

WAC 197-11-960 Environmental checklist.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Purpose of checklist:

The State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), chapter 43.21C RCW, requires all governmental agencies to consider the environmental impacts of a proposal before making decisions. An environmental impact statement (EIS) must be prepared for all proposals with probable significant adverse impacts on the quality of the environment. The purpose of this checklist is to provide information to help you and the agency identify impacts from your proposal (and to reduce or avoid impacts from the proposal, if it can be done) and to help the agency decide whether an EIS is required.

Instructions for applicants:

This environmental checklist asks you to describe some basic information about your proposal. Governmental agencies use this checklist to determine whether the environmental impacts of your proposal are significant, requiring preparation of an EIS. Answer the questions briefly, with the most precise information known, or give the best description you can.

You must answer each question accurately and carefully, to the best of your knowledge. In most cases, you should be able to answer the questions from your own observations or project plans without the need to hire experts. If you really do not know the answer, or if a question does not apply to your proposal, write "do not know" or "does not apply." Complete answers to the questions now may avoid unnecessary delays later.

Some questions ask about governmental regulations, such as zoning, shoreline, and landmark designations. Answer these questions if you can. If you have problems, the governmental agencies can assist you.

The checklist questions apply to all parts of your proposal, even if you plan to do them over a period of time or on different parcels of land. Attach any additional information that will 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.

Use of checklist for nonproject proposals:

Complete this checklist for nonproject proposals, even though questions may be answered "does not apply." IN ADDITION, complete the SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS (part D).

For nonproject actions, the references in the checklist to the words "project," "applicant," and "property or site" should be read as "proposal," "proposer," and "affected geographic area," respectively.

A. BACKGROUND

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable:

**Factoria Recycling and Transfer Station (RTS) Facility Master Plan (FMP)
King County Project No. 003168**

2. Name of applicant:

King County Department of Natural Resources and Parks, Solid Waste Division (KCSWD)

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

**Fred Bennett, PE, Project Manager
KCSWD
King Street Center
201 South Jackson Street, Suite 701
Seattle, 98104-3855
(206) 296-4426**

4. Date checklist prepared: **September 2010**

5. Agency requesting checklist: **KCSWD**

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

The Factoria RTS FMP will be sent to the King County Council for consideration in November 2010 with adoption planned for spring 2011.

Additional project information is found at the project website:

<http://your.kingcounty.gov/solidwaste/facilities/factoria-replacement-project.asp>

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

Further design activity will occur after adoption of the Factoria RTS FMP by the King County Council. The preferred design concept to replace the existing recycling and transfer station facility will be more detailed in the coming months. Specific construction activities and mitigation related to the Factoria RTS will be addressed under a project-specific SEPA environmental review during the land use approval and permitting phase of the project.

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

- **Wetland and Stream Delineation Report. HDR Engineering, Inc. June 2010.**
- **Traffic Impact Analysis. HDR Engineering, Inc. June 2010.**
- **Priority Habitat and Species (PHS) Data. Washington State Department of Fish & Wildlife. January 2010.**
- **Hazardous Materials Survey Report. HDR Engineering, Inc. June 2010.**
- **Conceptual Stormwater Management Plan Technical Memorandum. HDR Engineering, Inc. August 2010.**
- **Final SEPA Environmental Impact Statement King County 2001 Final Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan. February 2001**
- **Final Supplemental SEPA Environmental Impact Statement King County 2006 Solid Waste Transfer and Waste Management Plan. September 2006**

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.

There are no known applications pending for governmental approval of other proposals directly affecting this proposal. This is a non-project action to adopt the proposed FMP for the Factoria RTS.

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

The King County Council will need to review and adopt the FMP for the Factoria RTS. Specific construction activities related to future replacement of the transfer station will be addressed under a separate SEPA Environmental review at a future date.

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

The King County Department of Natural Resources and Parks, Solid Waste Division, prepared the 2010 Facility Master Plan (FMP) for the Factoria Recycling and Transfer Station (Factoria RTS). The purpose of the FMP is to provide a guide for the development of the site and the operational improvements of the new facility. The *2001 Final Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan* along with the *2006 Solid Waste Transfer and Waste Management Plan* demonstrate the need for a major overhaul of the County's aging transfer system infrastructure. These plans were adopted by the King County Council, and affirmed the need to replace the Factoria Station. A solid waste level of service analysis for the existing Factoria RTS showed that the existing facility does not meet several service needs including room for collecting recyclable materials, minimum roof clearance needed by modern, larger garbage collection vehicles, and the ability to compact waste. The new station would be built to meet current building and environmental standards, to increase operational efficiency, and to accommodate projected future growth in the region.

