

## **SEPA Checklist**

### **BNSF Intermodal Facility Access Study City of Tukwila, Washington**

*Applicant:*

**CITY OF TUKWILA**

Bob Giberson, Public Works Director  
6300 Southcenter Boulevard  
Tukwila, WA 98188

*Prepared by:*

**DAVID EVANS AND ASSOCIATES, INC.**

14432 SE Eastgate Way, Suite 400  
Bellevue, WA 98007

April 21, 2017

**City of Tukwila  
Endangered Species Act Screening Checklist**

Date: APRIL 21, 2017

Applicant Name: City of Tukwila Public Works Department

Street Address: 6300 Southcenter Boulevard

City, State, Zip: Tukwila, WA 98188

Telephone: (206) 433-0179

**DIRECTIONS:**

This Screening Checklist has been designed to evaluate the potential for your project to result in adverse effects to salmonids - Chinook, Coho, Cutthroat trout or char - as defined by Section 9 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA). If potential effects are identified, the project may need further evaluation.

Please review and answer each question carefully. Consider all phases of your project including, but not limited to, construction, normal operation, potential emergency operation, and ongoing and scheduled maintenance. To answer these questions, you may need to refer to site plans, grading and drainage plans, critical areas studies, or other documents you have prepared for your project. The City will evaluate your responses to determine if additional action is indicated.

**If ESA listed species are present or ever were present in the watershed where your project will be located, your project has the potential to affect them, and you need to comply with the ESA. The questions in this section will help determine if the ESA listings will impact your project.**

For more information on potential salmonid presence in your project area contact the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife Habitat Biologist for your region, [Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife](#) or use the SalmonScape tool, [WDFW SalmonScape](#).

1. Are ESA listed salmonids currently present in the watershed within which your project will be located?

Yes ☒ No ☐

Please describe.

The project is located within the Duwamish/Green Water Resource Inventory Area (WRIA). Fish in the Duwamish River include several species listed as threatened under ESA, including Chinook salmon, steelhead trout, and bull trout. These species use the portion of the river in the project area as migration habitat to and from marine waters and upstream spawning and rearing areas higher in the watershed. This portion of the Duwamish River is also designated critical habitat for bull trout and Chinook salmon.

2. Has there ever been an ESA listed salmonid stock present in this watershed?

Yes ☒ No ☐ Uncertain ☐

Please describe.

See previous answer.

***If you answered "yes" to either of the above questions you should complete the remainder of this checklist.***

**Part A - PROJECT SPECIFICS: Project and Vicinity**

1. Name of watershed: Duwamish/Green

2. Name of nearest water body: Duwamish River

3. What is the distance from this project to the nearest body of water? 0 ft.

4. What is the current land use between the project and the potentially affected water body (parking lots, farmland, etc)?

Commercial and light industrial buildings, parking lot, river bank, recreational trail, industrial railyard

5. Is the project above a:

- Natural permanent barrier (waterfall) Yes ☐ No ☒
- Natural temporary barrier (beaver pond) Yes ☐ No ☒
- Man-made barrier (culvert, dam) Yes ☐ No ☒
- Other (explain):

The project will include a bridge over the Duwamish River for trucks accessing the BNSF railyard. It does not include a fish barrier.

6. If answered Yes in #5, are there any resident salmonid populations above the blockage?

Yes ☐ No ☐ Don't know ☐

Not applicable.

## Part B - Project Specifics: Grading and Land Alteration

1. Does the project involve grading or land alteration of any kind?

Yes ☒ No ☐

**If your project DOES NOT involve grading please skip to Part C.**

2. Will the project involve the modification of a watercourse bank between Ordinary High Water (OHW) and the top of the bank? If yes, which water course?

*This includes any grading on any slope leading to a river or stream, but does not require work below OHW.*

Yes ☒ No ☐ Proposed bridge abutments will modify the banks of the Duwamish River above the OHWM.

3. Will the project involve the modification of a watercourse bank or bottom below OHW? If yes, please explain.

Yes ☐ No ☒

4. Could the construction, operation, or maintenance of equipment for the project result in sediment transport off site or increased rates of erosion and/or sedimentation in watercourses? If no, please explain.

*Most projects involving grading have the potential to result in increased erosion and/or sedimentation as a result of land disturbance.*

Yes ☒ No ☐

5. If the project involves grading, have you prepared a Temporary Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan?

Yes ☒ No ☐

If no, are you exempt under TMC 16.54.90?

Yes ☐ No ☒

6. Will the project result in new impervious services? Include all hard surface are such as rooftops, asphalt or concrete paving, compacted surfaces, etc.

Yes ☒ No ☐

7. What percent of the project will be impervious surface (including pavement & roof area)?

90 to 100 percent of the project area will be impervious, after construction.

## Part C – Project Specifics: Water Quality

1. Will the project generate stormwater from the creation of impervious surfaces that will not be infiltrated on site? Please explain.

*For the purpose of this analysis, infiltration includes the use of a stormwater treatment and management system intended to contain all stormwater on site by allowing it to seep into the ground.*

Yes ☒ No ☐ Project will result in additional stormwater runoff that will receive treatment, but not necessarily infiltration.

2. Will the project result in the processing or handling, storage, or treatment of hazardous substances?

*This does not include fuel properly stored in a vehicle fuel tank, but does include fuel or other chemicals stored on-site during construction.*

Yes ☒ No ☐ On-site hazardous substances could include paint or stored fuel.

