal will not impact vehicular trips. The non-project proposal has no particular project site. See Section D of this checklist for discussion of potential

impact concerns related to the non-project proposal.

g. Will the proposal interfere with, affect or be affected by the movement of agricultural and forest products on roads or streets in the area? If so, generally describe.

No.

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

None proposed.

15. Public Services

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

No. The non-project proposal has no particular project site. See Section D of this checklist for discussion of potential impact concerns related to the non-project proposal.

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

None proposed.

16. Utilities

a. Circle utilities currently available at the site:

electricity, natural gas, water, refuse service, telephone, sanitary sewer, septic system, other _____

The non-project proposal has no particular project site. It would affect how electrical utilities are arranged on future development buildings. See Section D of this checklist for discussion of potential impact concerns related to the non-project proposal

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.

The non-project proposal has no particular project site. See Section D of this checklist for discussion of potential impact concerns related to the non-project proposal.

C. Signature

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

Signature: _____

Name of signee _____

Position and Agency/Organization _____

Date Submitted: 10/11/2021

D. Supplemental sheet for nonproject actions

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

The recently updated Seattle Energy Code, related to this proposal, would reduce carbon emissions to the air by reducing the fuel use in each impacted building, and use of electricity. The current rooftop coverage proposal would not directly, indirectly or cumulatively generate significant increases in discharges or emissions of toxic or hazardous substances, to the air or water, or lead to significant adverse noise impacts (see the response to Question D.5 below for more discussion of noise impacts related to proposed Pioneer Square accommodations for new penthouse uses). Rather, it would provide more flexibility in code requirements to accommodate the possible presence of more mechanical equipment on rooftops of future new buildings, than would otherwise have been built in prior years. This greater equipment presence could relate to building and equipment designs that will be influenced by the new Energy Code requirements. The proposal helps ensure that the combination of all rooftop features extending above buildings will not be artificially constricted by a roof coverage limit that might otherwise be too low to accommodate a reasonable combination of rooftop uses.

There is no particular potential for changes in pollutant discharges to water with relevant future development, given the facts of the proposal. Equipment installed on rooftops could in a worst case potentially release emissions to the air, from accidental leaks, but the current proposal itself does not mandate an increased amount of equipment used on rooftops, which is at the discretion of building designers and engineers. So, the proposal would not directly lead to an increase in potential for air pollutant emissions or noise impacts. Mechanical equipment screening or enclosing could lead to a reduced potential for worst-case noise impacts related to mechanical equipment use.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are:

None proposed.

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

The updated Seattle Energy Code, indirectly related to this proposal, would lead to reductions in the on-site and off-site combustion of fossil fuels, which will reduce local air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions. This will provide a continuing benefit to plant and animal well-being. This rooftop coverage proposal will not directly, indirectly or cumulatively create negative impacts on plants, animals, fish, or marine life. This is due to a lack of a mechanism for generating probable adverse effects (on rooftops of future new buildings) on plant, animals, fish or marine life elements of the environment. Also, see the response to Question D.1 above. The proposed greater flexibility to accommodate mechanical equipment as part of all rooftop coverage features would not increase the size of buildings or their roofs or lead to greater habitat losses or different kinds of adverse impacts on these biological resources.

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

None proposed.

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

This rooftop coverage proposal would not directly, indirectly or cumulatively generate negative

impacts on energy or natural resource depletion. This is due to a lack of a mechanism for generating probable adverse effects. Rather, the proposal would indirectly support building mechanical features and designs that would lead to greater energy efficiency and less depletion of natural resources. See the responses to Questions D.1 and D.2 above.

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

None proposed.

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

This rooftop coverage proposal would not directly, indirectly or cumulatively generate probable significant adverse impacts on environmentally sensitive areas or resource areas of this kind. Most of these natural resources are scarcely present within the City of Seattle. See the responses to Questions D.1, D.2, and D.3 above. With respect to historic or cultural sites, the proposal includes provisions for 10 percent increase in rooftop coverage capabilities and for greenhouse presence, like several other zones, to accommodate potential for increased mechanical equipment to meet Energy Code requirements, and for greenhouse uses that are accommodated for sustainability and food production. (Without the proposal, the existing Land Use Code would allow for roofs with greenhouses to accommodate 60 percent rooftop coverage rather than the 45 percent proposed coverage level.)

