

CITY OF MOUNTLAKE TERRACE

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND
ESA LISTED SALMONIDS CHECKLIST**

A. BACKGROUND

1. *Name of proposed project, if applicable.*

Mountlake Terrace Shoreline Master Program (SMP) Update

2. *Name of applicant.*

City of Mountlake Terrace

3. *Addresses of Applicants.*

Community Development Department
6100 219th Street SW, Suite 200
Mountlake Terrace, WA 98043

Contact Person and Phone No.

Edith L. Duttlinger, Senior Planner
425.744.6279

4. *Date checklist prepared.*

November 23, 2011

5. *Agency requesting checklist.*

City of Mountlake Terrace

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

It is expected that the City Council will adopt the Shoreline Master Program in December 2011, pending subsequent Ecology approval.

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

Shoreline Master Programs are required to be updated periodically by state law. The next comprehensive SMP update is to occur in eight years. Amendments may be adopted at any time.

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

- Final Shoreline Inventory and Characterization Report (ESA Adolfson, December 2010)
- Draft Cumulative Impacts Assessment (ESA Adolfson, June 2011)

- Draft Restoration Plan (ESA Adolfson, August 2011).

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 applications or approvals are pending. Once adopted, the proposed SMP would apply to any new use or development located along the shoreline of Lake Ballinger. Permit applications for development in the shoreline area would be processed according to the adopted SMP regulations and procedures in effect at the time the application was determined to be complete.

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

The proposed Shoreline Master Program will need the following approvals:

- Review and threshold determination under the State Environmental Policy Act for Non-project actions;
- Adoption by the Mountlake Terrace City Council; and
- Approval by the Washington State Department of Ecology (RCW 90.58.090).

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 proposal is to update the 1993 City of Mountlake Terrace Shoreline Master Program. The comprehensive update to the SMP has been prepared consistent with Department of Ecology guidelines (WAC 173-26-20 I).

The proposed Shoreline Master Program is a non-project action that affects activities and developments along the shoreline of Lake Ballinger within City boundaries (See Inventory and Characterization Report, Map 1, Shoreline Planning Area) and includes:

- The upland area landward 200 feet of the ordinary high water mark (OHWM); and
- Associated wetlands. (See Shoreline Jurisdiction Map.)

The SMP updates the City's general SMP goals and policies for several elements including: Shoreline Use; Economic Development;

Public Access; Critical Areas; Circulation; Historic, Cultural and Scientific Resources; Restoration and Enhancement; Water Quality; Shoreline Vegetation Conservation; Recreation; Clearing and Grading; and shoreline bulk and dimensional standards.

The SMP updates the City's shoreline environment designations to "Natural", "Aquatic", "Urban Conservancy", and "Shoreline Residential". The shoreline environment designations are applied to different portions of the shoreline based on their ecological and land use characteristics. Shoreline environment designations function as an overlay to the City's Zoning Map to provide additional policies and regulations in addition to the development standards and protections afforded in underlying zoning classifications.

The SMP updates the City's development standards and use regulations to be applied in each shoreline environment. Generally, "standards" refer to setbacks, height limitations, buffers, and design guidelines or preferences. "Use regulations" refer to the allowance or prohibition of specific uses (such as recreational, commercial, or residential development) in each shoreline environment. The standards and regulations address shoreline modifications (such as bulkheads and shoreline stabilization structures, land clearing and grading, etc.) and specific shoreline uses (such as commercial, residential, and recreational development). The SMP development standards also address management and protection of critical areas (wetlands, vegetation, and wildlife habitat, etc.) located in the shoreline jurisdiction.

Finally, the proposed SMP updates the administrative provisions for reviewing development proposals in the shoreline and issuing shoreline substantial development permits, shoreline conditional use permits, shoreline variances or approvals of exemptions in accordance with current state rules.

- 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, or 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 map or detailed plans submitted with any permit application related to this checklist.***

The proposed SMP applies to the shoreline jurisdiction area (see map) which affects a total of five property owners (3 residential property

owners, the City of Mountlake Terrace and the Nile Temple (Golf and Country Club)).

B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS

1. EARTH

- a. General description of the site (circle one): flat, rolling, hilly, steep slopes, mountainous, other.*

Flat (Lake Ballinger Island and areas close to shoreline) to rolling (upland areas).