3. Will the project require long-term or re-occurring maintenance requiring the use of fertilizers, pesticides, or other chemicals?

*This may include landscape maintenance, bridge or parking lot cleaning, ice removal/melt, repeated chemical vegetation clearing, etc.*

Yes ☒ No ☐ Recurring maintenance could include the use of fertilizers or pesticides.

4. Will turbidity be increased during construction or operation of the project? Please explain any measures to be taken to ensure turbidity is not increased.

*Construction near the water or below OHW often will increase turbidity, both on-site and downstream.*

Yes ☒ No ☐ During construction, standard BMPs will be employed in order to minimize erosion potential. BMPs could include but not be limited to silt fences, straw wattles, inlet protection, and hydroseed.

5. Will the project either reduce or increase shade along or over a water body?

*Removal of trees/vegetation or the building of over-water structures (docks or floats) will often result in a change to shade.*

Yes ☒ No ☐ The bridge over the Duwamish River will increase the amount of shade over the river.

6. Will the project require debris removal from below OHW of a water course? *Debris includes, but is not limited to, fallen trees, logs, shrubs, rocks, piles, riprap, submerged metal, broken concrete, pipes, or other construction material.*

Yes ☐ No ☒

**Part D – Project Specifics: Flow Alterations and Fish Migration**

1. Will the project involve the direct alteration of the channel or bed of a water course? This includes both temporary and permanent modifications. If yes, please explain.  
Yes ☐ No ☒
2. Will the project involve any physical alteration to a wetland which is connected to a water course?  
*Few wetlands are isolated, most contain either surface or subsurface connection to a flowing water course.*  
Yes ☐ No ☒
3. Will water be rerouted, either temporarily or permanently as a result of the project? If yes, please explain.  
Yes ☐ No ☒
4. Will a culvert be installed or removed as part of this project?  
Yes ☐ No ☒
5. Will the project require withdrawal of surface water? If yes, please include amount and name of water body.  
Yes ☐ No ☒
6. Will the project result in the withdrawal, injection, or interception of groundwater? *Examples of projects that might affect groundwater include, but are not limited to, construction of a new well, changes in withdrawal from an existing well, projects involving prolonged dewatering, installation of French drains, swales, or sewer lines. Projects that require a geotechnical report pursuant to TMC 18.45.060 should answer Yes.*  
Yes ☐ No ☒ Additional stormwater runoff will occur from additional impervious surface. The existing closed stormwater detention system will be reconstructed; a storage/water quality vault may be constructed. Stormwater runoff will be managed in accordance with the Ecology 2012 Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington.
7. Will topography changes on the site affect the duration/direction of surface runoff flows? If yes, please describe changes.  
Yes ☐ No ☒
8. Will the project include bank stabilization? If yes, explain.  
*Bank stabilization includes, but is not limited to, riprap, rock, logs, soil, vegetated revetments, concrete structures, or similar.*  
Yes ☒ No ☐ Project will include stabilization and scour protection around new bridge abutments on bank of Duwamish River.
9. Will there be retention or detention ponds? If yes, will this be an infiltration pond or a surface discharge to either a municipal storm water system or a surface water body?  
Yes ☐ No ☒
10. Will the project involve any reduction of the floodplain or floodway by filling or other partial blockage of flows? If yes, how will the loss of flood storage be mitigated by your project?  
Yes ☐ No ☒
11. Will project include the construction of a new wetland or waterway that is connected by surface flow to an existing waterway that contains salmonids?  
Yes ☐ No ☒

## **A. BACKGROUND**

### **1. Name of proposed project, if applicable:**

BNSF Intermodal Facility Access Study (hereinafter referred to as "the access study")

### **2. Name of applicant:**

City of Tukwila Public Works

### **3. Date checklist prepared:**

April 21, 2017

### **5. Agency requesting checklist:**

City of Tukwila

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

Complete the non-project access study phase in 2017, pursue grant funding for final design and expanded permitting in 2018 and 2019. The project specific design, right-of-way and detailed environmental documentation phases are expected to be completed by 2021 and construction phase is expected to last approximately 12 months and occur between 2022 and 2023, depending on timing of funding and permitting for each previous phase.

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

- Access Study and Alternative Screening Analysis Report
- Existing Conditions Report
- Cultural Resources Assessment
- Alternatives Analysis Hazardous Materials Review
- Geotechnical Engineering Services Report

### **8. 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 applications for governmental approvals of other proposals directly affecting this non-project action access study are known to exist.

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

After the access study is completed and preferred alternative is identified, and design and environmental documentation is fully funded, work will begin on the following local, state and federal permits for a project-specific action:



- National Environmental Policy Act compliance
- Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act Permit (US Army Corps of Engineers)
- US Coast Guard Bridge Permit
- Section 4(f) Temporary Occupancy approval
- City of Tukwila Critical Areas Regulations compliance
- Hydraulic Project Approval (Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife)
- City of Tukwila Shoreline Management Act permit
- Coastal Zone Management Certification
- National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Baseline General Construction Permit

One or more of the following local permits may be required for the project specific preferred alternative by the City of Tukwila:

- Grading
- Right-of-way Use
- Road Improvement
- Storm Drainage
- Sanitary Sewer

**10. Give brief, complete description of your proposal, including the proposed uses and the size of the project and site. There are several questions later in this checklist that ask you to describe certain aspects of your proposal. You do not need to repeat those answers on this page. (Lead agencies may modify this form to include additional specific information on project description.)**

The access study (Attachment A) evaluated and ranked five alternative access points with improved access to the Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railway (BNSF) South Seattle Intermodal Facility (BNSF railyard) and improve traffic flow through the surrounding neighborhoods. Four of the five alternatives propose to relocate the BNSF railyard truck access route off of S 124th Street.

