

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.

DRAFT

Review limited to support of shoreline master program permitting

A. Background [\[HELP\]](#)

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable:

Mukilteo Parklet

2. Name of applicant:

Port of Everett

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

Laura Gurley, Director of Planning
Port of Everett
1205 Craftsman Way, Suite 200
Everett, WA 98201
(425) 388-0720
laurag@portofeverett.com

List of Contributors to this Environmental Checklist:

Landau Associates, Inc. 130 2 nd Avenue South Edmonds, WA 98020 (Environmental Services)	Hough Beck & Baird, Inc. 2101 4th Ave, Suite 1800, Seattle, WA 98121 (Landscape Architecture)
--	--

4. Date checklist prepared:

March 2022

5. Agency requesting checklist:

Port of Everett (Port)

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

The Port plans to complete the proposed project improvements by Spring 2022.

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

DRAFT

DRAFT

Review limited to support of shoreline master program permitting

Future plans may include the addition of a permanent patio cover by Ivar's restaurant.

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

- Floodplain Development Assessment

Please contact Laura Gurley at (425-388-0720) or LauraG@portofeverett.com to review environmental information relating to the proposed project.

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

There are no known applications for approvals or other proposals associated with the properties affected by the proposed project.

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

- Shoreline Master Program (City of Mukilteo) Shoreline Substantial Development Permit
- Floodplain Development permit
- Public Works permit
- Building permit (*To be confirmed*)

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

The Port of Everett (Port) is proposing development of a "parklet" on parcels (Snohomish County Parcel No. 28040400200100 and 28040400203000; [Site]) that were formerly part of the approach ramp for the former Washington State Ferry Terminal which included drive lanes, a utility shed, and ticketing building, all of which have been demolished by WSDOT as part of their new ferry terminal development to the east. Prior to turning the Site over to the Port, WSDOT repaved the project site, installed railings on the waterward end and constructed a vertical concrete block wall on the west side to separate the site from the adjacent Losvar Condominium property. The Port is partnering with Ivar's to repurpose the parcel for public park space and seasonal outdoor dining space. The dining space will be leased to Ivar's and will be separated

DRAFT

DRAFT

Review limited to support of shoreline master program permitting

from the publicly accessible portion of the parklet. This separation will be moveable to allow for special events. It is anticipated that Ivar's will be leasing offsite parking spaces from neighboring property owner(s) to accommodate the additional capacity associated with increase dining space.

The park space will include:

- Above-ground plant containers in the parcel and also adjacent to Front Street right of way to provide separation of the parklet from the street.
- Benches and picnic table for public seating.
- Resetting two interpretive signs.
- Replacement of existing wood plant containers located in the Front Street right of way immediately in front of Ivar's.
- Decorative panels affixed to the existing concrete block wall.
- Low-level and shielded accent lighting with electrical service at the existing concrete block wall.

The dining space will include:

- Seasonal outdoor tables, umbrellas and chairs provided by Ivar's Restaurant.
- Above-ground plant containers combined with a physical separation element (e.g. panel fence or railing) to provide separation from the public park component of the site.

Improvements across the Site include decorative treatment on the surface of the existing asphalt (e.g. colored sealcoat or similar product) and the plant containers will be set within areas of rounded cobble rock and boulder on top of the existing asphalt. The existing WSDOT installed guardrail and concrete block wall on the west side of the site will remain as-is. No disturbance is anticipated to the bulkhead or rip-rap along the shoreline.

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 700 Front Street in the City of Mukilteo, Snohomish County, Washington; Township 28N, Range 4E, Section 4. The project includes improvements to Snohomish County Parcel No. 28040400200100, upland portion of Parcel No. 28040400203000, and adjacent Front Street right of way. See attached Vicinity Map.

DRAFT

DRAFT

Review limited to support of shoreline master program permitting

B. Environmental Elements [\[HELP\]](#)

1. Earth [\[help\]](#)

a. General description of the site:

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

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

The Site is relatively flat.

