



SEPA¹ 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.

¹ <https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/SEPA/Environmental-review/SEPA-guidance/Checklist-guidance>

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

[Find help answering background questions](https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/SEPA/Environmental-review/SEPA-guidance/SEPA-checklist-guidance/SEPA-Checklist-Section-A-Background)²

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable:

Land Use and Development Review Procedures Code Update (CA-24-001)

2. Name of applicant:

City of Mukilteo

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

Sarah Kress, City of Mukilteo, 11930 Cyrus Way 98275. 425-263-8044

4. Date checklist prepared:

January 29, 2024

5. Agency requesting checklist:

City of Mukilteo

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

Planning Commission discussion held on January 18, 2024. Anticipated Planning Commission Public Hearing on February 15, 2024. Adoption by City Council would occur no earlier than end of March 2024. This coincides with the end of Commerce noticing (March 23, 2024).

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

No

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

None other than this SEPA checklist.

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.

None pending. This code amendment will require State agency review in accordance with RCW 36.70A.106, SEPA review, a Planning Commission public hearing, and action by City Council.

² <https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/SEPA/Environmental-review/SEPA-guidance/SEPA-checklist-guidance/SEPA-Checklist-Section-A-Background>

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

Code amendments require adoption by the City Council. While not an approval, the proposed code amendment does require State agency review in accordance with RCW 36.0A.106.

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 would amend the Mukilteo Municipal Code 17.13 and associated sections to modernize the land use and development review procedures. The scope of the proposed update includes streamlining the permitting processes to facilitate more timely reviews, removing submittal requirements from the code and referencing checklists instead, revising noticing procedures to better reflect modern tools and practices, and making thresholds between permit review categories consistent with SEPA.

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 code amendment applies citywide.

B.Environmental Elements

WAC 197-11-315 (1)(e)

(1) Agencies shall use the environmental checklist substantially in the form found in WAC [197-11-960](#) to assist in making threshold determinations for proposals, except for:

...

(e) Nonproject proposals where the lead agency determines that questions in Part B do not contribute meaningfully to the analysis of the proposal. In such cases, Parts A, C, and D at a minimum shall be completed.”

In accordance with WAC 197-11-315(1)(e), this nonproject proposal skips questions in this section because the answers will not contribute meaningfully to the analysis of the proposal. A nonproject supplemental sheet is included.

C. Signature

[Find help about who should sign](#)³

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.

X Sarah Kress

Type name of signee: Sarah Kress

Position and agency/organization: Associate Planner, City of Mukilteo

Date submitted: February 1, 2024

D. Supplemental sheet for nonproject actions

[Find help for the nonproject actions worksheet](#)⁴

Do not use this section 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?

The proposed code amendment is unlikely to increase discharge to water, emissions to air, or production of noise. The amendments will not change the production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous materials. The proposal simply clarifies and streamlines procedures for processing permits; any permits issued under the new procedures will require the same level of environmental review as currently in place.

- **Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are:**

None

³ <https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/SEPA/Environmental-review/SEPA-guidance/SEPA-checklist-guidance/SEPA-Checklist-Section-C-Signature>

⁴ <https://ecology.wa.gov/regulations-permits/sepa/environmental-review/sepa-guidance/sepa-checklist-guidance/sepa-checklist-section-d-non-project-actions>

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

The proposal is unlikely to affect plants, animals, fish, or marine life. The proposal simply clarifies and streamlines procedures for processing permits; any permits issued under the new procedures will require the same level of environmental review as currently in place.

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

None

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

The proposed code amendment is unlikely to deplete energy or natural resources. The proposal simply clarifies and streamlines procedures for processing permits; any permits issued under the new procedures will require the same level of environmental review as currently in place.

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

None

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?

The proposed code amendment is unlikely to affect environmentally sensitive areas. The proposal simply clarifies and streamlines procedures for processing permits; any permits issued under the new procedures will require the same level of environmental review as currently in place.

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

None

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 clarifies and streamlines procedures for processing permits. Doing so will make land use and permit approvals more timely which may help to incentivize development and redevelopment compatible with existing plans. Any permits issued under the new procedures will require the same level of environmental review as currently in place.

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

None

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

The proposed code amendment is unlikely to increase demands on transportation, public services, or utilities beyond what is planned for in the comprehensive plan. The proposal

clarifies and streamlines procedures for processing permits. environmentally sensitive areas. Doing so will make land use and permit approvals more timely which may help to incentivize development and redevelopment compatible with existing plans. Any permits issued under the new procedures will require the same level of environmental review and concurrency analysis as currently in place; the impacts on transportation, public services, and utilities would be analyzed and mitigated consistent with current project review practices.

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

None

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

No conflicts with local, state, or federal laws or requirements for the protection of the environment have been identified. In fact, the proposal is designed to keep the city in compliance with new state laws related to reduced review timelines.