The proposal also includes Pioneer Square provisions that would accommodate different rooftop penthouse uses – for lodging and eating/drinking establishments – as rooftop additions on buildings of 40-foot height or greater. This would accommodate change and renovation on historic properties, but would be subject to the review and recommendation of special review district board, evaluations of consistency with City policies and rules on historic preservation, and exercises of City authority. While this would lead to altering of existing historic buildings, it would do so with provisions such as setbacks from roof edges, screening, use controls, visual impact evaluations, and other design guidance in the code that would be able to influence penthouse designs to be visually compatible additions. This suggests that potential for significant adverse impacts to the affected historic buildings would be avoided or minimized. The proposal would also accommodate retrofitting on buildings in Pioneer Square approximately 13 years old or newer to place enclosed recreational spaces on roofs. These would not be historic buildings, but any such projects would be subject to Pioneer Square board review for their potential impacts on surroundings. It is also worth noting that the proposal does not alter the rooftop code requirements and allowances for the Pike Place Market area.

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

None proposed.

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 details of this non-project proposal are not likely to generate significant adverse impacts on

land use and shoreline use patterns, directly, indirectly, or cumulatively. Rooftop features – their presence and arrangement on a roof – are not likely to negatively affect the arrangement and combinations of land uses on the ground that could occur within the neighborhoods of Seattle. Rather, overall land use patterns are primarily affected by the existing zoning patterns across the city, and associated factors such as density limits. Therefore, this analysis identifies no probable adverse impacts or creation of incompatibilities with land use plans.

The proposal's types of potential adverse land use impacts are limited to those relating to the additional coverage of roofs with tall features that could extend above height limits. These could include land use impacts related to height/bulk/scale of buildings and related aesthetic visual impacts, to the extent the rooftop features may be seen from locations close or at some distance away from the future new buildings. In Seattle, the range of hilly topography and range of zones allowing tall buildings means that in many locations the rooftop features may not even be visible from nearby locations but could be seen from more distant locations. These kinds of visual impacts could include instances where rooftop features could affect other building users' views either by blocking a view of a skyline or scenic feature, or adding to visual clutter if the building's rooftop features may be looked down upon from buildings at tops of hills.

Many of the proposal's code amendments relate to changing allowances in the up-to-15-foot-above-height-limit category. The proposal would not change this maximum 15-foot height allowance. Certain other higher height exceptions are already defined in the existing Land Use Code for other features such as elevator penthouses, but these height allowances are not proposed to change either. Therefore, there would not be potential for impacts in this regard, due to lack of change in rooftop height allowances.

Seattle's codes do not protect private views from impairment by new buildings, or define quantitative limits on visual clutter. However, processes like Design Review seek to achieve a design in permitted buildings that will result in a harmonious building design and appearance, which can include shaping the building's roof treatment and seeking to limit visual rooftop clutter if a building may be viewed from above.

This checklist discloses that the proposal would increase rooftop coverage limits for tall rooftop features by 10-20% in several zones. In Downtown zones, the permissible maximum rooftop coverage with these features on residential towers would be 75% coverage, or 50% for non-tower buildings, or a maximum of 35% in Pioneer Square and CID zones with Board approval. In other non-Downtown zones, there is also a proposed option for a 75% coverage limit on rooftop coverage if proposed 5-foot height restrictions on rooftop features near roof edges, requirement to screen or enclose mechanical equipment, and solar access provisions are met. For taller buildings, such as those exceeding 120 feet, future development per the proposed codes could generate increases in potential adverse impacts related to height, bulk, and scale of future buildings, including visual impairments of views available to existing building users nearby or farther away but within the visual field of a new building. This could newly occur in zones allowing buildings greater than 120 feet, which include: Highrise, Seattle Mixed, Commercial and Neighborhood Commercial zones; and could conceivably occur for buildings less than 120 feet tall in Seattle Mixed zones.

By including proposed provisions for limiting height of rooftop features within 10 feet of roof

edges in high-roof-coverage buildings (if certain design and regulatory options are chosen by an applicant), and also incentivizing screening or enclosing of mechanical equipment in certain zones, the proposed code would limit and reduce the worst-case potential magnitude of the adverse visual impacts of future new buildings.