#### Airport Way Alternatative:

This alternative access would connect the northern end of the intermodal facility to Airport Way S. The existing railroad maintenance road would be reconstructed and provide ingress and egress to the intermodal facility. A new intersection and traffic signal would be required at Airport Way and the access road.

Due to geometric constraints and the alignments of Airport Way S and the new access road, access from Airport Way south of the new intersection to the intermodal facility is not feasible. Entry and exit from the intermodal facility would only be north of the new intersection. Taking into account these restrictions, I-5 freeway access would be via S Norfolk Street, East Marginal Way S, and S Boeing Access Road. A figure of the truck freeway access route can be found in Appendix B.

This alternative access would require the bridge on Boeing Access Road over the railroad tracks to be reconstructed due to the width of the new access road and the existing bridge configuration.

#### S 112<sup>th</sup> St Alternative:

This alternative would connect to the northern half of the intermodal facility. This new roadway would begin at East Marginal Way S and use the existing Seattle Public Utilities and Seattle City Light utilities corridor. The utilities corridor borders a shooting range to the north, and Duwamish Hill

Preserve and a residential neighborhood to the south. A bluff separates the higher-elevation residential neighborhood from S 112th Street to the north and the rail facility to the east.

The existing utility corridor contains three separate high-power transmissions lines and a large-diameter water line, as seen in aerial photos.

The truck freeway access route to I-5 would be via East Marginal Way S and S Boeing Access Road. A figure of the truck freeway access route can be found in the access study.

This alternative would require the intermodal facility to construct the following at the north end of the yard: a check-in/check-out facility, truck queuing lanes, an operations building, and a truck storage access road along the western edge of the facility. This new road cannot be built within the existing BNSF parcel, therefore new right-of-way would be required for this alternative.

#### S 124<sup>th</sup> St Alternative:

This alternative would use the existing route and connect into the intermodal facility at its current location. Truck traffic would continue to access the rail facility using Interurban Avenue S, 42nd Avenue S, S 124th Street, and the existing check-in/check-out facility. No improvements or changes would occur to the streets along the route as part of this project. This route is adjacent to approximately 50 homes and the Tukwila Community Center, and runs through the middle of the Allentown neighborhood. Impacts to the neighborhood associated with the truck traffic would continue, similar to existing conditions, and could continue to worsen, based on recent increases in freight-related truck traffic in this area. Due to its age and service life, the 42nd Avenue S bridge over the Duwamish River would require replacement.

As a mitigation measure for the truck noise, it is assumed that a noise wall would be constructed along the northern edge of 42nd Avenue S. The construction of this new noise wall would require the acquisition of all homes whose driveways are on 42nd Avenue S. Also, seven roadways (43rd Avenue S, 44th Avenue S, 45th Avenue S, 46th Avenue S, 47th Avenue S, 48th Avenue S, and 49th Avenue S) would have their access to 42nd Avenue S closed. These streets would become dead-end streets, and new cul-de-sacs would be constructed at the south end of each street. All of the neighbor access would be shifted to S 122nd Street to the north.

There would be no changes to freeway access with this alternative.

There would be no changes to the intermodal facility as part of this alternative.

#### Gateway Drive Alternative:

This alternative access would connect to the intermodal facility at its current check-in/check-out location. This alternative would begin at Interurban Avenue S, use the north leg of Gateway Drive, construct a new roadway between the Boeing Employee Credit Union (BECU) buildings, construct a bridge over the Green River Trail and Duwamish River, go through residential parcels, and tie into the existing intermodal check-in/check-out facility. This alternative would construct three new at-grade intersections at Gateway Drive (east leg), 50th Place S, and 51st Place S. The new bridge would include a 10-foot-wide pedestrian facility.

The truck freeway access route to I-5 would be via Interurban Avenue S. A figure of the truck freeway access route can be found in the access study.

There would be no changes to the intermodal facility as part of this alternative.

48<sup>th</sup> Avenue South Alternative:

Project components include improving existing 48th Avenue S starting at Interurban Avenue S and extending 48th Avenue S to the BNSF railyard to the east and north. The extension would require a bridge over the Green River Trail, a bridge over the Duwamish River, an at-grade intersection with S 130<sup>th</sup> PI (Railroad Avenue on plat maps), and a route under the S 129th Street overpass. The new road will provide access to a new truck-queuing area located on the existing paved area between 51st Place S and the forested strip west of the trailer parking area. New lanes would be striped in this area to allow for two lanes entering and three lanes exiting the truck-queuing area. Trucks will exit the queue at the west end and will be processed through the check-in facility. The area to be improved covers approximately 5.5 acres.

The project would include road improvements at the intersection of Interurban Avenue S and 48th Avenue S, including rebuilding and resignalizing the intersection. Improvements on 48th Avenue S will include either placing a new asphalt overlay on the existing road section; or (1) demolishing the roadway section, (2) establishing subgrade, and (3) constructing a new roadway section. The roadway profile would be raised starting approximately 375 feet west of the Green River Trail to meet the elevation of the proposed bridge. During construction, access to businesses would be maintained. No vehicle detours would be necessary, although temporary and intermittent one-lane closures on 48th Avenue S and S 130<sup>th</sup> PI (Railroad Avenue on plat maps) will occur.