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

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 prime farmland.*

Mukilteo Muck covers most of the shoreline jurisdiction area. A small upland portion is Alderwood Gravelly Sandy Loam, ranging from 2-15% slope. (See Inventory and Characterization Report, Map 4, Soils.)

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

No.

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

N/A.

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

Erosion control would be addressed on a project level basis through clearing and grading code and other provisions of the SMP.

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

No new impervious area is proposed. The proposed SMP encourages

minimization of impervious areas.

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

The proposed SMP includes provisions to limit clearing, retain existing native shoreline buffer vegetation, use low impact development techniques to reduce stormwater runoff, and provide erosion and sediment control. These provisions are implemented on a project-by-project basis.

2. AIR

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

None.

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

No.

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

None specifically.

3. WATER

a. Surface

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

Yes. Lake Ballinger, Hall Creek & McAleer Creek. Hall Creek flows into Lake Ballinger from the north; McAleer Creek flows out of Lake Ballinger on the eastside of the lake. McAleer Creek drains into Lake Washington, approximately 3.5 miles southeast of Lake Ballinger.

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.

Not applicable. As a non-project action, adoption of the proposed SMP would not require any in- or -overwater work. New development in the shoreline jurisdiction would be subject to the provisions of the proposed SMP, which includes specific prohibitions and standards for over-water structures.

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

No filling or dredging is proposed. Proposals would be reviewed and evaluated on a case-by-case basis for consistency with proposed SMP. Under the proposed SMP, dredging within shoreline jurisdiction is permitted only under limited and specific circumstances as a conditional use activity.

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

No surface water withdrawals are proposed.

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

Yes, a portion thereof. The 100-year flood plain is mapped on Snohomish County Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) flood insurance rate maps (FIRM). (See Inventory and Characterization Report, Map 7, Critical Areas, Biological Resources.)

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

N/A.

b. Ground

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

No groundwater withdrawals or discharges are proposed.

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.

No material will be discharged into the ground. There are no homes or other development on septic systems within the shoreline.

c. Water Runoff (Including storm water)

1) Describe the source of runoff (including storm water) and method of collection and disposal, if any (including quantities, if known). Where will this water flow? Will this water flow into other waters? If so, describe.

No new impervious surfaces within the shoreline planning area are expected. However, the proposed SMP would require new development and redevelopment to provide low impact stormwater management to minimize impervious surfaces and additional stormwater runoff.

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

N/A.

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

The proposed SMP encourages and/or requires management of stormwater with low impact development techniques consistent with the City's Stormwater Comprehensive Plan and storm and surface water regulations (Chapter 16.20 MTMC).

4. PLANTS

a. Check or circle type of vegetation found on the site:
(Not all of the following plants are found on each site)

 x deciduous trees: Red Alder, Bigleaf Maple, Willow, Dogwood, Wild Cherry

 x evergreen trees: Douglas Fir, Western Red Cedar, Hemlock

 x shrubs: Oregon grape, red elderberry, ocean spray, salmonberry, red osier dogwood, vine maple

- herbs: grasses and ferns
- pasture or crop or grain
- wet soil plants: common cattail, skunk cabbage, bladderwort, large-leaf pondweed, chara, brittlewort
- water plants: slender arrowhead, fragrant water lily, purple loosestrife

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

None specifically. The proposed SMP requires new development to protect shoreline vegetation (see 4.d below).

c. List threatened or 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.

The proposed SMP encourages the protection and restoration of native vegetation and control of non-native invasive plant species. The SMP update includes a restoration plan describing opportunities to restore native vegetation.

5. ANIMALS

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

Within the City of Mountlake Terrace, a diversity of animals is found. Not all of the following are found on each site.

- Fish: cutthroat trout (stocked)
- Amphibians: None specifically identified; common species such as Pacific tree frog likely present
- Reptiles: None specifically identified; common species such as northwestern garter snake likely present
- Birds: Bald eagle, waterfowl, heron
- Mammals: Coyote, raccoon, opossum, eastern gray squirrel, rodents (rabbit, mice)

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

None known.