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 USCA NRCS Web Soil Survey identifies the Site as "Urban Land". The site sits on fill over original native soils. No agricultural soils exist on the Site.

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

City of Mukilteo Critical Areas mapping identifies the Site in an area where Geotechnical Report may be required for certain types of activities, but is outside of mapped landslide hazard area.

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.

Site grading will be minimized to only that necessary for trenching of electrical utilities. It is anticipated that trenching activity would occur only in the area surrounding the existing concrete block wall at the west end of the site within the existing gravel surface that has already been disturbed during construction of the wall (by WSDOT). The existing asphalt will remain in place and the shoreline below the bulkhead will remain undisturbed.

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

Some minor short-term, minimal erosion during construction could occur; however, no long-term erosion is anticipated as a result of the proposed project.

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

DRAFT

DRAFT

Review limited to support of shoreline master program permitting

There will be no change to impervious surface area. The majority of the Site is currently paved with a small gravel portion adjacent to the concrete block wall at the west end.

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

Applicable Port Best Management Practices (BMPs) and discharge controls for the control of potential sources of erosion will be implemented as part of all of the proposal's electrical installation activities. Standard BMPs that are both in accordance with the Washington State Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington and City of Mukilteo requirements will also be implemented during all activities in the Project area.

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.

Construction equipment and vehicles will generate minor amounts of localized carbon monoxide and particulate emissions and possible dust. These emissions are temporary and may slightly degrade local air quality, but the resultant pollutant concentrations will be short-term.

Construction activities will be temporary and are anticipated to last up to 1 month. The anticipated construction equipment for the Project has not yet been estimated as the contract has not moved to the bidding phase. As a result, detailed emissions estimates of construction activities associated with the Project cannot be generated at this time.

Vulnerability of the Proposal to the Impacts of Climate Change:

The proposal is not likely to be negatively affected by the environmental impacts of climate change. The Port project team is considering potential impacts of climate change in its design for the Site. At this point, the Port has determined the primary physical affect that climate change may have on this Site is sea level rise. The current projected medium change in Puget Sound sea level is 13 inches by 2100 with a range of 6–50 inches.¹ The Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) issued by the Washington State Department of Transportation for the Mukilteo Multimodal Project indicated that overall, recent studies appear to be converging on projected sea level increases in the range of 2 to 4 ft.² Some additional variation may occur from this estimated increase within Puget Sound and its adjacent waters, according

¹ See, <http://www.cses.washington.edu/db/pdf/moteetalslr579.pdf>

² See, <http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Projects/Ferries/mukilteoterminal/multimodal/library.htm>

DRAFT

DRAFT

Review limited to support of shoreline master program permitting

to Ecology.³ The lowest portions of the proposed project area are currently at an elevation of +13.93 ft above MLLW. This will be approximately 0.71 ft above the Highest Astronomical Tide (HAT) elevation (+13.22 ft MLLW) at the Site.

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

There are no off-site sources of emissions or odor that may affect the proposal.

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

To reduce carbon monoxide and particulate emissions from gasoline and diesel engines, construction equipment will have the best available emission control devices generally available to the contractor. Because the construction work is temporary, no significant air quality impacts are expected during construction.

3. Water [\[help\]](#)

a. Surface Water: [\[help\]](#)

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

The Site is located adjacent to Puget Sound.

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.

Work will occur adjacent (i.e. within 200 feet) to Puget Sound. No in-water work is proposed.

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.

Not applicable.

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

No, not applicable.

³ See <https://apps.ecology.wa.gov/publications/SummaryPages/1201004.html>

DRAFT

DRAFT

Review limited to support of shoreline master program permitting

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

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) flood insurance mapping identifies the Site as occurring in the 100-year floodplain, with corresponding base flood elevation (BFE) of 13 ft (NAVD88). Elevations vary across the site from approximately +11.68 to +13.13 feet (NAVD88).