The proposed single-span concrete girder bridge will be approximately 175 feet long and 40 feet wide, oriented approximately east-west with two travel lanes and one 10-foot sidewalk on the north side, and will extend from approximately 100 feet west of the Green River Trail to Railroad Avenue. The west bridge abutment will be located between the river and the Green River Trail. The intersection of Railroad Avenue and 48th Avenue S and portions of Railroad Avenue near this intersection would be reconstructed to match the grade of the north approach to the bridge. The north bridge abutment will be located between the river and Railroad Avenue. Railroad Avenue is currently a two-way road paved with asphalt concrete oriented along the east river bank adjacent to the crest of the slope. Concrete jersey barriers separate Railroad Avenue from the slope.

Staging and storage will occur along 48th Avenue S and at either end of the proposed bridge. Any unpaved area used for construction staging or storage would be restored to its existing condition, including any disturbed area near the river.

**11. 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.**

Airport Way Alternative:

This alternative would create a new intersection on Airport Way South at:  
Latitude: 47.510176 and Longitude: -122.286136

**S 112<sup>th</sup> St Alternative:**

This alternative would extend from the modified existing intersection at S 112<sup>th</sup> Street and East Marginal Way ( Latitude: 47.502936 and Longitude: -122.2890740) and head due east to the BNSF South Seattle Intermodal Facility.

**S 124<sup>th</sup> St Alternative:**

This alternative is the do nothing baseline alternative that maintains the primary truck route along South 124<sup>th</sup> St, 42<sup>nd</sup> Ave South, and 50<sup>th</sup> Place South, with the truck entrance near S 124<sup>th</sup> St and 51<sup>st</sup> Place S (Latitude: 47.492014 and Longitude -122.270161).

**Gateway Drive Alternative:**

This alternative would extend from the existing intersection of Gateway Drive to the existing truck entrance near S 124<sup>th</sup> St and 51<sup>st</sup> Place South.

**48<sup>th</sup> Avenue South Alternative:**

This proposed alternative begins at the existing intersection of 48<sup>th</sup> Avenue South and Interurban Avenue South and ends at the south end of the BNSF South Seattle Intermodal Facility.

**12. Does the proposal lie within an area designated on the City's Comprehensive Land Use Policy Plan Map as environmentally sensitive?**

Yes, see Attachment E and NW Maps sensitive area maps for all alternatives studied.

**B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS**

**1. Earth**

**a. General description of the site:**

Please refer to Attachment B Geotechnical Report, dated June 2, 2016 for a thorough discussion of all surface conditions, route geologies and anticipated soil conditions for all five alternative routes.

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

See Attachment B.

**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.**

See Attachment B.

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

See Attachment B.

**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.**

See Attachment B.

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

All alternative routes analyzed in the access study will require NPDES permits and erosion control and sedimentation control protocols. During construction of any of these alternatives, standard Best Management Practices (BMPs) will be employed in order to minimize erosion potential. BMPs could include but not be limited to silt fences, straw wattles, inlet protection, and hydroseed. See **Attachment B**, Geotechnical Report, for more information.

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

Approximately 80 to 100 percent of the proposed alternative areas will be impervious surface after construction

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

See **Attachment B**, Geotechnical Report for more information. During construction, BMPs will be employed in accordance with the King County Surface Water Design Manual.

## **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.**

The Seattle area is a maintenance area for CO, Ozone (1-hour), and PM<sub>10</sub>. Localized exhaust emissions from large industrial truck traffic would transfer from the existing route on S 124th Avenue in Allentown to any of the other project alternative routes. During construction, construction vehicles and equipment would result in temporary adverse impacts to air quality.

The Puget Sound Clean Air Agency is installing air quality monitoring stations in Allentown to monitor air quality due to rail, freight, air, and vehicle traffic. The access study alternate routes will move high volumes of freight traffic away from the Allentown neighborhood, to the primarily industrial and commercial areas of the other alternate access routes

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

Existing air quality in the proposed alternative access routes are currently affected by nearby transportation and industrial uses such as the railroad, airport, industrial activities and production (including freight movement), and highways. These existing sources of potential air emissions or odors would not change with the project or affect the project's construction or operation, although a relatively high volume of freight traffic would be relocated from S 124th Avenue to one of the other alternative routes that have been studied.

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

Appropriate BMPs will be employed during construction of the preferred alternative to reduce and control air quality impacts, including the following:

- using well-maintained equipment and vehicles and minimizing prolonged periods of vehicle idling; and
- if dust emissions are noted during construction, areas of exposed soils could be sprayed with water or other dust suppressant.

**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.**

The Duwamish River runs through or adjacent to all access study alternate routes. The middle of the project area and is designated by the City of Tukwila as having shorelines of statewide significance. Although City of Tukwila sensitive area maps do not indicate the presence of wetlands, several ditches and low areas will need to be fully analyzed along with future project specific analysis and permitting. The Washington Department of Natural Resources (WDNR) Forest Practices Application Review System (FPARS) identifies the Duwamish River as a Type 1 perennial stream and shoreline of the state. The City of Tukwila Shoreline Environments Map designates the Duwamish River shorelines in the project area as Urban Conservancy Shoreline Environment. The City's Shoreline Master Program (SMP) jurisdiction extends 200 feet from the ordinary high water mark (OHWM) of each side of the Duwamish River.

