DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT
ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATOR
450 110th Ave NE., P.O. BOX 90012
BELLEVUE, WA 98009-9012

OPTIONAL DETERMINATION OF NON-SIGNIFICANCE (DNS) NOTICE MATERIALS

The attached materials are being sent to you pursuant to the requirements for the Optional DNS Process (WAC 197-11-355). A DNS on the attached proposal is likely. This may be the only opportunity to comment on environmental impacts of the proposal. Mitigation measures from standard codes will apply. Project review may require mitigation regardless of whether an EIS is prepared. A copy of the subsequent threshold determination for this proposal may be obtained upon request.

File No. 16-134029-LM

Project Name/Address: East Main Station Non-Project SEPA

Planner: Leah Chulsky

Phone Number: 425-452-6834

Minimum Comment Period: June 30, 2016 5pm

Materials included in this Notice:

- [x] Blue Bulletin
- [x] Checklist
- [ ] Vicinity Map
- [ ] Plans
- [ ] Other:

OTHERS TO RECEIVE THIS DOCUMENT:

- [ ] State Department of Fish and Wildlife / Sterwart.Reinbold@dfw.gov; Christa.Heller@dfw.wa.gov;
- [ ] State Department of Ecology, Shoreline Planner N.W. Region / Jobu461@ecy.wa.gov; sepaunit@ecy.wa.gov
- [ ] Army Corps of Engineers Susan.M.Powell@nws02.usace.army.mil
- [ ] Attorney General ecyolyef@atg.wa.gov
- [ ] Muckleshoot Indian Tribe Karen.Walter@muckleshoot.nsn.us; Fisheries.fileroom@muckleshoot.nsn.us

SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Purpose of checklist:

Governmental agencies use this checklist to help determine whether the environmental impacts of your proposal are significant. This information is also helpful to determine if available avoidance, minimization or compensatory mitigation measures will address the probable significant impacts or if an environmental impact statement will be prepared to further analyze the proposal.

Instructions for applicants:

This environmental checklist asks you to describe some basic information about your proposal. Please answer each question accurately and carefully, to the best of your knowledge. You may need to consult with an agency specialist or private consultant for some questions. You may use "not applicable" or "does not apply" only when you can explain why it does not apply and not when the answer is unknown. You may also attach or incorporate by reference additional studies reports. Complete and accurate answers to these questions often avoid delays with the SEPA process as well as later in the decision-making process.

The checklist questions apply to all parts of your proposal, even if you plan to do them over a period of time or on different parcels of land. Attach any additional information that will help describe your proposal or its environmental effects. The agency to which you submit this checklist may ask you to explain your answers or provide additional information reasonably related to determining if there may be significant adverse impact.

Instructions for Lead Agencies:

Please adjust the format of this template as needed. Additional information may be necessary to evaluate the existing environment, all interrelated aspects of the proposal and an analysis of adverse impacts. The checklist is considered the first but not necessarily the only source of information needed to make an adequate threshold determination. Once a threshold determination is made, the lead agency is responsible for the completeness and accuracy of the checklist and other supporting documents.

Use of checklist for nonproject proposals: [help]

For nonproject proposals (such as ordinances, regulations, plans and programs), complete the applicable parts of sections A and B plus the SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS (part D). Please completely answer all questions that apply and note that the words "project," "applicant," and "property or site" should be read as "proposal," "proponent," and "affected geographic area," respectively. The lead agency may exclude (for non-projects) questions in Part B - Environmental Elements –that do not contribute meaningfully to the analysis of the proposal.

Received
MAY 31 2016
Permit Processing

A. Background [help]

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable: [help]

East Main Station Area Plan

2. Name of applicant: [help]

City of Bellevue

3. Address and phone number of applicant and contact person: [help]

Mike Kattermann
Planning & Community Development
City of Bellevue
P.O. Box 90012
Bellevue, WA 98009-9012
(425) 452-2042

4. Date checklist prepared: [help]

May 2016

5. Agency requesting checklist: [help]

City of Bellevue

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

Once a preferred alternative is identified and accepted by the City Council, that alternative would be implemented through amendments to the City's Comprehensive Plan, Land Use Code, Zoning Map, and other regulatory and policy documents.

This SEPA Checklist is for the proposed programmatic-level redevelopment of the study area that would correspond with a rezone of the area from Office and Limited Business (OLB) to a new Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) district. Project-level SEPA Checklists with applicable permit applications and supporting documentation will be required when individual redevelopment projects are proposed.

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

After evaluation of these alternatives, the City with Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) and public input will select or develop a preferred alternative. Following acceptance by the City Council, related amendments to City policy and regulatory documents will occur.

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

An Environmental Review memo was prepared by Environmental Science Associates (ESA) in February 2016 and is appended to this memo. During that time, a Traffic Noise Impact Analysis and Sound Attenuation Potential of Proposed Buildings, along with an Aesthetics Technical Memorandum were also prepared by ESA; these, too, are appended to the SEPA Checklist. Additional documentation includes transportation modeling prepared by City of Bellevue Transportation staff and shadow models prepared by VIA Architecture.

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. [help]

There are no pending applications directly affecting development and implementation of the proposed project.

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

Implementation of a preferred alternative will ultimately require changes to the City's Comprehensive Plan, Land Use Code, Zoning Map, and other policy and regulatory documents. As the plan is implemented, individual projects will require project level review and approval.

