



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

230 Pioneer Street | PO Box 608 | Ridgefield, WA 98642
(360) 887-3557 | Fax: (360) 887-0861 | www.ci.ridgefield.wa.us

NOTICE OF SEPA THRESHOLD DETERMINATION (DNS) REVIEW

Discovery Ridge

File Name: Discovery Ridge PROJ-18-
0003

Date Published: September 13, 2018

Today's Date: September 7, 2018

Attached is an environmental **Determination of Non-significance (DNS)** and associated environmental checklist issued pursuant to the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Rules (Chapter 197-11, Washington Administrative Code). The enclosed review comments reflect evaluation of the environmental checklist by the lead agency, the City of Ridgefield, as required by WAC 197-11. You may comment on this determination within twenty-one (21) days of the DNS publication date of September 13, 2018. The lead agency will not act on the SEPA DNS until the close of the 21-day **comment period which ends at 5:00 PM on October 4, 2018**.

Please address any correspondence to: Ridgefield Community Development Dept.
RE: SEPA – Discovery Ridge PROJ-18-0003
P.O. Box 608
Ridgefield, WA 98642

DISTRIBUTION:

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Ridgefield, WA
U.S. Postmaster – Ridgefield, WA
WA Department of Commerce, SEPA Review
WA Department of Ecology, SEPA/GMA Coordinator
WA Department of Natural Resources - Olympia
WA Department of Natural Resources - Castle Rock
WA DOT, SW Region, SEPA Review
WA Office of Archaeology & Historic Preservation
C-Tran – Environmental Review
Clark County Dept. of Community Development
Clark County Environmental Public Health
Clark County Public Works

Clark County Public Utilities – SEPA Coordinator
Clark County Fire & Rescue
Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board
Port of Ridgefield
Ridgefield Junction Association
Ridgefield Police Department
Ridgefield Public Library
Ridgefield School District # 122 – SEPA Review
Cowlitz Tribe – SEPA Review
Yakima Tribe – SEPA Review
Chinook Tribe – SEPA Review
The Reflector
Comcast – SEPA Review
Grey & Osborne – SEPA Review
NW Natural Gas – SEPA Review
Qwest Communications – SEPA Review



RIDGEFIELD COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

**NOTICE OF
DISCOVERY RIDGE
SEPA THRESHOLD DETERMINATION (DNS)**

PROJ-18-0003

230 Pioneer St ♦ PO Box 608 ♦ Ridgefield, WA 98642
Ph: 360.887.3557 ♦ Fax: 360.887.2507 ♦ www.ci.ridgefield.wa.us

Date: September 13, 2018

Proponent: City of Ridgefield

Description of Proposal: This non project action is known as the “*Discovery Ridge Comprehensive Plan Amendment*”. The proposed amendments address changes to the development code.

Location: APN 213968000, 213969000, 213970000, and 214071000

Project Proponent & Contact Persons:

Applicant: City of Ridgefield, Community Development Department; 301 N 3rd Ave., Ridgefield, WA 98642;
Contact Jeff Niten, Community Development Director, 360.857.5013, jeff.niten@ci.ridgefield.wa.us

Lead Agency: The lead agency for this proposal has determined that the proposal does not have a probable significant adverse impact on the environment as a result of compliance with adopted City standards, including the 2012 Ridgefield Shoreline Master Program. An environmental impact statement (EIS) is not required under RCW 43.21C.030 (2)(c). This decision was made after review of a completed environmental checklist, the proposed plan document, and other information on file with the lead agency. Information is available to the public on request at Ridgefield City Hall during normal business hours.

This **DNS** is issued under WAC 197-11. The lead agency shall not act on this DNS for a minimum of 21 days from the date of issuance. Comments on the **DNS** must be submitted to the responsible official c/o the Ridgefield City Clerk by **5:00 PM on Thursday, October 4, 2018**. The City will conduct a hearing on the proposal on **Thursday October 11, 2018 beginning at 6:30 PM** at the **Ridgefield Community Center, 210 N. Main Ave., Ridgefield, WA**. The public is invited to present testimony.