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 FMP is associated with the location for the Factoria RTS, which is located at 13820 Southeast 32nd Street, approximately one quarter mile north of Interstate 90 and one half mile east of Interstate 405 in King County. The existing facility is located in the light industrial area between SE 30th Street and SE 32nd Street in the City of Bellevue, Washington within Section 10, Township 24 North, and Range 5 East.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS

1. Earth

- a. General description of the site (circle one): Flat, rolling, **hilly, steep slopes**, mountainous, other _____. Describe location and areas on the site that have different topography.

Hilly, Steep Slopes

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

This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP, but the steepest slope on the associated project site is 30 to 40 percent slope. The topography within the immediate vicinity generally slopes down from southeast to northwest.

- 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 prime farmland.

This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP, but the general types of soil found on associated project site are Loam and Sandy Loam, Pits, and Everett (Gravelly Sandy Loam).

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

This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP, but the steepest slope on the associated project site show no indications of unstable soils.

- e. Describe the purpose, type, and approximate quantities of any filling or grading proposed. Indicate source of fill.

This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP; therefore, the specific cut and fill quantities are unknown at this time for the associated project.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP. Design development is underway for the associated project and impervious surface quantities will be addressed in a project-specific SEPA environmental review.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP. Design development is underway for the associated project that will assess the impervious surface quantities, which will be addressed in a project-specific SEPA environmental review.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP.

2. Air

- a. What types of emissions to the air would result from the proposal (i.e., dust, automobile, odors, industrial wood smoke) during construction and when the project is completed? If any, generally describe and give approximate quantities if known.

Not applicable. This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP. Minor exhaust and minor fugitive dust emissions (particulate matter) could be expected based on future developments at the Factoria RTS property.

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

Not applicable.

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

This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP; however, specific measures to reduce emissions would be identified for the associated project based on future development of the Factoria RTS property by applying best management practices (BMPs). The FMP proposes several facility design features that reduce dust and odors as well as improves energy efficiencies which reduces greenhouse emissions.

3. Water

a. Surface:

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

This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP; however, four streams are located in the study area of the associated project: Sunset Creek (fish bearing), Stream 0263, Stream A, and Stream B (non fish bearing). In addition, there are five wetlands in the study area. These include Wetlands 2, 3, 4, A, and C. The wetlands range in size from 0.01 acre to 0.96 acre and they are classified as Type III and IV (City of Bellevue rating) slope and depressional wetlands.

- 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. Note approximate distance between surface waters and any construction, fill, etc.

This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP for an associated project; however, the associated project will impact wetlands and streams on site. The impact amount and intensity will depend on future project design and construction methods.

- 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.

This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP. Some fill activities for the associated project are anticipated as part of future development activities at the Factoria RTS property.

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

This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP. Diversion of on-site surface water would be analyzed during detailed design. Approximately quantities, if any, are unknown at this time.

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

This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP. The site is not within a 100-year floodplain.

- 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.

This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP. It is unlikely that future development at the Factoria RTS property would involve a discharge to surface waters.

b. Ground:

- 1) Will ground water be withdrawn, or will water be discharged to ground water? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.

Not applicable. This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP.

- 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.

Not Applicable. This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP.

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.

Not Applicable. This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP. Based on future development of the Factoria RTS property, stormwater would be collected, treated, and disposed, in accordance with state and local governmental stormwater regulations and best management practices.

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

Not Applicable. This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP. Based on future development of the Factoria RTS property, it is likely that waste materials would be removed from runoff prior to entering ground or surface waters.

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

Not Applicable.

4. Plants

a. Check or circle 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
☐ wet soil plants: cattail, buttercup, bullrush, skunk cabbage, other
☐ water plants: water lily, eelgrass, milfoil, other
☐ other types of vegetation
☒ Not Applicable

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. Future development activities at the Factoria RTS property would cause the removal of vegetation and potential restoration activities.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. A review of the Washington Department of Natural Resources Natural Heritage Program (NHP) database for the associated project showed no known threatened or endangered plant species on the Factoria RTS property within the project area.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action; however, the future project would include landscaping using native plants where possible.