**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.**

The Airport Way and S 112<sup>th</sup> St alternatives will be outside the 200 foot zone from described waters. The S 124<sup>th</sup> Street, Gateway Drive and the 48<sup>th</sup> Avenue South Alternatives all will require work within the 200 foot zone and possibly over the Duwamish River and within the shoreline management area on both sides of the Duwamish River.

**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.**

For all access study alternate routes, no material will be added to or removed from the Duwamish River or wetlands.

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

None of the access study alternate routes will. The 48<sup>th</sup> Ave S alternative will not require any surface water withdrawals or diversions.

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

The access study alternate routes do not overlap with the 100-year floodplain. The nearest floodplain area is located in Codiga Park west of 50th Place S, near the south end of the BNSF railyard. The Duwamish River is a designated floodway that is contained by revetments.

**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.**

None of the access study alternate routes include intentional discharges of waste materials.

**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 groundwater will be withdrawn from a well for any of the access study alternatives.

**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.**

No waste material will be discharged to the ground for any of the access study alternatives.

**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.**

For all access study alternative routes, additional stormwater runoff will occur after project construction as a result of an increase in impervious surfaces, including potential new bridges, additional pavement and sidewalks. Stormwater detention, low impact development strategies and water quality treatment vaults may be constructed to accommodate any of the resulting projects. Stormwater runoff will be managed in accordance with the 2016 King County Surface Water Design Manual . Also, BMPs will be employed in accordance with the same manual.

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

See Attachment B. GeoEngineers expects groundwater to be relatively shallow in all of the access study alternative proposal areas; they anticipate that groundwater elevation will be within a few feet of the elevation of water in the Duwamish River. Groundwater elevation is expected to fluctuate due to seasons, precipitation, and water levels in the river. Site class in the alluvial soils in these proposed access alignments will likely be D or E. Liquefaction susceptibility of the alluvial soils along the route alignment is likely moderate to high.

Waste materials are unlikely to inadvertently enter ground or surface waters, as a result of the proposed project. Construction stormwater will be collected and managed in accordance with the 2016 King County Surface Water Design Manual .

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

For all proposed access alternatives, the existing outfalls will remain the same. A Filterra or equivalent modular wetland system will be used; and treated stormwater will be discharged into the Duwamish River.

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

BMPs will be employed in accordance with the 2016 King County Surface Water Design Manual.

**4. Plants**

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

For all access study alternate routes:

- ☒ X \_deciduous tree: alder, maple, aspen, other
- ☒ X \_evergreen tree: fir, cedar, pine, other
- ☒ X \_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

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

Trees will be removed and mitigated for through the Shoreline Master Program and other permitting processes. Most trees that will require removal are landscaped street trees, although several bigleaf maples, poplars and cottonwoods would likely need to be removed .

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

No threatened or endangered plant species are known to be on or near the site.

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

After construction, disturbed areas would be restored with landscaping and trees, similar to existing conditions.

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



Invasive species are common along the riverbank, including Himalayan blackberry, reed canary grass, and Japanese knotweed.

## 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 \_\_\_\_\_

Fish and wildlife use of the access study proposal areas are limited by its high density of industrial, commercial, and residential development. Terrestrial wildlife habitat in the proposal areas are limited to the narrow riparian fringe along the Duwamish River. Aquatic habitat is limited to the Duwamish River, which contains a wide range of native and nonnative fish species. Anadromous fish use in the Duwamish River is described below.

**Documented Fish—Duwamish River and Tributaries within Project Area**

WDFW Salmonscape Data	WDFW PHS Data
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documented rearing habitat for fall Chinook, fall chum, and coho in Duwamish River.</li> <li>• Documented presence of fall chum, winter and summer steelhead, and sockeye, bull trout, and pink salmon in Duwamish River.</li> <li>• Documented presence of coho in local tributaries.</li> <li>• Threatened, accessible Evolutionarily Significant Units (ESUs) for spring Chinook, summer Chinook, fall Chinook, and pink (odd year).</li> <li>• Species of concern, accessible ESUs for coho.</li> <li>• Threatened, accessible DPSs for winter and summer steelhead.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Includes occurrence areas for Chum, Steelhead, Bull Trout, Chinook, and Coho.</li> <li>• Includes threatened areas for Steelhead, Bull Trout, and Chinook.</li> <li>• Includes Candidate areas for Coho.</li> </ul>

According to WDFW PHS data, no occurrences of priority habitats or species are documented in the project area, other than the fish species described above. The majority of the new road would affect a currently developed area. Impacts on fish in the Duwamish River could be minimized by keeping work outside the OHWM.

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

Fish use in the Duwamish River includes several species listed as threatened species under the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA), including Chinook salmon, steelhead trout, and bull trout. These species use the portion of the river in the project area as migration habitat to and from marine waters and upstream spawning and rearing areas higher in the watershed. This portion of the Duwamish River is also designated critical habitat for bull trout and Chinook salmon.

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

Chinook salmon, steelhead trout, and bull trout use the portion of the river in the project area as migration habitat to and from marine waters and upstream spawning and rearing areas higher in the watershed.

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

Limited wildlife habitat exists within the access study proposal areas. No measures will be employed to preserve or enhance wildlife.

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

No invasive animal species are known to occur in or near the proposed alternative access sites.