It should be noted that the current Land Use Code for rooftop coverage balances the permissible height, bulk, view, and building feature allowances in ways that already let rooftop features exceed height limits in certain ways. These already allow for a degree of adverse visual impact to occur due to a new building's rooftop features, recognizing that certain building features like elevator penthouses need to be taller than the height limit (to allow elevators the equipment to function), and that rooftop amenities or other uses can be present. The main controlling factor in the code is the allowable percent rooftop coverage. The current proposal is calibrated to modestly or moderately increase the allowable coverage limit for certain kinds of buildings to account for technological and mechanical equipment changes driven by Energy Code requirements. These changes may result in future new buildings with more and different equipment on building rooftops than was required in the past. This also would result in additional environmentally beneficial factors – promoting sustainable energy modes in new buildings and addressing carbon emissions' role in climate change – which directly relates to the City's rationale for the non-project proposal.

Given the analysis above, the proposal could generate adverse but not significant adverse cumulative impacts related to height/bulk/scale and visual changes, due to the increment of additional percent rooftop coverage with tall features that would be permitted in future development. These potential adverse impacts related to the proposal would be experienced unevenly and in some cases not at all by nearby viewers: often, nearby persons at indoor or outdoor locations may not be able to see differences at all, because rooftop features would not be visible from their vantage point. However, in some situations influenced by the geographic location of sites and relationship to topography and other buildings within the field of vision, the increased coverage of roofs with tall features could be noticeable and in some cases could result in degrees of added impairment to private views. Such situations with combinations of those characteristics could be rare. The degree of such change, to the extent it can be predicted for all possible future viewers, likely would be slight-to-moderate (in many cases due to percent coverage increases amounting to 10-20%) and which would depend on the building design using most of the rooftop coverage area allowed by the Land Use Code in a way that would be visually impairing to a given viewer. Such impacts potentially could be avoided or reduced by the outcome of design review processes in future reviews of individual building proposals.

Regarding proposed code amendments in Pioneer Square and Chinatown/I.D. special review districts

The foregoing analysis about visual and height/bulk/scale related impacts also applies to these neighborhoods, albeit in a more limited fashion due to the greater limits on rooftop coverage and setbacks that would continue to apply in these neighborhoods.

In Chinatown/I.D., the primary change is to accommodate greenhouses as a possible rooftop use and constrain the maximum rooftop coverage if one is present to 45 percent rather than a 60 percent rooftop coverage limit that applies by virtue of allowances in code section 23.49.008. Also, the proposal would accommodate a 10 percent increase in rooftop coverage above existing limits which include choices of 15 percent or 25 percent maximum coverages

depending on Board reviews of individual proposals. A 10 percent increase in rooftop coverage with these taller features creates some potential for increased bulk presence and visual impacts that would be adverse in magnitude. But the setback requirements and other protections would help limit and minimize the effect and visibility of such changes, including through the Board review and recommendation process.

The findings above also pertain to Pioneer Square for the same greenhouse and 10 percent increase in rooftop coverage allowances. In addition, a code proposal to allow retrofitting of enclosed recreational spaces on newer buildings (approximately 13 years old or newer) in Pioneer Square would accommodate the possibility of added bulk on a few buildings, which could create more potential for visual impacts and similar effects related to increased bulk and scale of taller features on rooftops.

Newly allowing lodging and eating/drinking establishment penthouses, and newly allowing office penthouses on buildings of all sizes in Pioneer Square Preservation District

Until now, Pioneer Square has accommodated residential and office penthouse uses on rooftops within height limits (12 feet and not exceeding the zoned height limit) and rooftop coverage limits (50% coverage) that set bounds on where and how much presence these uses may have on rooftops. The proposal accommodates an expansion of permissible uses for penthouse spaces to include lodging and eating/drinking establishment uses. While it maintains the same coverage and height limits applicable to the residential and office penthouses, the proposal also newly extends the possibility of these penthouses to existing buildings that are shorter (a minimum building height of 40 feet rather than the existing minimum of 60 feet for office penthouses), and smaller in size than currently allowed for office penthouses. This would increase the chances of, and eligibility for, more buildings to pursue these penthouse additions.

Past use allowances supporting residential and office penthouses in Pioneer Square, defined decades ago, reflected opinions that these kinds of penthouse uses could aid financial feasibility of Pioneer Square building renovations and be compatible uses. Now, evaluation of the current proposal anticipates that lodging uses and eating/drinking establishment uses could also support financial feasibility of renovations and be compatible kinds of uses for additions to existing buildings.