5. Animals

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

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

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

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action.

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

Adoption of the FMP is a non-project action; however, Chinook salmon, sockeye salmon, coho salmon, and steelhead are documented to occur in Sunset Creek, which is within the associated project site.

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

Adoption of the FMP is a non-project action; however, the Pacific Northwest is located within the Pacific Flyway migration route for the associated project site.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP. The project would avoid any disturbance to Sunset Creek.

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.

Not applicable. This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP; however, based on future development of the Factoria RTS property, electricity, or natural gas may be used to heat buildings for the associated project.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP; however, the topography of the associated project site is such that when the Factoria RTS is rebuilt, it is unlikely that the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties would be impacted because the building would sit much lower than what currently exists.

- 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:

Not applicable. This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP. Design of the Factoria RTS would incorporate several energy conservation measures to reduce energy impacts.

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.

Not applicable. This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP; however the FMP proposes to replace an existing transfer station, which will include building a new facility to current industry standards including on-site stormwater and sanitary sewer upgrades.

- 1) Describe special emergency services that might be required.

Not applicable. This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP; however, based on future development of the Factoria RTS property, similar levels of services from police, fire, and medical services could be required.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP; however, future development at the Factoria RTS property would be subject to appropriate regulatory controls to control health hazards.

b. Noise

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP; however, typical industrial land use noise including large trucks, back up beepers, diesel engines, generators, and other types of large equipment will affect the associated project.

- 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.

Not applicable. This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP; however, the associated project would have noise from transfer vehicles and the pre-load compactors.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP; however, the associated facility will be in an enclosed building, which would minimize the noise.

8. Land and shoreline use

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP; however, the current use of the associated project includes buildings for recycling and transfer of solid waste. Adjacent property uses include light industrial use and storage. A regional utility corridor exists below ground and overhead. A forested parcel of land to the east of the project.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP; however, no agricultural use has been documented.

- c. Describe any structures on the site.

Not applicable. This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP; however, the associated project has the several structures on the site, including the existing transfer station, scalehouse, and two warehouse buildings.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP. The associated project-specific SEPA environmental review would evaluate demolition of the existing warehouse buildings, the transfer station, and possibly the scalehouse for construction of the new facility.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP; however, the associated project is zoned as Light Industrial.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP; however, the property is designated as Light Industrial in the comprehensive plan.

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

Not applicable.

- h. Has any part of the site been classified as an "environmentally sensitive" area? If so, specify.

Not applicable. This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP; however, the associated project has four streams, five wetlands, and steep slopes located in the site area.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP; however, the associated facility is compatible with the existing land use as it replaces a similar facility and it is supported by both the comprehensive plan and zoning (as a conditional use).

9. Housing

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP; however the associated project does not provide housing.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP.

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?

This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP; however, architectural design is underway for the associated project. Height of new structures will comply with the City of Bellevue zoning requirements for light industrial land uses.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP. Project effects on views for the associated project will be analyzed as part of the project-specific SEPA environmental review.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP; however, based on future development of the Factoria RTS property, site plans would include measures to control or reduce any aesthetic impacts. Future developments will be consistent with adopted land use classifications.

11. Light and glare

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP. When future development activities occur, there may be an increase in light produced from motor vehicles, buildings, etc.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP; however, light and glare with the associated project would have minimal negative impacts to safety and views.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP. Based on future development of the Factoria RTS property, any building lighting may be directed

and shielded to reduce impacts. Landscape buffering may also be used to reduce impacts.

12. Recreation

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP. No designated and/or informal recreational opportunities lie in the immediate vicinity of the associated project.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP.

13. Historic and cultural preservation

- a. Are there any places or objects listed on, or proposed for, national, state, or local preservation registers known to be on or next to the site? If so, generally describe.

Not applicable. This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP; however no places or objects from such registers are known to be on or near the associated project site.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP. No landmarks or evidence of historic, archaeological, scientific, or cultural importance are known to be on or next to the site of the associated project.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP; however further assessment of historical and cultural resources would occur during the project-specific SEPA environmental review.