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

The City lies within the Pacific Flyway migratory route for certain birds that fly over Mountlake Terrace during the annual spring and fall, north/south migrations. It has been reported that some of the migratory birds stop in Mountlake Terrace to rest and feed as part of that migration.

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

The updated SMP regulations protect existing riparian vegetation through critical area buffer standards; vegetation conservation provisions; limits on filling, clearing and grading; and mitigation sequencing. Riparian habitat conditions are expected to improve through restoration projects.

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.*

N/A.

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

No.

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.*

N/A.

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?*

No.

1) Describe special emergency services that might be required.

N/A. The City of Mountlake Terrace has an Emergency Hazard Response Plan.

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

N/A.

b. Noise

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

N/A.

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.

N/A.

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

N/A.

8. LAND AND SHORELINE USE

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

Current uses in the shoreline jurisdiction area are aquatic (Lake Ballinger), single family residences (3), and recreation (two golf courses and Ballinger Boat Launch Park). Adjacent uses are golf/clubhouse (to the north and east); and multifamily to the northeast.

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

No.

c. Describe any structures on the site.

The shoreline jurisdiction is currently developed with 3 single family homes, several docks, a fishing pier and a storage structure.

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

None.

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

The 3 residences are zoned RS 7200; the remainder of the shoreline jurisdiction area is zoned Recreation and Parks (REC). (See Inventory and Characterization Report, Map 9, Zoning and Comprehensive Plan Designations.)

f. What is the current Comprehensive Plan designation of the site?

The 3 residences are zoned Urban Low Residential (ULR); the remainder of the shoreline jurisdiction area is comprehensively planned Parks and Open Space (POS). (See Inventory and Characterization Report, Map 9, Zoning and Comprehensive Plan Designations.)

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

The City of Mountlake Terrace's 1993 Shoreline Master Program applies two shoreline environment designations to lands within the shoreline jurisdiction including Urban conservancy", and "Shoreline residential".

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

Yes. Environmentally sensitive or critical areas present in the shoreline jurisdiction include wetlands, and fish and wildlife habitat areas.

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

N/A.

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

None.

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

N/A.

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

The proposed SMP does not change the underlying comprehensive

plan and zoning designations. No inconsistency is created. Critical areas within shoreline jurisdiction will be regulated by the SMP critical areas element.

9. HOUSING

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

None. The proposed SMP would not change the underlying Comprehensive Plan land use or zoning designations.

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

None. The proposed SMP would not change the underlying Comprehensive Plan land use or zoning designations.

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

N/A.

10. AESTHETICS

- a. What is the tallest height of any proposed structures(s), not including antennas? What is the principal exterior building material(s) proposed?*

No specific structures are proposed. The proposed SMP maintains a maximum building height limitation of 35 feet above average grade level for properties in the shoreline jurisdiction.

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

N/A.

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

N/A. Other City regulations provide for view protection and aesthetic controls.

11. LIGHT AND GLARE

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

N/A.

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

N/A.

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

N/A.

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

Existing city regulations already require lighting to be directed and shielded to avoid off-site glare.

12. RECREATION

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

Portion of Ballinger Gold Course, Ballinger Boat Launch and Nile Temple Golf Course lie within shoreline jurisdiction.

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

No, this is a non project action.

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

One goal of the Shoreline Management Act is to provide for and enhance public access and recreational opportunities in the shorelines of the state. Public water-oriented recreational development is a preferred shoreline use.

13. HISTORIC AND CULTURAL PRESERVATION

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

None recorded.

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

None known.

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

The SMP requires that if any archeological artifacts are uncovered during excavations in the shoreline, work must stop and the affected Indian Tribes, and the State Department of Archeology and Historic Preservation must be notified. Permits issued in areas known or highly suspected to contain archeological artifacts and data require a site inspection and evaluation by an archeologist in coordination with affected Indian Tribes prior disturbance and for monitoring of potentially disruptive activities.

14. TRANSPORTATION

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

The 3 residents take access from 74th Avenue W (through City of Edmonds). Ballinger Golf Course and Ballinger Boat Launch take access from Lakeview Drive. Nile Temple Golf Course takes access from 244th Street SW (SR 104).