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.) [help]

Under Puget Sound Regional Council's Transportation 2040 plan, light rail projects are being developed as a means of providing high-capacity transportation between dense population areas and employment centers. Sound Transit plans to extend its Link Light Rail over Interstate 90, through Bellevue, and north to Redmond. This East Link project includes stops and stations in Bellevue's Southwest, BelRed and Downtown subareas. One of the proposed light rail stations will be located south of Main Street, along 112th Avenue SE. Through its comprehensive plan, the City of Bellevue strives to provide high density, mixed-use development near future light rail extension areas. Therefore, the City proposes zoning changes to eight parcels located directly east of the future Link station to encourage redevelopment. These parcels are bounded by 112th Avenue SE to the west, 114th Avenue SE to the east, Main Street to the north, and SE 8th Street to the south.

The proposed rezone would change parcels that are currently zoned Office and Limited Business District (OLB) to a new higher density, Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) zone. This zoning change would increase the floor area ratio (FAR) and maximum building height allowed to encourage new, denser development. A mixture of uses (new office, commercial, or residential development) would also be allowed to replace, or potentially occur alongside, existing structures.

The current code allows a maximum 0.5 FAR and 75-foot building height. However, most of the existing buildings are between 35 and 75 feet tall. Under the proposed project, the maximum FAR would either be increased to 4.0 or 5.0 and the maximum height would be increased to 200 or 300 feet, respectively (20 or 30 stories). Initially, redevelopment would occur at the north end of the study area, on a portion of a 6.1-acre parcel currently occupied by a Red Lion Hotel. However, zoning changes would apply to the entire study area.

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. [help]

The study area is composed of 8 parcels that are bounded by 112th Avenue SE to the west, 114th Avenue SE to the east, Main Street to the north, and SE 8th Street to the south.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS [help]

1. Earth [help]

a. General description of the site: [help]

The majority of the northern study area (greater than 75 percent), north of SE 6th Avenue, contains impervious surfaces including roads, parking lots, and commercial buildings. Approximately 50 percent of the southern study area, south of SE 6th Street, is covered by similar land uses. Undeveloped portions of the study areas contain landscaped area, Sturtevant Creek, and associated riparian corridor and wetland.

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

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

North of SE 6th Avenue, the study area has been altered by development, is essentially flat, with slopes of 1 percent or less. South of SE 6th Street, development that surrounds Sturtevant Creek and the associated riparian corridor is located on relatively level ground. The undeveloped area near the stream slopes down from the east and west at a 5-10 percent slope. The stream, which flows to the south, flows at an approximate 5 percent slope.

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. [help]

The Natural Resource Conservation Service indicates soils in the western study area are primarily composed of Alderwood gravelly sandy loam (8 to 15 percent slopes) and to a limited extent, Arents, Alderwood material (6 to 15 percent slopes). The central and eastern portions of the study area are primarily Tukwila muck and the south end is composed of Seattle muck.

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

King County iMap does not map any erosion hazard, seismic hazard, or landslide hazard within or adjacent to the study area. City of Bellevue Critical Hazards Maps indicate several, small areas that contain steep slopes (greater than 40 percent slope). Steep slopes are geographically disperserd throughout the study area; however, no liquefaction or very severe soil erosions hazards are mapped. Most of the study area is heavily developed and the undeveloped portion of the study area does not show signs of recent soil movement.

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. [help]

The proposal is a non-project action and would not directly result in filling or grading. New development under any of the alternatives would likely result in some degree of filling and grading, the extent of which would be dependent on the amount of development proposed. Much of the study area, in particular the northern 2/3 is already heavily developed.

New development activities under either alternative would be subject to further review on a case-by-case basis and would need to be consistent with the City of Bellevue Municipal Code 27.36 "Clearing and Grading" and State Regulations.

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

Under either of the alternatives being considered, the intensity of land use in the study area would increase. The northern 2/3 of the study area are heavily developed, resulting in limited potential for long-term erosion; short-term/construction related erosion would be minimized with implementation of construction Best Management Practices (BMPs). The southern 1/3 of the study area contains significant undeveloped area; however, much of this area is constrained by critical areas and their buffers; thereby limiting the extent of development.

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

The majority of the study area (greater than 60 percent) contains impervious surfaces including roads, parking lots, and commercial buildings.

Under either of the alternatives, development or redevelopment in the study area would occur and could result in an overall increase in impervious area; however, the extent is likely limited because much of the area is currently occupied by buildings or parking lots and pervious areas are constrained by critical areas.

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

Soils temporarily exposed during construction could be eroded by stormwater. However, all construction projects would be required to comply with the City's erosion control regulations. Erosion control measures including but not limited to BMPs and appropriate site management techniques would be implemented to mitigate these potential impacts. Following construction, graded or filled areas would be stabilized and landscaped.

Minor erosion impacts are unavoidable. Assuming that development complies with the City's erosion control requirements, significant impacts from erosion are unlikely. The potential for erosion as a result of clearing and construction activities would not likely occur as a result of redevelopment activities. Construction activities would provide erosion control measures consistent with City of Bellevue Municipal Code and State Regulations on a case-by-case basis.

2. Air [help]

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. [help]

Development under either of the proposed alternatives would result in air quality impacts during construction activities including fugitive dust, odors, and emissions from heavy machinery, trucks, and other vehicles traveling to and operating on construction sites. Increased traffic congestion and delays due to construction would have the potential to increase localized emissions by slowing or stopping traffic.

Increased development under any of the alternatives would likely result in an increase in the number of auto trips and associated emissions. The FAR 5 alternative would allow for 25 percent more useable floor area, and the associated potential to accommodate 25 percent more workers and/or residents. An increase in the number of individuals working and/or living within the study area would increase traffic emissions in the surrounding study

area. The relative size of the increase would depend on the amount and type of development expected under each alternative.