**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.**

During construction, electricity, gasoline, diesel fuel, and oil would be used for lighting, vehicles, and equipment. In the long run, after construction is complete, the project would not have energy needs beyond those needed for maintenance.

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

No, the proposed alternative access sites would not affect potential use of solar power by adjacent properties.

**c. What kinds of energy conservation features are included in the plans of this proposal? List other proposed measures to reduce or control energy impacts, if any:**

This proposed alternative access sites would not include energy conservation measures beyond those listed in (6)(a).

**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.**

No environmental health hazards will occur as a result of the project, other than the unlikely occurrence of a hazard or accident related to fuel spilling from construction vehicles or equipment.

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

The Duwamish River is on the Ecology 303(d) list for several water quality measures or pollutants, including temperature, dissolved oxygen, pH, bacteria, ammonia, and several other pollutants. GeoEngineers has prepared a Hazardous Materials Alternatives Analysis (see **Attachment C**) to address the potential for encountering contamination within the project area.

The contractor will comply with environmental regulations and current rules of resource agencies, according to *WSDOT Standard Specifications* Section 1-07.5. The Contractor will follow the *WSDOT Environmental Procedures Manual* (31-11), Chapter 620.08, which provides policy and procedures for identifying, handling and disposing of hazardous materials encountered during construction. The *Construction Manual* (M41-01), Section 1-2.2K provides guidance and procedures to ensure environmental compliance during construction.

**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.**

No underground hazardous liquid or gas transmission pipelines are located within the 48<sup>th</sup> Ave S alternative area. The closest pipeline is a hazardous liquid pipeline running northwest-southeast between Beacon Avenue S and Renton Avenue S, approximately 0.75 mile northeast of the project.

**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.**

Toxic or hazardous chemicals stored, used, or produced during construction or long-term operation of the project could include cleaners, gasoline and oil for construction vehicles and equipment, and paint.

**4) Describe special emergency services that might be required.**

In the event of an emergency during construction, emergency response would be required. After construction, no additional emergency services would be required other than those serving the alternative access proposals.

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

No environmental health hazards are expected on- or off-site as a result of any of the proposed alternative access sites.

**b. Noise**

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

Traffic, train, and airport noise sources already exist in the area, Interstate 5 in particular, and would not affect the project. No additional sensitive receptors would be present due to the project's construction or long-term operation.

**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.**

Short-term noise from construction equipment would occur during appropriately set hours (see [7][b][3]). The increased noise generated during construction would be temporary and would last the length of the construction period. Noise receptors near the alternative access alignments include residential, industrial, commercial, retail and hotel.

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

Construction of any of the proposed alternative access sites will comply with the City of Tukwila noise regulations. Mitigation measures could include the following:

- limit construction activity to daytime hours;
- use electric rather than diesel or gas-powered machines where practical;
- use mufflers on all internal combustion engine-driven equipment;
- turn off idling equipment.

## **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 current use of the Airport Way, Gateway Drive, and 48<sup>th</sup> Ave S alternative sites are transportation related, and adjacent properties are commercial/industrial. The S 112<sup>th</sup> St alternative is currently used as a utility corridor owned by Seattle Public Utilities (48" water transmission main) and Seattle City Light (overhead large power transmission lines). The S 124<sup>th</sup> St alternative is a residential neighborhood with a high volume of heavy trucks in and out of the BNSF intermodal facility. The alternative access proposal would result in additional truck traffic on the alternative routes, which could increase noise at the adjacent receptors. Some alternates have industrial, commercial and retail receptors and are therefore not as sensitive to noise increases.

### **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?**

The proposed alternative access sites have not likely been used in recent history as farmland or forest land.

### **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:**

The proposed alternative access sites would not affect or be affected by working farm or forest land operations; none are located near the project site.

### **c. Describe any structures on the site.**

Airport Way S and S 112<sup>th</sup> alternative routes do not have any adjacent structures. S 124<sup>th</sup> is bordered by the Tukwila Community Center (near 42<sup>nd</sup> Ave S) and single family structures. Gateway Drive is adjacent to business and financial campus structures on the west side of the river, and residential on the east. Commercial and industrial buildings border 48th Avenue S on both sides.

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

No buildings will be demolished for any of the proposed alternative access sites alternative. Some roadway-related structures or roadway pieces may be removed or relocated as part of the access alternative routes.

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

The Airport Way and South 112<sup>th</sup> St alternatives are zoned MIC/H. South 124<sup>th</sup> Street is zoned LDR. The Gateway Drive and 48th Avenue S alternate route areas are zoned as C/LI ( Commercial Light Industrial).

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

The May 2015 Comprehensive Plan designations match the current zoning classes describe in 8e.

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

The South 124<sup>th</sup> Street, Gateway Drive and part of the 48<sup>th</sup> Ave S alternatives fall within Tukwila's shoreline jurisdiction. Based on City of Tukwila Shoreline Management Act guidelines, Tukwila's shoreline jurisdiction includes the channel of the Duwamish River, its banks, the upland area which extends from the OHWM landward for 200 feet on each side of the river, floodways, and all associated wetlands within its floodplain.

For the purpose of determining shoreline jurisdiction only, the City's Shoreline regulations state that the floodway shall not include those lands that have historically been protected by flood control devices and, therefore, have not been subject to flooding with reasonable regularity.

The City of Tukwila identifies the shoreline within the project site as Urban Conservancy, the purpose of which is to protect and restore ecological functions of open space, flood plain, and other sensitive lands in urban and developed settings, while allowing a variety of compatible uses.