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

Yes, Community Transit provides service on Lakeview Drive with bus stops near Ballinger Boat Launch. The Community Transit Park and Ride and Sound Transit Flyer Stop are located east of the shoreline area at I-5 and 236th Street SW. King County Metro serves 244th Street SW/SR 104.

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

N/A.

- d. Will the proposal require any new roads or streets, or improvements to existing roads or streets, not including***

driveways? If so, generally describe (indicate whether public or private).

N/A.

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

N/A.

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

N/A.

- g. Proposed measures to reduce or control transportation impacts, if any.*

The proposed SMP prohibits new transportation facilities in the shoreline.

15. PUBLIC SERVICES

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

No.

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

N/A.

16. UTILITIES

- a. Circle utilities currently available at the site:*

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

All of the above utilities, as well as cable TV and cellular telephone service, are currently available throughout the city. The City does not provide or support septic systems. Concurrency is required at time of a specific development action.

- 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 that might be needed.*

No new utilities are proposed.

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: _____

Date Submitted: November 23, 2011

ATTACHMENTS

- ESA Checklist
- Final Shoreline Inventory and Characterization Report (ESA Adolfson, December 2010) with Maps
- Draft Cumulative Impacts Assessment (ESA Adolfson, June 2011)
- Draft Restoration Plan (ESA Adolfson, August 2011)
- Draft SMP (November, 2011)

D. SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NON-PROJECT ACTIONS

Because these questions are very general, it may be helpful to read them in conjunction with the list of 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 substance, or production of noise?*

The proposal would be unlikely to increase discharges to water; emissions to air; production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or production of noise. The anticipated development and redevelopment in the shoreline jurisdiction is expected to be low. Proposed activity and development would be subject to applicable local, state, and federal regulatory requirements, including building code, fire code, and surface water design standards, in addition to the provisions of the proposed SMP update. As part of the SMP update, a Cumulative Impacts Analysis (CIA) was completed to assess the potential adverse impacts that could result from uses and developments permitted through the SMP. The CIA concluded that, over time, reasonably foreseeable development in the shoreline would not result in a net loss of ecological functions such as water quality and could see some improvement. The CIA is included as Appendix A

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increase are:

The proposed SMP includes policies and regulations for the protection of the shoreline environment and addressing impacts of specific uses and shoreline modifications. Generally, the proposed SMP shoreline environment designations and the updated development standards and regulation of shoreline modifications provides more protection for shoreline ecological processes. The Restoration Plan provides opportunities to improve or restore ecological functions that have been impaired as a result of past development activities.

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

The proposed SMP is expected to have a minor positive impact on the shoreline plants, animals and fish. Since the proposed SMP has

been developed, in part, to meet the goal of "no net loss" of shoreline ecological functions, impacts to shoreline ecological functions will be avoided, minimized, or compensated for. Additionally, the shoreline restoration plan addresses the goal of improving shoreline ecological functions that have been degraded over time from past development activities. Through goals, policies, development standards, use regulations, and mitigation requirements, the proposed SMP provides protection and enhancement of wildlife habitat, vegetation, and management of critical areas (streams, wetlands).

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

The proposed SMP requires that all uses and development (even exempt activities) achieve no net loss of ecological functions. As part of the SMP update, a Cumulative Impacts Analysis (CIA) was completed to analyze the potential adverse impacts that could result from uses and developments permitted through the proposed SMP. The CIA concluded that, over time, reasonably foreseeable development in the shoreline would not result a net loss of ecological functions such as fish and wildlife habitat.

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

The proposed SMP update would not result in depletion of energy or natural resources. Mining, agriculture, aquaculture, and forestry are prohibited in all shoreline environments in the proposed SMP.

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

No specific measures are proposed.

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?*

Generally, the proposed SMP establishes policies and regulations for the protection and conservation of critical areas and public access recreational sites. The proposed SMP provides a new system of shoreline environment designations and updated development standards and regulation of shoreline modifications that provide more protection for shoreline processes.

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

Numerous provisions of the proposed SMP were developed consistent with the state shoreline guidelines (WAC 173-26), to provide a level of protection of shoreline to assure no net loss of ecological functions. These include protections of critical areas and native shoreline vegetation. They also include limitations of damaging shoreline development and shoreline modifications. The CIA and Restoration Plan together with the proposed SMP provide for protection and enhancement of shoreline elements.