In general, however, the increase under any of the alternatives would not add an appreciable amount of emissions to existing conditions caused by surrounding urban development and I-405.

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

Construction activities associated with development under either alternative would have the potential to temporarily create odors and/or emissions. Emissions from vehicles on the freeway would be dispersed before reaching the project area. There are no other known sources of off-site odors or emissions that would affect the proposal.

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

Mitigation measures to control air quality impacts would be considered and developed on a project-by-project basis, and could include transportation demand management strategies such as transit and carpooling incentives, bike facilities, and other means of encouraging alternatives to single occupancy vehicle travel.

3. **Water** [help]

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. [help]

Sturtevant Creek flows from Lake Bellevue, located northeast of the study area, through a culvert underneath I-405 and into the study area on the Hilton Hotel parcel. The stream then flows southeast of the Bellevue Club parcel through culverts and daylights north of SE 6th Street. Sturtevant Creek, then flows through culverts in SE 6th Street and into a large wetland located between SE 6th Street and SE 8th Street. The stream discharges to Kelsey Creek south of SE 8th Street.

Between SE 6th Street and SE 8th Street, a large palustrine forested/scrub-shrub wetland occupies much of the area and is bordered by office buildings and/or roads. In the City's Draft Shoreline Analysis Report, this approximately 12-acre riverine wetland, known as the Sturtevant Creek Wetland, is hydrologically fed by Sturtevant Creek and high groundwater (City of Bellevue, 2009). The wetland was rated as providing moderate habitat functions and was identified as a Category III wetland. Despite the presence of SE 8th Street, a surface water and groundwater connection exists between this wetland and Kelsey Creek/Mercer Slough and associated 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. [help]

Adoption of either alternative is not expected to require work in any streams or wetlands; however, development is likely within 200 feet of streams and wetlands, where allowed.

Development under either of the alternatives would be required to comply with the City's critical areas code, which prohibits nearly all activities in streams and wetlands and their buffers. In cases where temporary impacts are

unavoidable, the City's critical areas code requires mitigation that results in no loss of the functions and values of the resource.

Impacts to surface water resources and wetlands would be evaluated on a project-by-project basis. If future development is proposed in the vicinity of any surface waters or wetlands, the project action will be evaluated for consistency with the requirements codified in Bellevue City Code (BCC) 20.25H "Critical Areas Overlay District." The City would determine the appropriate mitigation of any potential adverse impacts.

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. [help]

No filling or dredging activities in surface water resources or wetlands are planned as a component of either proposed alternative. Future construction activities associated with development or redevelopment under either alternative would not likely involve the filling or dredging of surface water resources or wetlands. The placement or removal of dredge or fill materials from surface waters or wetlands are not allowed by the City's critical areas regulations. Development would be required to remain outside of designated critical areas and buffers.

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

No surface water withdrawals or diversions are planned as a component of any of the alternatives. As a non-project plan SEPA Checklist, the specific nature of improvements is not currently known. All work would comply with the City's critical area code.

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

New projects developing in accordance with the preferred alternative, once implemented, would not be located in the 100-year flood plain. Construction projects occurring near or adjacent to streams would be subject to existing City regulations designed to protect critical areas including riparian corridors, floodplains, and wetlands.

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. [help]

No direct discharge of waste materials to surface waters is anticipated under either alternative. Considerations for waste material discharge would be identified and evaluated on a case-by-case basis for proposed development within the study area. Waste material containment, storage, and disposal would be considered for projects with the potential to contaminate surface water bodies.

The probability for accidental spills is typically linked to the types of land uses included in each alternative.

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. [help]

Under either alternative, development would likely occur in portions of the study area that have been previously developed and are connected to stormwater facilities, municipal water facilities, and the sanitary sewer system. This

infrastructure would eliminate the need for withdrawals from ground water and would help avoid/abate discharge to groundwater.

If development were to occur in the undeveloped portion of the study area, impacts to ground water resources would be evaluated on a project-by-project basis.

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. [help]

Under both alternatives, no waste material would be discharged into ground water. There would be no septic systems or livestock in the study area. Considerations would be required on a case-by-case basis to ensure that individual construction activities and development sites take measures to abate and capture storm and waste water runoff, and properly store hazardous, toxic, or otherwise dangerous materials in a way to prevent potential impacts to ground water resources. If construction activities comply with the City's storm and wastewater regulations, clearing and grading standards, and all other building and development codes significant impacts to ground water are unlikely.

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. [help]

Much of the study area (greater than 60 percent) is currently impervious and was not designed to comply with current stormwater regulations. The proposal is a non-project action; specific measures would be considered when projects are developed under the adopted plan. New or redeveloping sites are required to mitigate runoff to pre-developed/forested conditions if downstream areas are less than 40 percent impervious. This is the case for the study area, which drains to Kelsey Creek/Mercer Slough. This means each parcel will be required to construct stormwater detention and treatment facilities and mitigate runoff rate and duration. Low impact development strategies and special water quality BMP's to reduce impacts to water quality would also be considered for new developments.

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

All new development under any of the alternatives would be required to comply with current stormwater standards. Assuming compliance, waste material would not enter ground or surface water.

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

City of Bellevue stormwater regulations require that new development or redevelopment projects mitigate site runoff to pre-developed/forested conditions. This is a more stringent standard than existed when the area was developed, which means that redevelopment would result in substantially reduced rates of runoff.

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

Compliance with City of Bellevue adopted stormwater regulations is required for all new development. The regulations require that new development or redevelopment projects mitigate site runoff to pre-developed/forested conditions if downstream areas are less than 40% impervious.