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.

b. Ground Water: [\[help\]](#)

1) Will groundwater be withdrawn from a well for drinking water or other purposes? If so, give a general description of the well, proposed uses and approximate quantities withdrawn from the well. Will water be discharged to groundwater? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.

No groundwater withdrawal will occur as part of the proposed Project.

2) Describe waste material that will be discharged into the ground from septic tanks or other sources, if any (for example: Domestic sewage; industrial, containing the following chemicals. . . ; agricultural; etc.). Describe the general size of the system, the number of such systems, the number of houses to be served (if applicable), or the number of animals or humans the system(s) are expected to serve.

Not applicable. No waste materials associated with domestic sewage or other activities will be discharged into the ground.

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.

Stormwater runoff will be conveyed to existing catch basin on the Site, which conveys runoff to the adjacent shoreline (Puget Sound). The project will no change the area of impervious surface contributing runoff to the onsite catch basin.

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

DRAFT

DRAFT

Review limited to support of shoreline master program permitting

No, not applicable.

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

The project will maintain current drainage patterns on the Site.

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

There will be no changes to existing drainage patterns. During construction, standard BMPs for erosion and sediment control will be implemented to minimize impacts from Site runoff. All of the proposal's construction activities will be controlled to avoid and minimize potential impacts to surface water in Puget Sound. of the project will comply with Washington State Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington and City of Mukilteo code requirements.

4. Plants [\[help\]](#)

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

- deciduous tree: alder, maple, aspen, other: cottonwood
- evergreen tree: fir, cedar, pine, other:
- shrubs
- grass
- pasture
- crop or grain
- Orchards, vineyards or other permanent crops.
- wet soil plants: cattail, buttercup, bullrush, skunk cabbage, other
- water plants: water lily, eelgrass, milfoil, other
- other types of vegetation: weeds, Himalayan blackberry

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

None, the majority of the Site is currently paved and there is a small strip of crushed rock gravel on the west side.

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

Washington Natural Heritage Program (WNHP) data available online⁴ does not identify any threatened or endangered plant species within the township, range, section of the project (data current as of July 15, 2021).

⁴ See <https://www.dnr.wa.gov/NHPdata>

DRAFT

DRAFT

Review limited to support of shoreline master program permitting

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

Proposed plants will be in above ground containers.

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

None, the Site is currently paved.

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.

Examples include:

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

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

Species lists were obtained from the US Fish and Wildlife Services and NOAA Fisheries websites, and listed threatened or endangered species that might occur in the Site vicinity (specifically Puget Sound) include:

- Puget Sound Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*)
- Puget Sound steelhead (*O. mykiss*)
- Coastal-Puget Sound bull trout (*Salvelinus confluentus*)
- Yelloweye rockfish (*Sebastes ruberrimus*)
- Bocaccio rockfish (*S. paucispinis*)
- Marbled murrelet (*Brachyramphus marmoratus*)
- Yellow-billed cuckoo (*Coccyzus americanus*)
- Streaked horned lark (*Eremophila alpestris strigata*)
- Humpback whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*)
- Southern Resident killer whale (*Orcinus orca*).

DRAFT

DRAFT

Review limited to support of shoreline master program permitting

The proposed project avoids in-water work, will maintain the area of impervious surface contributing runoff to the aquatic environment, and does not provide suitable habitat for listed terrestrial species, therefore, the project will have no effect on listed threatened or endangered species.

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

Yes, the Project area is in the Pacific flyway bird migration corridor and nearshore areas of Puget Sound are used by outmigrating and rearing juvenile Chinook, coho, chum, and pink salmon; steelhead trout, sea-run cutthroat trout (subadult and adult), and bull trout (subadult and adult). Adults of each of these species may also migrate in nearshore and offshore areas of Puget Sound before entering nearby freshwater streams/rivers. The proposal will not effect any migration routes.