14. Transportation

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

Currently the site is accessed from the SE 32nd Street / Richards Road intersection. The new

facility would have transfer vehicles accessing the site from SE 30th Street, while self haul customers and commercial vehicles would continue to use SE 32nd.

Four intersections lie in the vicinity of the study area, including:

- Richards Road/SE 30th Street
- Richards Road/SE 32nd Street
- Richards Road/SE Eastgate Way
- Richards Road/SE 36th Street

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP. The associated project is approximately 1/2 mile to the nearest bus stop which is located on Richards Road.

- c. How many parking spaces would the completed project have? How many would the project eliminate?

Not applicable. This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP; however parking would be provided for employees and visitors to the site.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP; however, based on future development of the Factoria RTS property, road improvements may be necessary depending on the final design of the associated project.

- e. How many vehicular trips per day would be generated by the completed project? If known, indicate when peak volumes would occur.

The adoption of the FMP does not generate any new vehicle trips; however, the project-specific SEPA environmental review would analyze additional (if any) vehicle trips generated by the new facility.

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

None. This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP. A traffic impact analysis would be prepared for the project-specific SEPA environmental review.

15. Public services

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP; however, the associated facility should require similar public services as the current facility.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP.

16. Utilities

- a. Circle utilities currently available at the site: electricity, natural gas, water, refuse service, telephone, sanitary sewer, septic system, other.

Not applicable. This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP; however the current facility has access to all necessary utility services.

- 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.

Not applicable. This is a non-project action to adopt the FMP.

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: Fred Bennett

Date Submitted: 9/27/2010

Relationship of Signer to Project: Project Manager

SEPA Nonproject Review Form

The State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), chapter 43.21C RCW, requires all governmental agencies to consider the environmental impacts of a proposal before making decisions. The Nonproject Review Form (NPRF) is an optional tool to help the lead agency evaluate the environmental consequences of a nonproject proposal and to provide information to decision-makers and the public.

The NPRF cannot be used as a substitute for the environmental checklist, but may be attached as supplemental analysis. Applicable information in the NPRF can be referenced in the environmental checklist without having to repeat the information.

The NPRF is intended to be used concurrently with the development of a nonproject proposal. To achieve maximum effectiveness and efficiency the initial use of the form should begin at the time a nonproject proposal is being contemplated, i.e. upon identification that a plan, policy or rule is likely to be needed or is mandated.

The information and analysis in the NPRF should be updated as the proposal is developed. The number of revisions will depend on the complexity of the proposal. If the proposal is minor, one iteration of the NPRF may be sufficient. For more complex proposals, the NPRF should be revised as analysis is completed or key issues resolved.

If you are unfamiliar with the form, you should review all of the questions before providing any answers. This will help familiarize you with the questions and should avoid duplication of information. Please note that when a nonproject proposal is first contemplated, it is often premature to respond to some questions in the NPRF. Answers may also change as the proposal is developed and analysis is completed.

NONPROJECT REVIEW FORM

DATE: 9/27/2010

COMPLETED BY: Fred Bennett

PART I - FRAMEWORK

1) Background

a) Name of proposal, if any, and brief description.

Factoria Recycling and Transfer Station (Factoria RTS) Facility Master Plan (FMP)

The King County Department of Natural Resources and Parks, Solid Waste Division, is preparing the 2010 Facility Master Plan (FMP) for the Factoria Recycling and Transfer Station (Factoria RTS). The purpose of the FMP is to provide a guide for the development of the site and operational improvements of the new facility. The *2001 Final Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan* as well as the *2006 Solid Waste Transfer and Waste Management Plan* demonstrated the need for a major overhaul of the County's aging transfer system infrastructure. These plans were adopted by the King County Council, and affirmed the need to replace the Factoria Station. A solid waste level of service analysis for the existing Factoria RTS showed that the existing facility does not meet several service needs including room for collecting recyclable materials, minimum roof clearance needed by modern, larger garbage collection vehicles and the ability to compact waste. The new station will be built to meet current building and environmental standards, to increase operational efficiency, and to accommodate projected future growth in the region.

b) Agency and contact name, address, telephone, fax, email

Fred Bennett, P.E., Project Manager
King County Department of Natural Resources and Parks
Solid Waste Division
King Street Center,
201 South Jackson Street, Suite 701
Seattle, WA 98104-3855
(206) 296-4426

c) Designated responsible official

Kevin Kiernan, P.E., Division Director
King County Department of Natural Resources and Parks Solid Waste Division

- d) Describe the planning process schedule/timeline

The Factoria RTS Facility Master Plan (FMP) will be sent to the King County Council for consideration in November 2010 with adoption planned for Spring 2011.