Assuming that all new developments under any of the alternatives achieves consistency with the City's new stormwater standards, future developments would result in better stormwater management than exists currently. As such, the alternatives with greater expected development would likely achieve greater overall improvements to stormwater management.

4. **Plants** [help]

a. Check the types of vegetation found on the site: [help]

The northern 2/3 of the study area is heavily developed, while the undeveloped portion of the study area between SE 6th Street and SE 8th Street is dominated by native vegetation typically found in wetlands and associated upland areas in the Pacific Northwest. Limited development is present in the southern 1/3 of the study area. These areas also include ornamental vegetation. The undeveloped portion of the southern study area contains native and invasive plant species. A complete plant survey has not been conducted, but the following are species likely to be present.

__X__deciduous tree: alder, maple, cottonwood, ornamental
__X__evergreen tree: fir, cedar, pine
__X__shrubs
__X__maintained grass
____pasture
____crop or grain
____Orchards, vineyards or other permanent crops.
__X__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? [help]

The proposal would not directly remove vegetation. The proposal would encourage future construction activities and development or redevelopment of higher density infrastructure in the study area. The majority of the study area that would be impacted by new land uses has been previously cleared of vegetation. The amount of vegetation that will be removed or altered as a result of new development would vary depending on the magnitude of new development under each alternative. Future projects occurring in the study area would be subject to review on a case-by-case basis and impacts to vegetation would be mitigated by following the City's critical area buffer standards and tree retention regulations.

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

There are no known threatened or endangered plant species, or associated critical habitat within or near the study area. Alteration or destruction of threatened or endangered species, or critical habitat would be regulated by city, state, and federal rules. Significant impacts to vegetation from future development are not anticipated.

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

Adoption of either alternative being evaluated would result in additional development and some loss of existing vegetation. The proposal includes provisions for landscaping of areas to improve the aesthetic and environmental character of the study area. Planting designs would incorporate the use of native species and would include low groundcover, low shrubs, and trees for canopy cover.

In addition, all development would be required to comply with the City's critical areas regulations, tree retention policies, and setbacks and screening requirements. Development consistent with current regulations would not result in significant impacts.

Development activities that are not categorically exempt from SEPA would be subject to review under the City's SEPA implementing ordinance (BCC 22.02). Any impacts to native vegetation as a result of future projects will be appropriately mitigated under SEPA substantive authority.

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

Much of the study area is developed or contains landscaping that is frequently maintained. The undeveloped portion of the study area south of SE 6th Street and the riparian corridor associated with Sturtevant Creek located north of SE 6th Street likely contain noxious weed species common to western Washington, including: Himalayan blackberry, reed canarygrass, knotweed, purple loosestrife, tansy ragwort, and Scotch broom.

5. **Animals** [help]

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. [help]

Examples include:

birds: hawk, heron, eagle, songbirds, other:
mammals: deer, bear, elk, beaver, other:
fish: bass, salmon, trout, herring, shellfish, other _____

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

Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) map coho salmon within the study area (WDFW, 2015a; WDFW, 2015b); however, this species is not federally or state listed as threatened or endangered. Kelsey Creek is mapped as supporting, fall Chinook salmon, coho salmon, sockeye salmon, winter steelhead trout, resident coastal cutthroat trout, and rainbow trout; winter steelhead trout and fall Chinook salmon are both listed as threatened under the Endangered Species Act (WDFW, 2015a; WDFW, 2015b). Steelhead trout and Chinook salmon are also modeled within Sturtevant Creek; however, habitat conditions make their presence unlikely. Modeled presence only

indicates there is a connection to a fish bearing stream and the streambed slope does not preclude fish (WDFW, 2015b). No critical habitat for Chinook salmon and steelhead trout is designated or proposed for designation within or in proximity to the study area.

In addition to fish, four avian species are mapped (e.g., nesting location) within proximity to the study area, including semipalmated plover, peregrine falcon, osprey, and bald eagle. These species are not federally or state listed as threatened or endangered.

c. Is the site part of a migration route? If so, explain. [help]

The study area is located within the Pacific Flyway, which is a flight corridor for migrating waterfowl and other avian fauna. The Pacific Flyway covers the entire Puget Sound region, and extends south from Alaska to Mexico and South America.

d. Proposed measures to preserve or enhance wildlife, if any: [help]

The study area is highly developed and has not been identified as habitat for threatened or endangered species, or associated habitat. Sturtevant Creek does not likely support any threatened or endangered species, due to habitat conditions; however, Kelsey Creek is mapped as supporting fall Chinook salmon and winter steelhead trout. No critical habitat for Chinook salmon and steelhead trout is designated or proposed for designation within or in proximity to the study area.

Future project activities must comply with the City's critical areas regulations, and would therefore likely avoid Sturtevant Creek, wetlands, and their associated buffers.

e. List any invasive animal species known to be on or near the site. [help]

New Zealand Mudsnails are documented as occurring in close proximity to the study area; within Kelsey Creek, but have not been mapped within Sturtevant Creek or Mercer Slough.

6. Energy and Natural Resources [help]

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. [help]

Energy use in the study area would be typical of urbanized commercial areas. Under either of the proposed alternatives, development or redevelopment would require electrical power for lighting as well as safety lighting around parking areas and walkways. Natural gas would be used within structures for heating and cooking. Construction under any of the alternatives would use gasoline and diesel.

The FAR 5 alternative would allow for 25 percent more useable floor area, and the associated potential to accommodate 25 percent more workers and/or residents. Increase in the number of individuals working and/or living within the study area would increase energy demands within the study area. The relative size of the increase would depend on the amount and type of development expected under each alternative.