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

Several measures are included in the proposed Project design to avoid or minimize adverse impacts to wildlife. Care will be taken in all work to prevent materials such as uncured asphalt sealant, debris, oils, and grease from entering the water.

In addition, the following BMPs will be implemented as part of constructing this Project:

- The contractor will be responsible for the preparation of an SPCC plan to be used for the duration of the project. The SPCC plan will be submitted to and approved by the Project engineer prior to the commencement of any construction activities. A copy of the SPCC plan, along with any updates, will be maintained at the work Site by the contractor. The SPCC plan will provide advanced planning for potential spill sources and hazardous materials (gasoline, oils, chemicals, etc.) that the contractor may encounter or uses as part of conducting the work. The SPCC plan will outline roles and responsibilities, notifications, and inspection and response protocols.
- Care will be taken to prevent any petroleum products, chemicals, or other toxic or deleterious materials from entering the water. If a spill were to occur, work would be stopped immediately, steps would be taken to contain the material, and appropriate agency notifications would be made. Fuel hoses, oil drums, or fuel transfer valves and fittings, etc., will be checked regularly for drips or leaks, and shall be maintained and stored properly to prevent spills.
- All upland areas will be protected in accordance with standard BMPs as outlined in Ecology Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington. BMPs and water quality protection measures that will be implemented for conformance with the permit requirements and conservation measures outlined herein.
- Excess or waste materials will neither be disposed of or abandoned waterward of the OHW line, nor allowed to enter waters of the state.

DRAFT

DRAFT

Review limited to support of shoreline master program permitting

- The contractor will have a spill containment kit, including oil absorbent materials, on-Site to be used in the event of a spill, if any oil product is observed in the water.
- The contractor will be required to capture any debris associated with Project construction and not allow it to enter Puget Sound.
- Stormwater catch basins within the vicinity of the work area will be protected with inserts in accordance with Ecology Standard BMPs.

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

None known.

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.

Electricity will be used for Site lighting.

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

The project will not affect 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:

During construction, construction vehicle idling will be minimized to reduce fuel consumption. Site illumination may include energy-efficient light fixtures. LED lighting is being considered for because of its energy-saving properties.

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.

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

DRAFT

DRAFT

Review limited to support of shoreline master program permitting

The Ecology What's in My Neighborhood database identifies five sites within 0.25 miles of the Site, in which three are noted as cleanup completed and the remaining two identified as cleanup started. There is no known contamination at the Site. Vehicles and equipment used for both construction activities and subsequent facility maintenance would include the use of fuels, oils, lubricants, and other petroleum-related products within the proposed project area. No increase to exposure of the materials or risks of fire or explosion is anticipated.

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.

None.

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.

Chemicals associated with construction equipment, such as hydraulic fluid and diesel may be used by vehicles and equipment onsite during construction.

4) Describe special emergency services that might be required.

No special emergency services will be required for the proposal. No additional police, firefighting, or other emergency services, other than those that will normally be required at a construction site, will be necessary. Typical and temporary increases in this proposed public gathering space could create a small increase in the level of potential emergency services already associated with the adjacent commercial/recreational activities now occurring at the waterfront.

5) Proposed measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards, if any: BMPs will be used during construction to prevent spills.

A health and safety plan will be completed that will document specific procedures to be followed if environmental health hazards are encountered. This plan will be onsite during construction. During construction, any spill of materials, such as diesel fuel and lubricating oil, will be cleaned up immediately.

No significant adverse effects associated with environmental health hazards that cannot be avoided or minimized are anticipated for the proposed Project.

b. Noise

DRAFT

DRAFT

Review limited to support of shoreline master program permitting

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

The noises that currently exist in the vicinity (vehicular traffic, railroad traffic, and ferry terminal) would not have an impact on the proposal. Existing noise will not affect the project.