- e) Location - Describe the jurisdiction or area where the proposal is applicable.
(Attach map(s) if appropriate)

The FMP is associated with the location for the Factoria RTS, which is located at 13820 Southeast 32nd Street, approximately one half mile north of Interstate 90 and one half mile east of Interstate 405 in King County. The existing facility is located in the light industrial area between SE 30th Street and SE 32nd Street in the City of Bellevue, Washington within Section 10, Township 24 North, and Range 5 East.

- f) What is the legal authority for the proposal?

The King County *2001 Final Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan* as well as the King County Division's *2006 Solid Waste Transfer and Waste Management Plan* demonstrated the need for a major overhaul of the aging County solid waste transfer system infrastructure.

- g) Identify any other future nonproject actions believed necessary to achieve the objectives of this action.

None.

2) Need and Objectives

- a) Describe the need for the action. (Whenever possible this should identify the broad or fundamental problem or opportunity that is to be addressed, rather than a legislative or other directive.)

The Factoria Recycling and Transfer Station, which was constructed in the mid-1960s, does not meet several service needs, including room for collecting recyclable materials, minimum roof clearance needed by modern, larger garbage collection vehicles and the ability to compact waste. The new station will be built to meet current building and environmental standards and to accommodate projected future growth in the region. The *2001 Final Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan*, along with the *2006 Solid Waste Transfer and Waste Management Plan* demonstrated the need for a major overhaul of the aging transfer system infrastructure. These plans, which were adopted by the King County Council, affirmed the need to replace the Factoria station.

- b) Describe the objective(s) of the proposal, including any secondary objectives which may be used to shape or choose among alternatives.

The FMP will document the following:

- An overview of the existing facility, site, and adjacent land uses.
- A description of the project purpose and need.
- A description of development criteria used for concept creation.
- A narrative of the concepts considered.
- A conceptual plan for the preferred development option that includes a site plan, floor plans, and renderings.
- A summary of environmental impacts associated with the preferred development option, and a summary of anticipated permits and conceptual cost estimates.

Please refer to the FMP for more detail on the objectives and criteria used to develop the preferred concept.

- c) Identify any assumptions or constraints, including legal mandates, which limit the approach or strategy to be taken in pursuing the objective(s).

None are known.

- d) If there is no legislative or other mandate that requires a particular approach, describe what approaches could reasonably achieve the objective(s).

King County employed a FMP Task Force comprised of transfer station staff, planning and operations staff, recycling and Household Hazardous Waste coordinators, and representatives from maintenance to provide input on what was needed in a new transfer station. The FMP Task Force then reviewed the various concepts for site suitability and operational function to make a recommendation of a preferred concept to the County's Solid Waste Division Management Team (SWDMT) for the final decision.

3) Environmental Overview

Describe in broad terms how achieving the objective(s) would direct or encourage physical changes to the environment. Include the type and degree of likely changes such as the likely changes in development and/or infrastructure, or changes to how an area will be managed.

The FMP proposes replacement of the existing Factoria RTS, including:

- An enclosed solid waste transfer building, with adequate roof clearance, that will minimize noise, dust, and odors
- Two preload compactors to improve the efficiency of payloads and decrease the number of transfer trailer trucks trips required to and from the station
- A new recycling collection area for items such as yard waste, clean wood, appliances, and scrap metal to improve further diversion and recycling goals of the Solid Waste Division.
- More efficient and effective household hazardous waste collection and storage system.