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

The development and implementation of a preferred alternative would likely affect zoning and allow greater building heights. Increase shade could result, but would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis for consistency with city policies and standards.

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: [help]

The development and implementation of a preferred alternative would encourage the implementation of green features into new building design.

Existing City and local utility infrastructure is adequate to serve development under either of the alternatives. Development and redevelopment in the study area would be consistent with all local utility standards. In addition, new development would consider and implement energy conservation into building design. Accordingly, no significant impacts to energy availability are anticipated.

7. Environmental Health [help]

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. [help]

The development and implementation of a preferred alternative would result in the construction of high density development in the study area. Construction sites would pose a potential risk of fire and explosion, spill, or exposure to hazardous materials. Spills or leakage from heavy equipment at construction sites could occur, but would not be greater than what is normally anticipated during construction activities. Normal precautions would be taken to store equipment, hazardous fuels, and other materials used in construction. Waste and storm water would be contained and treated appropriately to mitigate impacts to the environment. All construction activities would follow the City's storm and surface water code and clearing and grading code, in addition to all local and state regulations.

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

There is no known contamination within the study area and development within the study area has included hotels, office buildings, and an athletic club resulting in a low likelihood of site contamination (e.g., dry cleaner chemicals or gas station petroleum leak).

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. [help]

One high-risk site is located at the south end of study area; beneath SE 8th Street. Soil and groundwater samples were collected as part of a street improvement project, which revealed both mediums were contaminated by petroleum.

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. [help]

The proposal would not directly result in use of toxic or hazardous materials. Spills or leakage from heavy equipment at construction sites could occur as part of development that would follow, but would not be greater than what is normally anticipated during construction activities.

4) Describe special emergency services that might be required. [help]

Specific types of uses are not known at this stage of planning. While unlikely, it is possible that new uses could require special emergency services. These service needs would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. In general, it is not expected that special emergency services would be required for new development under any of the alternatives. Typical emergency services such as fire, police, and emergency medical response may be required for emergencies developing as a result of construction activities.

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

Best Management Practices would be used in storing equipment, hazardous fuels, and other materials used in construction. Storage, maintenance, and handling precautions for any materials considered to be hazardous materials would comply with International Fire Code requirements. Waste and storm water would be contained and treated in an environmentally safe manner. If development activities follow the City's storm and surface water code, grading and clearing code and other development and building codes, significant impacts from toxic chemicals, fire hazards, and/or wastes and spills are unlikely.

b. Noise [help]

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

The project location has a long history of elevated noise levels associated with vehicular traffic originating from the I-405 freeway corridor. Noise from I-405 would have a variable effect depending on land uses at receiving sites.

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. [help]

Under either of the alternatives, short-term noise impacts could result from construction vehicles and equipment during daylight hours. According to BCC, development activity and operation of heavy machinery would be limited to 7 a.m. to 8 p.m. on weekdays and 9 a.m. to 8 p.m. on Saturdays. No development activity or operation of heavy machinery would occur outside of these times, on Sundays or on holidays, except if permitted by the director of community development and only in cases where activity would not interfere with residential use permitted in the zone in which it is located.

Long-term impacts could result from increased traffic in the study area. However, the incremental increase in auto noise would be unlikely to significantly raise the overall noise level. See the attached Traffic Noise Impact Analysis for a brief discussion of potential noise impacts attributed to the project.

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

Significant noise impacts are not anticipated under either alternative. Existing noise standards for construction and operation are likely sufficient to control potential noise impacts.

8. Land and Shoreline Use [help]

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. [help]

The study area is bounded by I-405 to the east, residential properties to the west, commercial properties to the north, and an office park to the south.

The 36 acres of land north of SE 6th Street is comprised of three hotels (a two-story Red Lion Hotel, an eight-story Hilton Hotel, and a four-story Hotel Bellevue), two restaurants (Polaris and Jonah's Restaurant and Lounge), three rental car businesses (Hertz Rent-a-Car, Budget Rent-a-Car, and Avis Bellevue Hilton Rent-a-Car), three offices (Navia Benefit Solutions, Savers, and Eastside Sports Rehab Clinic), a recreational facility (Bellevue Club), and a few commercial businesses. It has minimal undeveloped land, and areas without a building present are used for surface parking. To the north there is a five-lane road and commercial properties across the street.

Land south of SE 6th Street is comprised of 29 acres with three office buildings between three and six stories tall, a seven-story Marriott Hotel, surface parking, and approximately 11 acres of undeveloped property.

Redevelopment of the study area is not anticipated to affect adjacent properties; however, construction of the light rail station as part of a separate proposal, may change land use in the area.

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? [help]

The site has not been used for agriculture in the recent past. The study area was logged in the early 1900s and was later developed for commercial land uses.

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: [help]

There are no working farm or forest lands surrounding the study area, which is located within an urban setting.

c. Describe any structures on the site. [help]

See response 8a.

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

The proposal would not directly require any demolition. Under any of the proposed alternatives, future development and redevelopment would be encouraged and is likely. At this time, demolition of existing structures is not anticipated. If demolition is proposed, it would be evaluated on a project-level basis.

e. What is the current zoning classification of the site? [help]

Office and Limited Business District (OLB), which allows for office, hotel, and limited retail use.

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

Office, Limited Business District (OLB).

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

Sturtevant Creek Wetland and the reach of Sturtevant Creek that flows through this wetland are located within shoreline jurisdication. The City's Shoreline Master Program designates this site as Urban Conservancy-Open Space.