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

Construction of the proposed Project will generate temporary short-term increases in noise levels at adjacent and nearby areas. Construction will be conducted in accordance with City of Mukilteo noise ordinance. Construction activities are expected to occur during daytime hours. If circumstances arise that require night work, the contractor will be required to adhere to all applicable City of Mukilteo noise regulations, including obtaining a variance if needed.

Noise associated with operations on the Site will be limited to public use at the parklet and Ivar's customers, and will be subject to noise restrictions provided in Mukilteo Municipal Code chapter 8.18.

The types of noise associated with the operation of the proposal after its completion would likely be similar to the types generated by existing uses in the vicinity.

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

Construction-industry BMPs will be incorporated into construction plans and contractor specifications, which may include, but are not limited to, the following: fitting construction equipment engines with adequate mufflers, intake silencers, or engine enclosures; and turning off construction equipment when not in use. Construction activities associated with the proposed project is not anticipated to occur during nighttime hours.

The proposed project would include practices to reduce construction noise. Examples include:

- Using properly sized and maintained mufflers, engine intake silencers, engine enclosures, and turning off idle equipment. Construction contracts would specify that mufflers be in good working order and that engine enclosures be used on equipment when the engine is the dominant source of noise.
- Although safety warning back-up alarms are exempt from noise ordinances, they often emit very annoying sounds from construction sites. A construction noise

DRAFT

DRAFT

Review limited to support of shoreline master program permitting

mitigation measure requiring all construction equipment be fitted with ambient-sensing broadband alarms that broadcast a warning sound loud enough to be heard over background noise but without having to use a preset, maximum volume could be implemented. Another alternative that could be implemented would be to use broadband backup alarms instead of pure tone alarms. Such devices have been found to be very effective in reducing annoying noise from construction sites.

Use of the Site will be conducted in accordance with City of Mukilteo noise restrictions provided in Mukilteo Municipal Code Chapter 8.18. Any special events with the potential to generate noise beyond typical operations will be coordinated with the City of Mukilteo and adjacent neighboring properties.

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.

The Site is was part of the access road to the former location of the WSDOT Mukilteo Ferry and currently consists of asphalt paving and a small gravel area. The Site is bordered by Puget Sound to the north, Ivar's Restaurant to the east, Front Street to the south, and Losvar Condominiums to the west. The proposed project will provide option for outdoor seating for Ivar's and recreational opportunities to nearby residents and the larger community.

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?

No, the project is located in existing commercial/residential waterfront.

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, the project is located in existing commercial/residential waterfront.

c. Describe any structures on the site.

The Site is currently asphalt with a concrete block wall on the west side providing privacy/separation from Losvar Condominiums. A concrete bulkhead is also located along the shoreline of the Site.

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

DRAFT

DRAFT

Review limited to support of shoreline master program permitting

No structures will be demolished as part of the proposed Project. The existing concrete block wall will be incorporated into the proposed site improvements.

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

The Site is zoned as Downtown Business (DB).

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

The City of Mukilteo Comprehensive Plan identifies current zoning designation as Downtown Business (DB) with associated land use as “Commercial”.

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

City of Mukilteo shoreline master program designation of the upland part of the Site as Urban Waterfront. The designation waterward of the ordinary high water line of Parcel No. 28040400203000 is Aquatic Urban, however no work will occur in that area of designation.

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

The Site is also within a Flood Hazard Area (i.e. 100 year floodplain) and Shoreline Critical Area. City of Mukilteo Critical Areas mapping identifies the Site in an area where Geotechnical Report may be required for certain types of activities.

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

The Parklet will not require additional Port staff for maintenance activities. Ivar’s may have two to three additional staff during times when outdoor seating is available.

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

No displacement of people would occur as a result of the proposed Project.

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

Not applicable. No displacement of people would occur as a result of the proposed Project.