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 proposed SMP does not allow or encourage uses that are not compatible with existing plans. The proposed SMP does create preferences for water-oriented uses and public access in the shoreline area. At the same time, most uses that are allowed by the underlying zoning are permitted provided they are developed consistent with the SMP's development standards.

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

Consistent with the state's shoreline guidelines (WAC 173-26), the proposed SMP includes provisions that require that all new shoreline uses or development mitigate their adverse impacts to achieve no net loss of shoreline ecological functions. Mitigation sequencing consistent with WAC 173-26-201(2)(e) is required.

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

The proposed SMP update does not establish new patterns of land use or increased density of existing land use patterns. Foreseeable development on redevelopment will not likely result in any significant changes to or increased demand for public services or infrastructure.

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

Since increased demands are not anticipated, no specific measures are proposed.

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

The proposed SMP is meant to be consistent with and work in conjunction with several local, State and federal programs to protect the functions and values of shoreline resources and the environment in general. Conflict with other laws is not expected. The critical areas regulations in the proposed SMP prevail over Chapter 16.15 MTMC, Critical Areas Ordinance, which applies elsewhere in the City of Mountlake Terrace.

ESA LISTED SALMONIDS CHECKLIST

Applicant Information

Name: City of Mountlake Terrace

Phone: 425.776.1161

Location: City of Mountlake Terrace

Project Information

Name and description:

Mountlake Terrace Shoreline
Master Program (SMP)
Update

This worksheet was designed to help project proponents and government agencies identify if project needs further analysis regarding adverse affects on ESA (Endangered Species Act) listed salmonids. Salmonids are salmon, trout and chars, e.g. bull trout. For our purposes, "ESA listed salmonids" is defined as fish species listed as endangered, threatened or being considered for listing.

If ESA listed species are present or ever were present in the watershed where your project will be located, your project has the potential for affecting them, and you need to comply with the ESA. The questions in this section will help determine if the ESA listings will impact your project. The Fish Program Manager at the appropriate Department of Fish and Wildlife (DFW) regional office can provide information for the following two questions. See attached list of Department of Fish and Wildlife regional offices.

- 1. *Are ESA listed salmonids currently present in the watershed in which your project will be?***

Yes: X No:

Please describe:

This is a non-project action. However, salmonids are listed in the west fork of Lyon Creek, which flows into McAleer Creek and eventually to Lake Washington. Salmonids are listed in McAleer Creek downstream from Lake Ballinger within the City limits of Lake Forest Park.

- 2. *Has there ever been an ESA listed salmonid stock present in this watershed?***

Yes: X No: Uncertain:

Please describe:

See above. The Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Fish Presence Report from the Streamnet Database, report dated 02/06/03, lists Priority Anadromous Fish Presence of Coho Salmon

and Winter Steelhead in McAleer Creek. The report also lists Priority Resident Fish Presence of Cutthroat in McAleer Creek.

If you answered "yes" to either of the above questions, you should complete the remainder of this checklist.

PROJECT SPECIFIC: The questions in this section are specific to the project and vicinity.

1. *Name of Watershed:*

Cedar-Sammamish Watershed ((WRIA) 08, per Department of Ecology), locally known as The Lake Washington/Cedar River Watershed (per King County Department of Natural Resources and Parks) and more commonly known as the Lake Ballinger/McAleer Creek Watershed (per the Lake Ballinger/ McAleer Creek Forum). Within the Lake Ballinger/McAleer Creek Watershed, there are three sub-basins: a) McAleer Creek, b) Lyon Creek, and c) Swamp Creek.

2. *Name of nearest waterbody:*

Lake Ballinger, Hall Creek, and McAleer Creek.

3. *What is the distance from this project to the nearest body of water? Often a buffer between the project and a stream can reduce the chance of a negative impact to fish.*

All water bodies listed are within the shoreline planning area.

4. *What is the current land use between the project and the potentially affected water body (parking lots, farmland, etc)?*

This is a non-project action. Refer to Environmental Checklist, Section B.8.a for a description of the land uses).