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

Sturtevant Creek and the Sturtevant Creek Wetland are located within the study area. Additional information on these features can be found under Section 3a(1) of this SEPA Checklist.

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

Specific types of land use are not known at this stage of planning, but future projects occurring in the study area would be subject to SEPA review on a case-by-case basis.

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

Land use in the study area currently includes commercial buildings such as hotels, office buildings, and an athletic club. At this time, demolition of existing structures is not anticipated. No residential units are located within the study area.

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

Displacement impacts are not expected. No measures are proposed.

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

Sound Transit's East Link Station project includes a proposed light rail station located south of Main Street, along 112th Avenue SE. Through its comprehensive plan, the City of Bellevue strives to provide high density, mixed-use development near future light rail extension areas. Therefore, the City proposes zoning changes to eight parcels located directly east of the future East Main light rail station to encourage redevelopment.

The parcels are currently zoned OLB and proposed zoning changes would increase density by means of a TOD zone. This zoning change would increase the FAR and maximum building height allowed to encourage new, denser development. A mixture of uses (new office, commercial, or residential development) would also be allowed to replace, or potentially occur alongside, existing structures.

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

None. There are no such lands surrounding the study area.

9. **Housing** [help]

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

Specific types of land use are not known at this stage of planning, but future projects occurring in the study area would be subject to SEPA review on a case-by-case basis.

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

No residential units are located within the study area.

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

No impacts are anticipated, therefore no measures are proposed.

10. **Aesthetics** [help]

a. What is the tallest height of any proposed structure(s), not including antennas; what is the principal exterior building material(s) proposed? [help]

Potential building heights under the two action alternatives have not yet been determined, and will depend on how much additional development potential is ultimately proposed. Under the FAR 4.0 alternative, maximum height could be increased to 200 feet (20 stories). Under the FAR 5.0 alternative, heights could increase to 300 feet (30 stories).

Building materials, textures, and exterior coloring would be determined for specific projects and subject to subsequent review.

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

See response to 10.a and the attached Aesthetics Technical Memorandum.

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

All new development would comply with height, setback and other provisions of the land use code. Architectural design, building materials, color, texture, retention of existing trees, and landscaping with native and non-native trees and shrubs would be used to complement the character of the site.

11. **Light and Glare** [help]

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

Light and glare during daylight hours would likely come from glass windows associated with an increased building density in the study area. Sources of additional light and glare are dependent on the location and design of new uses. Sources of light during nighttime hours would come from electric lights associated with building lighting and exterior safety lights over walkway and parking lot infrastructure. See the attached Aesthetics Technical Memorandum for additional details.

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

Light and glare from the project would be unlikely to constitute a safety hazard. Increased lighting from buildings, walkways, and parking areas could be viewed from adjacent properties. Landscaping and additional measures could be used to abate lighting that interferes with adjacent properties. Lighting for all development would comply with the City's lighting standards. See the attached Aesthetics Technical Memorandum for additional details.

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

No existing sources of off-site light or glare would affect the proposed study area.

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

Under either alternative, the retention of trees and vegetation and landscape design would be implemented as necessary on a project-by-project basis to soften or filter light and glare generated from new development. Outdoor lighting would be designed to aim light where appropriate and avoid general light dispersion. Impacts from light and glare are not anticipated under either of the proposed alternatives.

12. **Recreation** [help]

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

Surrey Downs Park is located west of the study area, south of SE 6th Street.

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

Neither alternative would displace existing recreational uses.

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

No measures are needed.

13. **Historic and cultural preservation** [help]

a. Are there any buildings, structures, or sites, located on or near the site that are over 45 years old listed in or eligible for listing in national, state, or local preservation registers located on or near the site? If so, specifically describe. [help]

According to Section 4.16, Historic and Archaeological Resources, of the East Link Final Environmental Impacts Statement, the East Main Station and therefore the study area, are located within proximity of a National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-Eligible historic district. The potential Surrey Downs Historic District contains 37 residential structures that were not determined eligible because many of the houses in the potential district were located outside of the Area of Potential Effect (AFE) of the East Main Station project. The proposed East Main Station is located between the study area and the potential historic district; therefore, because this area was outside of the APE for the East Main Station project; the district is located outside of the APE for the redevelopment project.

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. [help]

No designated landmarks or evidence of historic, archeological, scientific, or cultural importance are located on or adjacent to the study area. Professional studies have not been conducted for the study area, but will be required on a project-by-project basis.

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. [help]

For the East Link Final Environmental Impacts Statement, a historical records search was performed that identified several properties listed in the National Register, the Washington Heritage Register (WHR), or local registers. Inventoried resources would be 50 years old by the baseline year 2016. Field surveys by project historians and preparation of inventory forms took place primarily from February through June 2007, September through October 2007, and February to April 2010. Sound Transit also conducted field tours with Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP) staff to identify properties that appeared to meet National Register eligibility criteria.

The DAHP reviews NRHP recommendations for concurrence, and the local jurisdictions review local landmark register recommendations.

Specific studies have not been conducted for the study area, but may be required on a project-by-project basis.

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. [help]

No specific measures to avoid, minimize, or compensate for loss, changes to, and disturbance to resources are proposed, but development under the proposal would be reviewed on a project-by-project basis.

14. **Transportation** [help]

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. [help]

Interstate 405 and 114th Avenue SE are located immediately east of the study area, with the latter providing direct access to the study area. 112th Avenue SE provides access from the west, Main Street provides access to the north and SE 6th Street and SE 8th Street provide access to the central and southern study area, respectively.