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

DRAFT

DRAFT

Review limited to support of shoreline master program permitting

The proposed use of the Site is consistent with the current and projected underlying zoning designation as well as the applicable provisions of the Mukilteo Shoreline Master Program and Mukilteo Comprehensive Plan. The Port will manage all improvements associated with this proposal in a manner that is fully consistent with the City of Mukilteo's adopted comprehensive plan, shoreline management master program, and all applicable development regulations. This proposal will not preclude future development of the site consistent with the 2016 City of Mukilteo Downtown Waterfront Master Plan or other subsequent City plans.

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

Not applicable.

9. Housing [\[help\]](#)

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 part of this Project.

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 part of this Project.

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

Not applicable.

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?

The tallest element of the project will be approximately 10 feet. The existing concrete block wall on the Site is approximately 6 feet above existing grades, and decorative panels to be installed on the wall may extend up to 10 feet above existing grades.

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

DRAFT

DRAFT

Review limited to support of shoreline master program permitting

In accordance with the 2016 City of Mukilteo Downtown Waterfront Master Plan, a view corridor will be maintained from SR 525 to the sound, which includes the proposal area. The proposed light fixtures are located at the west edge of the site in order to preserve existing views.

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

Light fixture size will be minimized for low-lighting, accent purposes only.

11. Light and Glare [\[help\]](#)

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

The Site will be provided with accent lighting on the concrete block wall. The intent is to provide soft, ambient lighting for parklet users in the evening hours. Light will be low-level.

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

Light glow may be visible to adjacent property owners and residential areas located at higher elevations to the south of the Site. The lights will be shielded toward the Site as to minimize spillover onto adjacent properties. Consideration will be taken to avoid glare perceptible to drivers on Front Street and SR 525 and nearby residential properties. The proposed lighting is far less than that of the previous use at the Site by WSDOT Ferries.

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

There are no off-site sources of light or glare that will affect the proposed Project.

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

The lights will be shielded toward the Site to minimize spillover onto adjacent properties, roads and the waterway. The type of light is anticipated to be softer, ambient lighting with a decorative element to enhance the parklet experience in the evening hours.

12. Recreation [\[help\]](#)

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

DRAFT

DRAFT

Review limited to support of shoreline master program permitting

The Site is currently open to pedestrian traffic and provides viewing access to the shoreline. The City of Mukilteo Community Beach Park (796 Front Street) is located approximately 400 ft east of the site and the City's Lighthouse Park is located approximately 350 feet west of the site.

The site is adjacent to sidewalk that connects to the City of Mukilteo Lower Japanese Gulch Park, Rosehill Community Center, Barbara Brennon Dobro Park, Totem Park, and Byer's Park, and the Port's Edgewater Beach Park.

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

No displacements would occur and the project would enhance recreational use of the site. The main purpose of this project is to create a parklet for enjoyment by the public.

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

The project would enhance recreational use of the site by improving public access and amenities. Enhancements include addition of benches and lighting, and aesthetic improvements including landscaping and surface treatment to the existing asphalt.

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 ? If so, specifically describe.

No buildings occur on the site. The Washington Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP) Washington Information System for Architectural and Archaeological Records Data (WISAARD) database identifies the former Mukilteo Ferry Terminal (Property ID 115866) as Determined Not Eligible for historic property listing. In addition, the McConnell's Boathouse (Property ID 17731) adjacent to the site is listed as eligible for historic listing, however, the building appears to have been located in the area of the Silver Cloud Inn to the east of Ivar's.

Snohomish County Assessor data indicates that the adjacent building associated with Ivars was constructed in 1925.

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.

DRAFT

DRAFT

Review limited to support of shoreline master program permitting

The project site is in proximity to the Point Elliott Treaty site (45SN108) and the Mukilteo Shoreline Site (45SN393).

- 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.**

WSDOT completed archaeological evaluation of the site as part of the Mukilteo Ferry Terminal project, which involved removal of the former ferry terminal building, asphalt paving, and construction of the wall on the site adjacent to the Losver Condominiums. The Port also consulted directly with the Washington Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation to better understand the Site in order to avoid potential impacts.