Responsible official: Jeff Niten
Position/title: Community Development Director
Address: P.O. Box 608, 301 N 3rd Ave
Ridgefield, WA 98642
jeff.niten@ci.ridgefield.wa.us

Phone: (360) 857-5013

Signature:

Jeff Niten, Community Development Director

Issued: September 13, 2018

Appeal: An appeal of the City’s SEPA Threshold Determination must be submitted to the Community Development Department within fourteen (14) calendar days after the date issued. This appeal must be written

and make specific factual objections to the City's threshold determination. Appeals shall be conducted in conformance with RDC 18.810.205 (Appeals) and any required fees pursuant to RDC 18.810.205.F shall be paid at time of appeal submittal.

An appeal of Type III decisions on Shoreline Substantial Development Permit or Shoreline Variance shall be submitted to Ecology for its final decision. Ecology's final decision may be appealed to the Shoreline Hearings Board in accordance with 90.58.180 and WAC 461-08. Such appeals must be filed within twenty-one (21) days from the date the permit decision was filed. (Ridgefield SMP 7.4.2.3)

SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Purpose of checklist:

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

Instructions for applicants:

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

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

Instructions for Lead Agencies:

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

Use of checklist for nonproject proposals:

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

A. Background

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable:

Discovery Ridge PROJ-18-0003

2. Name of applicant:

City of Ridgefield

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

Jeff Niten
Community Development Director
301 N. 3rd. Ave.
Ridgefield, WA 98642
(360)857-5013
jeff.niten@ci.ridgefield.wa.us

4. Date checklist prepared:

September 7, 2018

5. Agency requesting checklist:

City of Ridgefield

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

Anticipated adoption of the Discovery Ridge Comprehensive Plan Amendment is October 25, 2018. Effective date of changes will be January 1, 2019.

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

Yes, further commercial development will occur at this location and will be evaluated as part of a site specific SEPA determination.

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

None.

9. Do you know whether applications are pending for governmental approvals of other proposals directly affecting the property covered by your proposal? If yes, explain.

No other known proposals pending approval for the property covered by the proposed change.

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

No other approvals will be necessary.

11. Give brief, complete description of your proposal, including the proposed uses and the size of the project and site. There are several questions later in this checklist that ask you to

describe certain aspects of your proposal. You do not need to repeat those answers on this page. (Lead agencies may modify this form to include additional specific information on project description.)

This proposal is a non-project action contemplating changes to the Ridgefield Comprehensive Plan. The proposal is intended to amend land use designations in order to correct a split zoned development site.

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 site is located at the south east corner of Pioneer St. and S. 45th Ave. APN 213968000, 213969000, 213970000, and 214071000.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS

1. Earth

a. General description of the site:

The City of Ridgefield of located on the banks of Lake River.

The city contains gently rolling topography, with some steep slopes located along the river banks.

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

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

The steepest slopes are between 10 and 15%.

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.

The general types of soils on the site are classified GeB and OdB.

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

No.

e. Describe the purpose, type, total area, and approximate quantities and total affected area of any filling, excavation, and grading proposed. Indicate source of fill.

This is not a project-specific proposal. There is not likely to be a change in the amount of filling and grading activity occurring within the UGA as a result of this update.

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

This is not a project-specific proposal. The RDC and City Engineering Standards will regulate fill and grading activity during time of development and construction review. The City uses the Stormwater Manual for Western Washington (Ecology 2005) to manage storm water quality and quantity. Section 18.280 of the RDC regulates impacts to steep slopes under the Critical Area provisions and provides a Critical Areas map of steep slope areas. RDC Chapter 18.755 regulates Erosion Control during construction activity.

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

This is not a project specific proposal. Amount of impervious surface permitted as a result of development will vary by zoning district, and will be subject to maximums established in RDC chapters 18.210 through 18.265.

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

The RDC and City Engineering Standards will regulate fill and grading activity during time of development and construction review. The city uses the stormwater manual for Western Washington (Ecology 2005) to manage stormwater quality and quantity. Section 18.280 of the RDC regulates impacts to steep slopes under critical area provisions and provides a critical areas map of steep slope areas. RDC 18.755 regulates erosion control measures during construction.