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? [help]

Transit is located along 112th Avenue SE and SE 8th Street, Main Street, and a Park and Ride is located at the intersection of 114th Avenue SE and SE 8th Street (Wilburton Park and Ride). Several King County Metro and Sound Transit bus routes provide local and commuter transit services. Routes 240, 246, and 342 serve Bellevue-Renton, Clyde Hill-Eastgate Park and Ride, and Park and Rides between Shoreline-Renton. Routes 555/556 and 560 provide service between Northgate-Issaquah Highlands and West Seattle-Bellevue, respectively.

In addition, the East Main light rail station is proposed near the intersection of 112th Avenue SE and Main Street. The street-level station will be reached by tunnel to the north and at-grade tracks to the south. The target opening date is 2023.

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

The number of parking spaces is not known at this phase of the planning process. The number of parking spaces will depend on the type and location of development. Development under either alternative will be required to comply with the City's parking requirements.

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). [help]

No new or improved roads, streets, pedestrian, bicycle, or state transportation facilities are proposed as part of the project.

The Link Light Rail East Main Station is proposed near the intersection of 112th Avenue SE and Main Street. The target opening date is 2023.

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

There are no water, rail, or air transportation facilities in the study area.

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? [help]

Specific types of land use are not known at this stage of planning; therefore, vehicular trips per day cannot be calculated; however, the FAR 5 alternative would allow for 25 percent more useable floor area, and the associated potential to accommodate 25 percent more workers and/or residents. Increase in the number of individuals working and/or living within the study area would increase traffic in proximity to the study area. The relative size of the increase would depend on the amount and type of development expected under each alternative. Future projects occurring in the study area would be subject to SEPA review on a case-by-case basis.

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. [help]

The site has not been used for agriculture in the recent past. The study area was logged in the early 1900s and was later developed for commercial land uses. There are no working farm or forest lands surrounding the study area, which is located within an urban setting.

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

No measures are proposed to reduce or control transportation impacts. The proposal is intended to encourage development that is transit-oriented, thereby helping to reduce regional transportation impacts from anticipated population and employment growth.

15. **Public Services** [help]

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. [help]

The demand for public services is based on the population of people and density of uses in a given area. Because use intensity is expected to increase under any of the alternatives, the demand for public services in also expected to rise. The specific types and amounts of service demand depend on the types and amounts of land use.

In general, the existing service and utility infrastructure is adequate to serve the anticipated growth, and substantial upgrades are not expected to be needed. Therefore, significant impacts to public services are not anticipated.

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

Because it is assumed that existing service and utility infrastructure is adequate to serve the anticipated growth under any of the alternatives, no measures are proposed.

16. **Utilities** [help]

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

Electricity, natural gas, water, refuse service, telephone, sanitary sewer, and stormwater drainage.

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. [help]

Project-specific extensions of or upgrades to the utilities listed above are likely to be required as development or redevelopment occurs. In general, however, the existing utility infrastructure is adequate to serve the anticipated growth, and substantial upgrades are not expected to be needed. Therefore, significant impacts to public services are not anticipated.

C. Signature [help]

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

Signature: 

Name of signee SCOTT OLTMER

Position and Agency/Organization BIOLOGIST / ESA

Date Submitted: 05/2016

D. supplemental sheet for nonproject actions [help]

(**IT IS NOT NECESSARY** to use this sheet for project actions)

Because these questions are very general, it may be helpful to read them in conjunction with the list of the elements of the environment.

When answering these questions, be aware of the extent the proposal, or the types of activities likely to result from the proposal, would affect the item at a greater intensity or at a faster rate than if the proposal were not implemented. Respond briefly and in general terms.

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

Discharge to Water

Under either alternative, development would likely occur in portions of the study area that have been previously developed and are connected to stormwater facilities, municipal water facilities, and the sanitary sewer system. Assuming that all new developments under any of the alternatives achieves consistency with the City's stormwater standards, future developments would result in better stormwater management than exists currently. As such, the alternatives with greater expected development would likely achieve greater overall improvements to stormwater management.

Emissions to Air

Development under either of the proposed alternatives would result in air quality impacts during construction activities including fugitive dust, odors, and emissions from heavy machinery, trucks, and other vehicles traveling to and operating on construction sites. Increased traffic congestion and delays due to construction would have the potential to increase localized emissions by slowing or stopping traffic.

Increased development under any of the alternatives would likely result in an increase in the number of auto trips and associated emissions. The relative size of the increase would depend on the amount and type of development expected under each alternative, but in no case is the increase expected to be significant, because of stricter air quality standards that apply to vehicles.

Release of Toxic or Hazardous Substances

Under either of the alternatives, construction encouraged by the proposal would pose potential risks for fire and explosion, spill, or exposure to hazardous materials. Spills or leakage from heavy equipment at construction sites could occur, but would not be greater than what is normally anticipated during construction activities.

Production of Noise

Under either of the alternatives, short-term noise impacts could result from construction vehicles and equipment during daylight hours. The project location has a long history of elevated noise levels associated with vehicular traffic originating from the I-405 freeway corridor.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are:

Discharge to Water

Under the City's new stormwater regulations (adopted January 1, 2010), new or redeveloping sites are required to mitigate runoff to pre-developed/forested conditions. This means each parcel will be required to construct stormwater detention and treatment facilities and mitigate runoff rate and duration. Low impact development strategies and special water quality BMP's to reduce impacts to water quality would also be considered for new developments.

Emissions to Air

In general, the increase under any of the alternatives would not add an appreciable amount of emissions to existing conditions caused by surrounding urban development and I-405. It is unlikely that air impact would be significant.