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

The majority of the access study alternative route areas are flat to rolling. The City identifies the Duwamish River and riverbanks sloped up to 40 percent critical areas with the project site. Riverbanks include areas sloping between 15 percent and 40 percent and underlain by permeable soils and are sloping more than 15 percent and underlain by impermeable soils or bedrock.

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

No one would reside in any of the access study alternate route sites.

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

No one would be displaced by any of the proposed alternative access sites.

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

No measures are needed because no displacements will occur.

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

The existing BNSF access route is not compatible with existing and projected land use, and has a large negative impact on the residential neighborhood. The alternative access routes are compatible with current and future land use plans, since truck routes are compatible with industrially zoned lands.

**m. Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with nearby agricultural and forest lands of long-term commercial significance, if any:**

No measures are necessary. No agricultural or forest lands of long-term commercial significance are located near This alternative.

**9. Housing**

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

No housing units would be provided as part of this alternative.

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

No housing units would be eliminated due to this alternative.

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

No measures are proposed because no impacts to housing will occur.

**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?**

For the access study alternate routes, the principal material proposed for the roadway improvements would be asphalt concrete roadways, and concrete curbs, sidewalks and bridges. The tallest height of any proposed structure would likely be a bridge over the Duwamish River, which would be at least 25 feet above the river, unless light poles are placed on the bridge. If lighting is placed on the bridge, the top of the light poles would be 60 feet above the river (the light poles would be 35 feet high).

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

No views would be altered for the Airport Way, S 112<sup>th</sup> and S 124<sup>th</sup> St Alternatives. On a permanent basis, views would be altered due to any new bridge over the river for the Gateway Drive and 48<sup>th</sup> Avenue South alternatives.. The proposed bridges would be visible to nearby employees and patrons of the businesses at the east end of Gateway Drive, 48th Avenue S, Duwamish River Trail users, residents of south Allentown, Codiga Park visitors, and drivers on Interstate 5 and S 129th Street. The additional bridge would not be inconsistent with existing views – two overcrossing structures are located within 300 feet of where the new bridge will cross the river: (1) Interstate 5 crossing over the river and the railroad, and

(2) S 129th Street crossing over the railroad. Views would temporarily change during construction due to construction activities.

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

No measures are required for all access study alternatives because no major permanent adverse impacts to aesthetics would occur.

**11. Light and Glare**

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

New illumination would be installed on any of the access study alternatives commensurate with the proposed roadway and bridge improvements. The purpose of the lighting would be to provide safety and security along the route, and would operate during nighttime hours.

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

Light from any of the completed access study alternate routes would not likely be a safety hazard or interfere with views because lights would only operate at night, for the purpose of safety and security.

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

During nighttime hours, lighting exists adjacent to all access study alternatives from nearby residential, industrial, retail, and commercial properties. However, these existing sources of light or glare would not affect the proposed access study alternatives.

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

None are necessary because no light or glare impacts would occur for the access study alternatives.

**12. Recreation**

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

Airport Way Alternative: bike lanes and shared use lanes.

S 112<sup>th</sup> St Alternative: Adjacent to Duwamish River Bend Hill park.

S 124<sup>th</sup> St Alternative: Adjacent to the Tukwila Community Center

Gateway Drive Alternative: Near the Green/Duwamish River Trail and Codiga Park.

48<sup>th</sup> Avenue South Alternative: Near the Green River Trail and Codiga Park.

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

The Airport Way South, and South 112<sup>th</sup> Street alternatives will not displace any existing recreational uses.

The South 124<sup>th</sup> Street Alternative will affect but not displace any recreational uses at the Tukwila Community Center.



The Gateway Drive and 48<sup>th</sup> Avenue South alternatives will temporarily affect the The Green/Duwamish River Trail with a temporary detour during construction. A trail detour will be in place for approximately one to three months, while the contractor hangs the bridge girders.

For the final design and permitting of any preferred alternative that includes a new bridge over the river, impacts to the trail would be evaluated under Section 4(f) of the US Department of Transportation Act of 1966, and would likely require a Temporary Occupancy form.

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

Any alternatives that impact recreation, will include mitigation such as replacement picnic tables, enhanced recreational opportunities and parking spaces for trail users .

**13. Historic and cultural preservation**

**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 located on or near the site? If so, specifically describe.**

See Attachment D for a summary of history of the five alternate access routes. Historical Research Associates, Inc. (HRA) found a total of 48 buildings, structures and sites older than 35 years old that are listed in section 4 of Attachment D.

**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.**

Section 5 of Attachment D discusses all available information for the access study alternate routes. Based on this information, HRA recommends further evaluation of the future project sites for NHRP, WHR, and King County Landmark List Eligibility; if any of the sites are eligible for a local, state, or national register, then additional cultural resources procedures (i.e., mitigation) may be required.

**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.**

HRA conducted an archival record search for records pertaining to locations within a 0.25-mile search radius of all of the access study alternatives. HRA searched the DAHP's online database, the Washington Information System for Architectural and Archaeological Records Data (WISAARD), for cultural resource survey reports, archaeological site records, historic property inventory (HPI) forms, historic register information, and cemetery records. HRA also reviewed a statewide archaeological predictive model on DAHP's WISAARD for probability estimates for archaeological resources.

**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.**

This non-project access study will result in a future project that will comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. If required by DAHP, a cultural resource survey and inadvertent discovery plan (IDP) will be prepared. An IDP will set forth procedures and steps to take if an inadvertent discovery occurs.