5. *Is the project above a:*

- *natural permanent barrier (waterfall)* Yes: No:
- *natural temporary barrier (beaver pond)* Yes: No:
- *man-made barrier (culvert, dam)* Yes: No:
- *other (explain)*

Weir on Hall Creek, just north of lake shoreline and a weir on McAleer Creek, just east of lake shoreline.

6. *If yes, are there any resident salmonid populations above the blockage?*

Yes: No: Don't know:

7. *What percent of the project will be impervious surface (including*

pavement & roof area)?

This is a non-project action. At the time of development, if any, impervious surfaces will be considered as part of individual project review and addressed consistent with City regulations.

FISH MIGRATION: The following questions will help determine if this project could interfere with migration of adult and juvenile fish. Both increases and decreases in water flows can affect fish migration.

1. Does the project require the withdrawal of:

I. Surface water? Yes: _____ No: X

Amount: _____

Name of surface water body: _____

ii. Ground water: Yes: _____ No: X

Amount: _____

From where: _____

Depth of well: _____

2. Will any water be rerouted? Yes: _____ No: X

If yes, will this require a channel change? N/A

3. Will there be retention ponds? Yes: _____ No: X

If yes, will this be an infiltration pond or a surface discharge to either a municipal storm water system or a surface water body?

At the time of development, if any, detention and retention facilities will be considered and constructed on a case-by-case basis as part of individual project review.

If to a surface water discharge, please give name of waterbody.

This is a non-project action. At the time of development, if any, storm water discharge would be evaluated, and compliance with applicable regulations and standards required.

4. Will this project require the building of new roads? Increased road mileage may affect the timing of water reaching a stream and may thus impact fish habitat.

Yes: _____ No: X

5. Are culverts proposed as part of this project? Yes: _____ No: X

6. ***Will topography changes affect the duration/ direction of runoff flows?***

Yes: _____ No: X

If Yes, describe the changes:

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. At the time of any future development, if any, changes in site topography will be considered and compliance with underlying City regulations and standards will be required.

7. ***Will the project involve any reduction of the floodway or floodplain by filling or other partial blockage of flows?***

Yes: _____ No: X

If yes, how will the loss of flood storage be mitigated by your project?

WATER QUALITY: The following questions will help determine if this project could adversely impact water quality. Such impacts can cause problems for listed species. Water quality can be made worse by runoff from impervious surfaces, altering water temperature, discharging contaminants, etc.

1. ***Do you know of any problems with water quality in any of the streams within this watershed.***

Yes X No _____

If yes, describe.

In general, there exist both water quantity and water quality issues within the Hall Creek/ Lake Ballinger/ McAleer drainage basin. The City maintains the existing infrastructure within jurisdictional boundaries and has developed storm drainage requirements for all development within these watershed basins. All applicants are required to meet these requirements as a condition of development.

2. ***Will your project either reduce or increase shade along or over a waterbody?***

Yes _____ No X

Removal of shading vegetation or the building of structures such as docks or floats often results in a change in shade.

Not applicable. However, compliance with critical areas regulations at time of development will preserve or protect some or all of these features.

3. ***Will the project increase nutrient loading or have the potential to***

increase nutrient loading or contaminants (fertilizers, other waste discharges, or runoff) to the waterbody?

Yes _____ No X

This is a non-project action. Compliance with the City's storm drainage requirements, which includes the adopted February 2005 Department of Ecology Stormwater Management Manual, will help reduce those impacts.

4. ***Will turbidity be increased because of construction of the project or during operation of the project? In-water or near water work will often increase turbidity.***

Yes _____ No X

This is a non-project action.

5. ***Will your project require long term maintenance, i.e. bridge cleaning, highway salting, chemical sprays for vegetation management, clearing of parking lots?***

Yes _____ No X

VEGETATION: The following questions are designed to determine if the project will affect riparian vegetation, thereby, adversely impacting salmon.

1. ***Will the project involve the removal of any vegetation from the stream banks?***

Yes _____ No X

If yes, please describe the existing conditions, and the amount and type of vegetation to be removed.

2. ***If any vegetation is removed, do you plan to re-plant?***

Yes _____ No X

If yes, what types of plants will you use?

Not applicable. However, the proposed SMP requires restoration and enhancement directly related to an activity or development.