- 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.**

No potential adverse effects on historic or cultural resources are anticipated as no work will occur below asphalt currently over the site. Electrical buried utilities will be confined to the existing previously disturbed gravel area created when the footing of the concrete block wall was recently installed.

If required by an agency with jurisdiction, an Inadvertent Discovery Plan (IDP) will be prepared and will be provided to the construction contractor. The IDP would address procedures in case of an unanticipated discovery, notification procedures (including the State Historical Preservation Officer [SHPO] and affected tribes if any archaeological, historic, or culturally significant items are discovered; and the Snohomish County Medical Examiner, if any human remains are found), the authority to temporarily stop construction, and procedures to evaluate and recover intact materials.

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.**

The Site is adjacent to Front Street which is accessible from State Route 525 (Mukilteo Speedway). The project will maintain existing separation from the vehicle travel lanes on Front Street.

DRAFT

DRAFT

Review limited to support of shoreline master program permitting

- 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?**

The site is not served by public transit. However, the site is located approximately 800 ft northwest of the WSDOT Mukilteo Ferry Terminal and Mukilteo Station (served by Sound Transit, Community Transit, and Everett Transit).

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

Additional parking is not required under City of Mukilteo code specifically for the parklet. However, the code does require additional parking associated with the Ivar's outdoor dining area. It is estimated that between 4 and 13 additional parking spaces may be required. Ivar's anticipates leasing parking from a neighboring property to satisfy City code requirements and will provide seasonal parking attendant to control use of the leased parking spaces.

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

The proposed Project includes replacement of the existing planter in the right of way in front of Ivar's, as well as installation of a new above grade planter to separate the parklet from Front Street. It is anticipated that this planter will be fairly stout to act as an informal safety barrier.

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

The proposed site is located approximately 800 ft northwest of the WSDOT Mukilteo Ferry Terminal and Sound Transit Mukilteo Station.

- 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?**

Based on the minimal size of the parklet, it is not anticipated to be a primary destination point, but instead would be a secondary destination for people visiting other places at the waterfront. The minimal size and seasonal nature of the proposed Ivar's outdoor seating will not alter the number or frequency of delivery trucks serving Ivar's. Foot traffic is anticipated to be the primary

DRAFT

DRAFT

Review limited to support of shoreline master program permitting

source of Ivar's patrons, but any additional vehicles will be accommodated in the leased parking area.

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.

The project will not interfere with, affect, or be affected by the movement of agricultural and forest products.

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

No traffic impacts are anticipated and no measures are proposed. It is estimated that between 4 and 13 additional parking spaces may be required associated with seasonal outdoor dining to be provided by Ivar's. Ivar's anticipates leasing parking from a neighboring property to satisfy City code requirements and will provide seasonal parking attendant to control use of the leased parking spaces.

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.

No significant increase in public services related to temporary construction activities is anticipated.

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

Proposed measures to reduce and control any direct impacts on public services will include ensuring that construction and operation of all proposed improvements will be done in full compliance with all applicable city, state, and federal building, safety, and environmental codes and standards and also in accordance with the Port's own BMPs for safety and environmental protection.

16. Utilities [\[help\]](#)

a. Circle utilities currently available at the site:

electricity, natural gas, water, refuse service, telephone, sanitary sewer, septic system, other _____ communications (Frontier cable)

DRAFT

DRAFT

Review limited to support of shoreline master program permitting

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.

Electricity will be provided by the Snohomish County PUD. Water for the planters will be sourced from existing hose bibs at the adjacent Ivar's property.

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 _____

Position and Agency/Organization _____

Date Submitted: _____

DRAFT

G:\Projects\147\055\F01VicinityMap.mxd 3/16/2022 | JValluzzi



Data Source: Esri.

Mukilteo Parklet
 700 Front Street
 Mukilteo, Washington

Vicinity Map

Figure
 1