2. Air

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

This is a nonproject action that will not directly result in additional future development. The Department of Ecology maintains air quality monitoring stations in Clark County. Federal and state standards are established for ambient air quality, emissions and pollutants. The subject area is subject to the Washington Clean Air Act, RCW 70.94.

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

Background traffic on Interstate 5 is a potential off-site source of emissions and odor, but it is outside the scope and jurisdiction of the RDC.

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

None.

3. Water

- a. Surface Water:

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

A wetland exists on the far eastern boundary of the site, and off site further east a farm pond exists.

- 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.

This is a nonproject action that will not directly result in additional future development, and will not change the review requirements for all work over, in, or within 200 feet of the waters. All work within 200 feet of the shorelines will be subject to the provisions of the Ridgefield Shoreline Master Program. Additionally, development within critical areas and buffers must meet the provisions of RDC Section 18.280, which regulates work near the water under the Critical Area provisions. RDC 18.755 establishes erosion control provisions that reduce environmental impacts of site development.

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

None. This is a non-project action.

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

No.

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

No.

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

No, this is a non-project action.

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.

Proposed amendments to the Comprehensive Plan will not involve any changes to withdrawal of or discharge to groundwater.

- 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.

Proposed amendments to the Comprehensive Plan land designations will not directly generate any discharge into the ground from septic tanks or other sources. RMC Section 13.05.050 requires that all new development be served by a public wastewater disposal system rather than a septic system. The RUACFP, Sewer element, includes a comprehensive sewer plan to serve development within the UGA.

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.

No runoff will directly result from this non-project action.

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

This is a nonproject action. Any development activity within frequently flooded areas, riparian areas, critical aquifer recharge areas, and wetlands and their buffers resulting from these proposed changes to the RDC would be regulated by RDC Section 18.280 and would continue to require SEPA review. All development activity must comply with the City's Surface Water Design Manual, Western Washington Storm Water Manual, and prohibition on new septic systems, which will guide development designed to prevent waste materials from entering ground or surface waters.

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

No. This is a non-project action.

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

The City has adopted the best management practices of the Western Washington Storm Water Manual and Critical Areas protections based on Best Available Science under RDC Chapter 18.280, including protections for critical aquifer recharge areas in Section 18.280.140.

4. Plants

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

- _x_ deciduous tree: alder, maple, aspen, other
- _x_ evergreen tree: fir, cedar, pine, other
- _x_ shrubs
- _x_ grass
- _x_ pasture
- _x_ crop or grain
- _x_ 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?

The proposed changes to the Transportation CFP would not directly alter or remove vegetative species and there is no additional development is expected to result from the proposed changes that would alter or remove vegetative species.

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

None known.

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

For all development, any potential impacts to plant species protected under the Endangered Species Act will require consultation with the US Fish and Wildlife Service. RDC Chapter 18.725 identifies landscaping requirements for all development and Section 18.725.030.B encourages the use of native plant materials where appropriate, as listed in RDC Chapter 18.830.

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

Scotchbroom, blackberry, milk thistle.

5. Animals

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

Examples include:

birds: hawk, heron, eagle, songbirds, other: crane, owl, woodpecker.
mammals: deer, bear, elk, beaver, other: fisher
fish: bass, salmon, trout, herring, shellfish, other lamprey

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

There are zero threatened species, five endangered species, 21 candidate species, and three sensitive species in the wider Clark County area according to the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife's Priority Habitats and Species lists.

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

The site is within the general area of the Pacific Flyway for migratory birds.

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

RDC Section 18.280 on Critical Areas provides regulations for and maps of fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas based on Best Available Science. SEPA review would continue to be required for any development within identified fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas.

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

None known.

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.

The changes to the Comprehensive Plan are a nonproject action and do not have any energy needs, per se, and will not result in any additional development, with concomitant additional demand for energy use. Changes to the Transportation CFP will not directly impact the source of energy. Private energy providers serving the area include: Clark Public Utility (electric) and Northwest Natural Gas (natural gas). The siting of private utilities is determined by the private service provider. City policies require coordination of private and public facilities with development.

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

This is a nonproject action and changes to the Comprehensive Plan will not result in development that alters the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties.