The proposal also reflects an evaluative opinion about the potential benefits of the City supporting economic and neighborhood revitalization objectives in Pioneer Square, given the recent and ongoing economic challenges caused by the pandemic. The probability of physical compatibility of future possible penthouses would be aided by maintaining Pioneer Square rules such as minimum setbacks from roof edges, and rooftop coverage limits similar to current limits.

In terms of the City's land use policy and regulatory outlook, while past choices have supported a relatively narrow range of residential and office-use penthouse purposes until now, the City may adjust this range of preferred possibilities for Pioneer Square. Rationales for making the proposed changes include supporting the financial viability of maintaining and improving buildings, allowing a reasonable range of accessory amenities for businesses in the neighborhood, and supporting new uses that will bring visitors and customers to the neighborhood to aid businesses and the economy. Building improvements for penthouses would still be subject to project-by-project review by the Board.

Spillover impacts that might occur with lodging and eating/drinking establishment penthouse uses include a generalized potential for increases in noise and activity-related disturbances. Aspects of these uses could include music, outdoor dining services, and indoor- or outdoor-crowd-related noises from typical gatherings in rooftop spaces. If loud enough, these could lead to annoyances of people using or living in nearby buildings, and potential for nuisance-related complaints. To some extent, the chance for these annoyances could be reduced depending on building designs and user practices. For example, amplified music could be avoided in certain timeframes such as after 10 PM, or outdoor dining hours could be restricted. Penthouses could be designed to avoid or minimize openings toward neighboring uses with residents. These topics could be the subject of future Board reviews for individual proposals, with impacts partly depending on the nature of surrounding land uses, which would vary on a site-by-site basis. These potential indirect land use-related impacts would be adverse in probable magnitude, but would not represent a probable significant adverse impact, because there are ways that lodging and eating and drinking establishment uses can be designed and operated that would avoid or minimize the potential for these impacts.

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

None proposed.

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

The current rooftop coverage code proposal would not directly, indirectly or cumulatively impact transportation systems, parking, or public services in a significant adverse manner. The proposed greater flexibility to accommodate mechanical equipment as part of all rooftop coverage features would not increase the total floor area size of buildings or their roofs, and would therefore not have implications for increasing transportation trips to/from new buildings or generate additional call volumes by fire/emergency and police service providers, for example.

One exception to this finding is that proposed code changes for Pioneer Square could generate additional floor area in building additions as penthouse spaces for lodging uses and eating and drinking establishment uses on a broader range of properties than can occur today. Such uses conceivably could generate additional volumes of visitor activity to future improved buildings and thus an increment of added vehicle traffic and parking demand. Within the context of the Downtown Urban Center and existing conditions in the Pioneer Square neighborhood, these kinds of possible increases in traffic and parking demand would not be likely to create project-related significant adverse impacts. This would be due to latent capacity in these areas' street systems, transit systems, and parking resources, to absorb these possible adverse impacts from future incremental building expansions.

Similarly, possible future new floor area added to Pioneer Square buildings in future building renovations/additions could generate incremental increases in demand for fire and police protection, and other similar public service needs. However, these increases are not likely to be significant adverse impacts given their limited cumulative potential to add floor area in the context of Pioneer Square and the Downtown Urban Center

This rooftop coverage proposal would not directly, indirectly or cumulatively create significant adverse impacts on utilities. This is due to a lack of a mechanism for generating probable adverse effects of these kinds. The proposed greater flexibility to accommodate mechanical equipment as

part of all rooftop coverage features would not increase the total floor area size of buildings or their roofs. While the proposal has a relationship to mechanical equipment that could be installed on future new buildings, the proposal does not mandate an increased amount of equipment to be used on rooftops, which is at the discretion of building designers and engineers. At the same time, implementing the proposal could indirectly contribute to achievement of greater energy efficiencies in future development given the recently updated Energy Code, which would cumulatively help reduce electricity demands and increase use of renewable energy.

For elements of the proposal creating new opportunities for penthouse building additions with lodging, eating and drinking establishments, office uses and recreational spaces in Pioneer Square, these possible future new spaces could generate incremental increases in demand for utility services. However, these increases are not likely to be significant adverse impacts given their limited cumulative potential to add floor area in the context of Pioneer Square and the Downtown Urban Center.

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

None proposed.

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

No conflicts with environmental protection laws are anticipated.