- An architecturally designed facility to improve the aesthetic view shed to and from the building.
- Improved floor operations to reduce customer wait times.
- Sustainable building design features to improve energy efficiency and result in lower life cycle costs than a conventional building design
- Sufficient space to process projected future volumes of solid waste and to expand recycling as needed.
- Upgrades to the on-site stormwater and sanitary sewer conveyance systems on site.
- Wetlands and streams have been delineated and functional assessments conducted. Impacts are anticipated to some of the wetlands and the streams on-site. A combination of on-site and off-site mitigation to offset impacts is currently in the planning stages. A formal mitigation proposal will be provided during the land use permit process.

The proposal would incorporate measures to minimize effects to the built and natural environment.

4) Regulatory Framework

- a) Describe the existing regulatory/planning framework as it may influence or direct the proposal.

The *2001 Final Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan* and *2006 Solid Waste Transfer and Waste Management Plan* demonstrated the need for a major overhaul of the aging transfer system infrastructure. These documents provide much of the planning framework which guided development of the FMP. Implementation of the preferred concept in the FMP would require land use approvals and permits from the City of Bellevue.

- b) Identify any potential impacts from the proposal that have been previously designated as acceptable under the Growth Management Act (GMA), chapter 36.70A RCW.

Not applicable to this proposal.

5) Related Documentation

- a) Briefly describe any existing regulation, policy or plan that is expected to be replaced or amended as a result of the proposal. (Adequate descriptions in section 4.a may be referenced here, rather than repeated.)

Not applicable.

- b) List any environmental documents (SEPA or NEPA) that have been prepared for items listed in 4.a. or that provide analysis relevant to this proposal. **Note:** Impacts with previous adequate analysis need not be re-analyzed, but should be adopted or incorporated by reference into the NPRF. Identify the:

- Type of document
- Lead agency and issue date

- iii) Where copies can be viewed or obtained
- iv) The portions of the document applicable to the current proposal and briefly explain relevancy. Summarize the relevant impact assessment or, provide reference to discussion(s) in Part II that includes this information.

The 2001 Final Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan and 2006 Solid Waste Transfer and Waste Management Plan demonstrated the need for a major overhaul of the aging transfer system infrastructure. A Final SEPA Environmental Impact Statement was issued in February 2001 for the 2001 Final Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan. A Final Supplemental SEPA Environmental Impact Statement for the 2006 Solid Waste Transfer and Waste Management Plan was issued in September of 2006.

A SEPA Non-Project action Environmental Checklist and Determination of Non-Significance is being prepared for adoption of the FMP. This document will be made available to the public, agencies, and Tribes in the fall of 2010. During the land use permit process and final design stage, a project specific SEPA environmental review would be completed.

- c) List other relevant environmental documents/studies/models which have been identified as necessary to support decision making for this proposal.

- 1) *Final Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan*, King County 2001.
- 2) *Solid Waste Transfer and Waste Management Plan* King County 2006.
- 3) Wetland and Stream Delineation Report. HDR Engineering, Inc. June 2010.
- 4) Draft Traffic Impact Analysis. HDR Engineering, Inc. June 2010.
- 5) Priority Habitat and Species (PHS) Data. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW). January 2010.
- 6) Hazardous Materials Survey Report. HDR Engineering, Inc. June 2010.
- 7) Conceptual Stormwater Management Plan Technical Memorandum. HDR Engineering, Inc. August 2010.

The above noted documents were sources of data and information for preparation of the FMP. Additional environmental documentation will be prepared and submitted as part of the land use permit process.

6) Public Involvement (Optional)

- a) Identify agencies with jurisdiction or expertise, affected tribes, and other known stakeholder groups whose input is likely to be specifically solicited in the development of this proposal.
- b) Briefly describe the processes used or expected to be used for soliciting input from those listed. [Examples: ad hoc committees, tribal consultations, interagency meetings, public workshops or hearings, newsletters, etc.]

PART II – IMPACT ANALYSIS AND ALTERNATIVES

7) Affected Environment

Generally describe the existing environmental landscapes or elements (e.g., character and quality of ecosystem, existing trends, infrastructure, service levels, etc.) likely to be affected if the proposal is implemented. Include a description of the existing built and natural environment where future “on the ground” activities would occur that would be influenced by the nonproject proposal.

Note: When complete, this section needs to provide information on existing conditions for the elements of the environment discussed in sections 8 and 9. A list of both the built and the natural elements of the environment is found in WAC 197-11-444, and included at the end of this form.