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

No additional energy conservation measures are included in the proposed changes to the SEPA review thresholds.

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.

The proposed changes to the RDC do not create any additional environmental health hazard risks. The City has adopted the Model Toxics Control Act (MTCA) to regulate the use and cleanup of any toxic materials.

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

None.

- 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.

There are no effects anticipated by this non-project action.

- 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.

None.

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

None anticipated as part of this non-project action.

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

The City has adopted the Model Toxics Control Act (MTCA) to regulate the use and cleanup of any toxic materials. No new measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards are proposed as part of changes to the RDC.

b. Noise

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

Typical noises across the Ridgefield UGA include traffic, construction, railroad activity, industrial uses, school playgrounds and more. These noises are not expected to change, increase or diminish under the proposed changes.

- 2) What types and levels of noise would be created by or associated with the project on a short-term or a long-term basis (for example: traffic, construction, operation, other)? Indicate what hours noise would come from the site.

The changes to the Comprehensive Plan will not generate any additional types or levels of noise. Development within the UGA is not expected to generate significant net increases in type or level of noise.

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

All development occurring under the proposed Transportation CFP must meet noise standards established by WAC 173-60.

8. Land and Shoreline Use

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

The site and adjacent site are undeveloped and are currently designated for both employment and commercial uses. This amendment will designate the entirety of the development site for commercial uses.

b. Has the project site been used as working farmlands or working forest lands? If so, describe. How much agricultural or forest land of long-term commercial significance will be converted to other uses as a result of the proposal, if any? If resource lands have not been designated, how many acres in farmland or forest land tax status will be converted to nonfarm or nonforest use?

The site are currently within the corporate city boundaries, and have been designated for commercial and employment uses since 2004.

1) Will the proposal affect or be affected by surrounding working farm or forest land normal business operations, such as oversize equipment access, the application of pesticides, tilling, and harvesting? If so, how:

No.

c. Describe any structures on the site.

There are no structures located on the subject site.

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

No. This is not a project-specific proposal; adoption of the changes to the Comprehensive Plan will not be the direct cause of demolition of any structures.

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

The zoning districts affected by the proposed amendments include Commercial Community Business and Employment zones.

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

The current comprehensive plan designations affected by the proposed amendments include: General Commercial and Employment.

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 a critical area by the city or county? If so, specify.

The majority of APN 213969000 is classified as a critical area due to the presence of a wetland.

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

None. This is a non-project action.

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

None. There are no current residents of the site.

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

NO DISPLACEMENT IMPACTS ARE ANTICIPATED.

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

Changes to the Comprehensive Plan will not significantly alter the characteristics of resultant development. This amendment is intended to correct split zoning on several parcels. The RDC is designed to implement the RUACP goals for the Ridgefield UGA and is consistent with the Plan goals.

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

None, no impacts are anticipated resulting from this non project action.

9. Housing

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

No housing units will be provided as a direct result of changes to the Comprehensive land use designations.

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

No housing units will be eliminated as a direct result of this non project action.

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

None.

10. Aesthetics

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

Not applicable.

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

Not applicable.

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

Not applicable.

11. Light and Glare

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

The proposed changes to land use designations will not directly generate any light or glare.

- 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.

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

None known.

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

None

12. Recreation

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

The city of Ridgefield adopted Parks and Recreation Plan identifies a trail segment in the vicinity of the subject site. When development occurs the trail will be incorporated into future development.

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

The proposed changes to land use designations would not displace any 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:

None.

13. Historic and cultural preservation

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

None.

- 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.

None known.

- c. Describe the methods used to assess the potential impacts to cultural and historic resources on or near the project site. Examples include consultation with tribes and the department of archeology and historic preservation, archaeological surveys, historic maps, GIS data, etc.

The proposal is a non-project action. Consultation with the Clark County Heritage register and the Clark County Museum takes place throughout the year.

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

The changes to land use designations will not create an impact on historic and cultural assets, so no measures are proposed to reduce or control impacts.

14. Transportation

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

Pioneer Street and S. 45th Ave. will serve as access for any future development of the site.

- 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?