#### **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.**

Airport Way Alternative: this route would intersect with Airport Way, north of Boeing Access Road.

S 112<sup>th</sup> St Alternative: this route would create a new fourth leg to the existing three-legged intersection at East Marginal Way and S 112<sup>th</sup> St.

S 124<sup>th</sup> St Alternative: this existing access route to the BNSF railyard would require upgrades and mitigation for increased noise and vibration from trucks

Gateway Drive Alternative: this route would extend the existing Gateway Drive over the Duwamish River with a proposed new bridge and intersect the existing BNSF access gate near S 124<sup>th</sup> St and 51<sup>st</sup> Place South.

48<sup>th</sup> Avenue South Alternative: this route would extend the existing 48<sup>th</sup> Avenue South over the Duwamish River to the south end of the BNSF railyard.

**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?**

For all access study alternatives, nearby public transit includes:

- Sound Transit's Central Link light rail runs along the western boundary of Allentown, on E Marginal Way South, and Interurban Avenue S.
- The Sounder commuter rail train uses the BNSF Railway rail lines along the eastern boundary of Allentown, and stops at 7301 Longacres Way in Tukwila.
- Sound Transit bus routes 577, 578, 586, 590, and 592 travel near the site on Interstate 5.
- King County Metro Transit route 124 from Tukwila to Seattle is accessible from near the project site on Pacific Highway South.

**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 access study alternatives will not increase or decrease parking spaces.

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

All alternative access roads in this non-project study will require future improvements to existing roads. The existing access road (S 124<sup>th</sup> St) would require noise and vibration mitigation improves such as soil reinforcement, noise walls, cul-de-sacs and dead-end road strategies.

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

This non-project access study has studied the impacts of a relocated truck route to access the BNSF railyard. Air and rail transportation is nearby. The access study alternatives project would not use water or air transportation.

**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?**

This non-project access study has evaluated the impacts of moving truck trips off of South 124<sup>th</sup> Street and moving them to Airport Way S, S 112<sup>th</sup> St, Gateway Drive or 48<sup>th</sup> Avenue South. No net change in number of vehicle trips would occur with any future project.

**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.**

None of the access study alternate routes would adversely affect movement of agricultural and forest products on streets in the area. During construction, access would be maintained at all times, and vehicles (including freight) could experience temporary delays. In the long run, safety and throughput capacity for the route to and from the BNSF railyard will improve.

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

During construction of any of the access study alternate routes, access to businesses, residents would be maintained. No vehicles detours would be necessary, although temporary and intermittent one-lane closures on 48th Avenue S and Railroad Avenue will occur. No measures are proposed because no permanent adverse transportation impacts are expected to occur.

## **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.**

None of the access study alternate routes will increase demand for public services, such as fire and police protection and public transit, would occur. No additional housing units will be constructed therefore no increase in demand for health care or schools.

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

None are proposed because none of the access study alternatives are expected to impact to public services.

## 16. Utilities

### a. Circle utilities currently available at the site:

All access study alternatives have adjacent or nearby utilities:

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.

Utilities will remain the same at all access study alternate routes. A storage and water quality vault may need to be constructed, depending on the amount of new impervious surface added and not treated with Low Impact Development techniques. Stormwater runoff will be managed in accordance with the King County Surface Water Design Manual. Also, BMPs will be employed in accordance with the same manual.

**(NON-PROJECT PROPOSALS (E.G., SUBURBAN PLANS AND ZONING CODE TEXT CHANGES) MUST COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING PAGES).**

**C. SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NON-PROJECT PROPOSALS**

(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.

Please respond to all questions. Use separate sheets as necessary.

**Applicant Responses:**

**Agency Comments**

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

This non-project proposal will result in a preferred alternative and a future project. The future project-specific action will require local (SEPA, Shorelines, and Sensitive Areas), state and federal permits and approvals that will require project specific mitigation.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are:

This non-project action has evaluated access alternatives to minimize any increases.

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

This non-project action has evaluated access alternatives in order to minimize impacts to plants, animals, fish and marine life.

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

N/A - Non-Project Action

Please respond to all questions. Use separate sheets as necessary.

**Applicant Responses:**

Agency Comments

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

N/A - Non-Project Action

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

N/A - Non-Project Action

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 habitats, historic or cultural sites, wetlands, floodplains, or prime farmlands?

N/A - Non-Project Action

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

N/A - Non-Project Action

5. How would the proposal be likely to affect land and shoreline use, including whether it would allow or encourage land or shoreline uses incompatible with existing plans?

N/A - Non-Project Action

Please respond to all questions. Use separate sheets as necessary.

**Applicant Responses:**

**Agency Comments**

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

N/A - Non-Project Action

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

N/A - Non-Project Action

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

N/A - Non-Project Action

7. Identify, if possible, whether the proposal may conflict with Local, State, or Federal laws or requirements for the protection of the environment.

N/A - Non-Project Action

### 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: Bob Liberson

Name of signee BOB GIBERSON

Position and Agency/Organization PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR, CITY OF TULSA

Date Submitted: 4/21/17

#### List of Attachments:

Attachment A	BNSF Railway Intermodal Facility Access Study
Attachment B	Geotechnical Report
Attachment C	Hazardous Materials Memorandum
Attachment D	Cultural Resources Report
Attachment E	NW Maps sensitive areas