The proposed site is located in a light industrial area north of Interstate 90 and east of Interstate 405 in Bellevue, Washington. The general built and natural environmental conditions are noted below:

Natural Environment

The site is characterized as having downsloping topography. Soils found on the site include Urban Land (Loam and Sandy Loam) and Pits and Everett (Gravelly Sandy Loam). The undeveloped portions of the site has a mix of deciduous and evergreen trees.

Four streams are located in the study area: Sunset Creek and three unnamed streams. Sunset Creek is a fish-bearing stream and the unnamed streams are non fish-bearing streams according to the City of Bellevue. In addition, there are five wetlands in the study area. These include Wetlands 2, 3, 4, A, and C. The wetlands range in size from 0.01 acre to 0.96 acre and they are classified by the City of Bellevue as Type III and IV slope and depressional wetlands.

Built Environment

The existing facility would remain open during construction. Tenants in the two warehouse buildings would have to relocate and the buildings deconstructed during the initial phase of construction.

Currently the site is accessed from the SE 32nd Street / Richards Road intersection. Four roadway intersections lie in the vicinity of the study area, including: Richards Road/SE 30th Street, Richards Road/SE 32nd Street, Richards Road/SE Eastgate Way, and Richards Road/SE 36th Street. When the facility is completed, transfer vehicles would begin accessing the site via SE 30th Street. Self-haul customers and commercial vehicles would continue to use SE 32nd Street.

Land uses along SE 32nd and SE 30th are generally mixed with industrial, maintenance, manufacturing, warehouse distribution, and athletic/sport clubs. A regional utility corridor easement with below ground gas pipelines and above ground power transmission line runs along the east boundary line of the site.

8) Key Issue Assessment

List the identified key issues or areas of controversy or concern and include a brief statement of why each is a key issue. For each item listed:

Several key issues have been identified for future analysis in the project specific SEPA environmental review for the project such as traffic, wetlands, streams, steep slopes, noise, air quality, and aesthetic quality. They are key issues due to the potential impacts during construction or operation of the facility on the environment. The information below provides some insight on the process used in the development of the FMP.

- a) Identify alternative options or solutions for the objective or concern.

Prior to recommending the preferred concept in the FMP, over 20 different alternatives were designed, reviewed, and analyzed. The development criteria (explained in detail in the FMP) established for the new Factoria RTS site plan was applied to the various concepts and used to narrow the options down to a preferred site plan.

A public open house was held on May 12, 2010 to present the top concepts under consideration to the surrounding community and stakeholders and provide opportunity for them to comment.

- b) Describe the environmental considerations/impacts relevant to each of the alternatives identified in 8.a.

The property is constrained by topography, a regional utility corridor, and the desire by the County to maintain operation of the existing transfer station while the new facility is under construction. The new facility footprint for all concepts was essentially in the same general location. Wetland and stream impacts for all concepts would be similar.

- c) Describe reasonable mitigation of adverse impacts identified.

Impacts to Category III and IV wetlands and a small stream near the existing warehouse would occur during construction of the new transfer station. A combination of on-site and off-site mitigation nearby in the watershed would be proposed during the conditional use permit process.

- d) Identify those alternatives to be carried forward for further analysis.

A preferred concept has been recommended in the FMP for consideration by the King County Council. Details on the development criteria, the workshop process, and elements of the preferred concept are contained in the FMP.

- e) Briefly describe why those alternatives rejected from further consideration were not carried forward.

Alternatives were not carried forward for a number of reasons. Some concepts were not favored by the FMP Task Force due to inadequate operational function, poor traffic circulation, or inability to meet the development criteria.

9) Proposed Nonproject Action or Alternative Actions

Describe a range of reasonable alternatives or the preferred alternative that will meet the objective(s). For each alternative, answer the following questions referring again to the list of the elements of the environment in WAC 197-11-444:

- a) If this alternative were fully implemented (including full build-out development, redevelopment, changes in land use, density of uses, management practices, etc.), describe where and how it would direct or encourage demand on or changes within elements of the human or built environment, as well as the likely affects on the natural environment. Identify where the change or affect or increased demand constitutes a likely adverse impact, and describe any further or additional adverse impacts that are likely to occur as a result of those changes and affects.