Transit service is provided to Ridgefield through C-TRAN's "Connector" service.

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

The proposed change to land use designations will not create or eliminate parking spaces. Future development of the site will likely have associated parking lots and will be evaluated as part of a development specific SEPA application.

- 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).

This non-project SEPA will not require any new or improved public road access.

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

No.

- 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?

The changes to land use designations will not increase vehicle trips because it is a nonproject action. Traffic impact analyses, including trip generation calculations, will be required for all future development.

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

No.

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

For all development in the UGA concurrency provisions (See RDC 18.010.080.A) prohibits the approval of any land use application if approval of the proposal will cause the LOS on a transportation facility to fall below the LOS identified in the Transportation element of the RUACFP for that roadway or intersection.

15. Public Services

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

No.

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

Any impacts to public services resulting from development will be evaluated as part of the land use and engineering permit review process. Public services to serve the projected 2035 population of 25,494 people have already been planned for in Chapter 7 of the RUACP and accompanying RUACFP.

16. Utilities

a. Circle utilities currently available at the site:

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

All utility services are available within the City of Ridgefield.

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.

This non-project action will not require utility services. At the time of development utility services will be evaluated as part of a project specific SEPA application.

C. Signature

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

Signature: _____

Name of signee _____

Position and Agency/Organization _____

Date Submitted: _____

D. supplemental sheet for nonproject actions

(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?

Changes to land use designations will not increase discharges to water. The production of noise, emissions to air, or impacts related to toxic or hazardous substances should be lessened with the change of designation from Employment uses to Commercial uses.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are:

None.

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

Development within the UGA was forecasted in the RUACP and its impacts were forecasted as part of the SEPA review of the RUACP. Changes to land use designations will not generate additional development beyond what was forecast in the RUACP and therefore will not have any additional impacts on plants, animals, fish or marine life.

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

RDC Chapter 18.280 (critical areas protections) and the Ridgefield SMP provide regulations and procedures to protect plants, animals, fish and marine life. SEPA review will be required for development impacting regulated areas.

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

Changes to land use designations will not generate additional development beyond what was forecast in the RUACP and therefore will not deplete energy or natural resources beyond the level already approved. The RUACP estimates that there will be a population of 25,494 in Ridgefield by 2035 and future development within the UGA to serve the anticipated population will require additional energy and natural resources.

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

No additional consumption of energy and natural resources beyond levels already forecast are projected as a result of these proposed changes.

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?

Development in environmentally sensitive areas will be regulated by RDC 18.280, Critical Areas, and will complete project specific SEPA review at the time of development. The decision to include any prime farmlands or wilderness within the UGA was made as part of the RUACP adoption, which included SEPA review to determine and mitigate for any potential impacts.

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

The RDC critical area provisions in Chapter 18.280 would prevent or mitigate impacts to environmentally sensitive areas or designated areas, threatened or endangered species habitat, and wetlands, and SEPA review will be required for development affecting such areas. Development in the floodplains is regulated by RDC 18.755, which limits impacts in accordance with FEMA standards. The Parks/Open Space district standards (RDC Chapter 18.265) will protect existing parks and open spaces from incompatible development. Historic sites are protected by their listing on the Clark County Heritage Register.

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

The proposal will expand the scope of land uses permitted on the site for additional commercial opportunities. The proposal does not impact shoreline use, which is governed by the SMP.

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

Land use within the City is prescribed by the RUACP, which must meet GMA requirements, and implemented by the RDC consistent with the plan goals. Development standards for commercial development will ensure that there are no incompatible impacts on adjacent users. This proposal does not affect shorelines.

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

The changes to land use designations are not likely to increase demands on transportation or public services and utilities. When developed a project specific SEPA will be required.

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

Concurrency provisions prohibit the approval of any land use proposal if approval of the proposal will cause the LOS on a transportation facility to fall below the LOS identified in the Transportation element of the RUACFP for that roadway or intersection. The RUACP and the RUACFP include provisions for the adequate provision of public services and grounds to disapprove land use applications that would create adverse impacts on the provision of public services.

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

Development will still be required to complete SEPA review and Critical Areas review subject to RDC 18.280.