Mitigation measures to control air quality impacts would be considered and developed on a project-by-project basis, and could include transportation demand management strategies such as transit and carpooling incentives, bike facilities, and other means of encouraging alternatives to single occupancy vehicle travel.

Release of Toxic or Hazardous Substances

Normal precautions would be taken to store equipment, hazardous fuels, and other materials used in construction. Waste and storm water would be contained and treated appropriately to mitigate impacts to the environment. All construction activities would follow the City's storm and surface water code and clearing and grading code, in addition to all local and state regulations.

Production of Noise

Development activity and operation of heavy machinery would be limited to 7 a.m. to 8 p.m. on weekdays and 9 a.m. to 8 p.m. on Saturdays under the City's noise control regulations. No development activity or operation of heavy machinery would occur outside of these times, on Sundays or on holidays, except if permitted by the director of community development and only in cases where activity would not interfere with residential use permitted in the zone in which it is located. Existing noise standards for construction and operation are likely sufficient to control potential noise impacts.

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

The majority of the study area that would be impacted by new land uses has been previously cleared of vegetation. The amount of vegetation that will be removed or altered as a result of new development would vary depending on the magnitude of new development under each alternative. There are no known threatened or endangered plant species, or associated critical habitat within or near the study area.

Future project activities would likely avoid Sturtevant Creek, wetlands, and their associated buffers. Development that complies with the City's critical areas regulations would not result in significant impacts to threatened or endangered animal or fish species.

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

Alteration or destruction of threatened or endangered species, or critical habitat would be regulated by city, state, and federal rules. Significant impacts to vegetation, from future development, are not anticipated. Planting designs would incorporate the use of native species and would include low groundcover, low shrubs, and trees for canopy cover.

In addition, all development would be required to comply with the City's critical areas regulations, tree retention policies, and setbacks and screening requirements.

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

Energy use in the study area would be typical of urbanized commercial areas. Under either of the proposed alternatives, development or redevelopment would require electrical power for lighting and heating. Natural gas would be used within structures for heating and cooking. Construction under any of the alternatives would use gasoline and diesel.

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

The development and implementation of a preferred alternative would encourage the implementation of green features into new building design.

Existing City and local utility infrastructure is adequate to serve development under either of the alternatives. Development and redevelopment in the study area would be consistent with all local utility standards. In addition, new development would consider and implement energy conservation into building design.

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

No parks, wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, threatened or endangered species habitat, historic or cultural sites, or prime farmland are located within the study area. The study area does contain the highly-modified Sturtevant Creek floodplain and Sturtevant Creek Wetland. Future construction activities associated with development or redevelopment under either alternative would not likely involve the filling or dredging of surface water resources or wetlands.

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

Development that complies with the City's critical areas regulations would likely avoid Sturtevant Creek, wetlands, and their associated buffers.

Impacts to surface water resources and wetlands would be evaluated on a project-by-project basis. If future development is proposed in the vicinity of any surface waters or wetlands, the project action will be evaluated for consistency with the requirements codified in Bellevue City Code (BCC) 20.25H "Critical Areas Overlay District." The City would determine the appropriate mitigation of any potential adverse impacts.

New projects developing in accordance with the preferred alternative, once implemented, would not be located in the 100-year flood plain. Updated floodplain maps would very likely place some existing buildings in the floodplain. If these buildings were to redevelop they would have to meet City's regulations to elevate, flood proof, or otherwise reduce the risk of structural flooding. Construction projects occurring near or adjacent to streams would be subject to existing city regulations designed to protect critical areas including riparian corridors, floodplains, and wetlands.

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?

Under either of the alternatives being considered, the intensity of land use in the study area would increase. Land use in the study area currently includes commercial buildings such as hotels, office buildings, and an athletic club. No residential units are located within the study area. Current zoning classification of the study area is Office and Limited Business District (OLB); future development and redevelopment would meet applicable zoning requirements of the proposed TOD zoning, which is intended to be compatible with the light rail station coming to the project area, consistent with the City's comprehensive plan.

Sturtevant Creek Wetland and the reach of Sturtevant Creek that flows through this wetland are located within shoreline jurisdication. The City's Shoreline Master Program designates this site as Urban Conservancy-Open Space. This shoreline designation is designed to protect, retain, or restore those shoreline areas that are relatively free of urban development or that include intact or minimally degraded shoreline functions intolerant of urban development. Redevelopment of this area in a manner similar to the other parts of the study area would not be supported by shoreline or critical areas regulations.

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

Specific types of land use are not known at this stage of planning, but new development activities under either alternative would be subject to further review on a case-by-case basis and would need to be consistent with the City of Bellevue Municipal Code.

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

Transportation or Public Services

The amount of increased demand would depend on the amount and type of development that occurs under each alternative.

The East Main light rail station is proposed near the intersection of 112th Avenue SE and Main Street. The street-level station will be reached by tunnel to the north and at-grade tracks to the south. The target opening date is 2023. In all cases, the development expected under the proposal would be compatible with and oriented toward transit use, taking advantage of the future light rail station.

Utilities

Project-specific extensions of or upgrades to the utilities listed above are likely to be required as development or redevelopment occurs. In general, however, the existing utility infrastructure is adequate to serve the anticipated growth, and substantial upgrades are not expected to be needed.

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

Transportation or Public Services

No measures are proposed to reduce impacts on transportation or public services. Proximity to the light rail station is expected to limit transportation impacts from future development.

Utilities

No measures are proposed to reduce impacts on utilities because significant impacts to utilities are not anticipated.

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

The proposal would comply with all local, state and federal laws and requirements for the protection of the environment.