Implementation of the preferred concept will result in a change in land use for a portion of the site occupied by the warehouses. The zoning and development in the vicinity is light industrial which is compatible with a solid waste transfer station. Traffic patterns would change with transfer vehicles using SE 30th Street to access the new station versus SE 32nd Street as they do now; however with the ability to compact the loads, the number of daily transfer vehicle trips would be lower. Aesthetically, the new transfer station would benefit the community with architecturally sensitive design features, public art, and professional landscaping. Construction of the new facility will have impacts to on-site wetlands and streams that will be minimized where possible and mitigated as required by local, state, and federal regulations. Mitigation measures imposed as part of the project development would help reduce adverse impacts.

- b) Identify potential mitigation measures for the adverse impacts identified in 9.a and describe how effective the mitigation is assumed to be, any adverse impacts that could result from the use of the mitigation, and any conflict or concern related to the proposal objectives and/or key issues identified.

Mitigation measures would be developed for the site-specific SEPA environmental review and the City of Bellevue Conditional Use Permit. The conditions of the site plan approval would be coordinated with the City of Bellevue staff to ensure that the proposed mitigation offsets the impacts.

- c) Identify unavoidable impacts and those that will be left to be addressed at the project level.

Unavoidable impacts would occur to on-site wetlands and streams and their buffers. Those would be addressed at the project level during design and permitting of the facility.

- d) Describe how the proposal objectives will or will not be met if the impacts described in 9.c were to occur.

Addressing the unavoidable impacts at the project level would not jeopardize meeting the proposed objectives.

Note: Alternatives may be rejected at any point in the process if: they have no environmental benefit, are not within existing authority, are determined unfeasible, or do not meet the core objectives.

PART III – IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

10) Consistency of the proposal with other plans, policies and laws.

- a) Internal consistency - If there are internal inconsistencies between this proposal and your agency's previously adopted or ongoing plans and regulations, identify any strategies or ideas for resolving these inconsistencies.

The 2001 Final Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan as well as the 2006 Solid Waste Transfer and Waste Management Plan demonstrated the need for a major overhaul of the aging transfer system infrastructure. The 2006 plan was adopted by the King County Council and the current FMP is being developed to be consistent with the objectives of this document. One of the first stages of implementing the management plan is the development of a FMP that will provide a guide for the development of the site and the operational improvements to be featured at the new station.

- b) External consistency - If there are external inconsistencies between this proposal and adopted or ongoing plans and regulations of adjacent jurisdictions and/or other agencies, identify any strategies or ideas for resolving these inconsistencies.

No external inconsistencies have been identified at this time. The FMP is being developed to be consistent with the applicable federal, state, and local laws.

11) Monitoring and Follow-up

- a) Describe any monitoring that will occur to ensure the impacts were as predicted and that mitigation is effective, including responsible party, timing, and method(s) to be used.

Monitoring of the wetland and stream mitigation site, which is expected to be a combination of on-site and off-site, would be required by the City of Bellevue during installation as well as annually for an agreed upon length of time to ensure plant survival.

- b) Identify any plans or strategies for updating this proposed action based on deviation from impact projections or other criteria.

None is anticipated.

WAC 197-11-444, Elements of the Environment

Natural Environment

a. Earth

Geology, Soils, Topography, Unique physical features, Erosion/enlargement of land area

b. Air

Air quality, Odor, Climate

c. Water

Surface water movement/quantity/quality, Runoff/absorption, Floods

d. Plants and animals

Habitat for and numbers or diversity of species of plants, fish, or other wildlife, Unique species, Fish or wildlife migration routes

e. Energy and natural resources

Amount required/rate of use/efficiency, Source/availability, Nonrenewable resources, Conservation and renewable resources, Scenic resources

Built Environment

a. Environmental health

Noise, Risk of explosion, Releases or potential releases to the environment affecting public health

b. Land and shoreline use

Relationship to existing land use plans and to estimated population, Housing, Light and glare, Aesthetics, Agricultural crops

c. Transportation

Transportation systems, Vehicular traffic, Waterborne, rail, and air traffic, Parking, Movement/circulation of people and goods, Traffic hazards

d. Public services and utilities

Fire, Police, Schools, Parks and other recreational facilities, Maintenance, Communications, Water/storm water, Sewer/solid waste, Other governmental services or utilities

