

SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

UPDATED 2014

Purpose of checklist:

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

Instructions for applicants:

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

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

Instructions for Lead Agencies:

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

Use of checklist for nonproject proposals:

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

A. background

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable:

Walla Walla County Shoreline Master Program (SMP) Update

2. Name of applicant:

Walla Walla County

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

Walla Walla County Community Development Department

Attn: Lauren Prentice, Principal Planner

Phone number: (509)524-2620

310 W. Poplar, Suite 200

Walla Walla, WA 99362

4. Date checklist prepared:

March 8, 2016

5. Agency requesting checklist:

Walla Walla County

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

The SMP update process began in late 2013. The Planning Commission will hold a public hearing in April of 2016 and may vote in May 2016 to recommend the draft SMP to the Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) for local adoption. The BOCC is anticipated to adopt in June of 2016. After the SMP is locally adopted, the updated SMP and the supporting documentation will be delivered to Washington Department of Ecology for its formal review and approval.

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

The County is required to review and update the SMP every 8 years (Chapter 90.58.080(4)(a) RCW), following the completion of the current process.

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

- **Shoreline Analysis Report for Shorelines in Walla Walla County and the Cities of Walla Walla, Prescott and Waitsburg (Shoreline Analysis Report). September 2014.**
- **Shoreline Restoration Plan for Shorelines in Walla Walla County and the Cities of Walla Walla, Prescott and Waitsburg (Restoration Plan). June 2015.**
- **Cumulative Impacts Analysis for the Walla Walla County Shoreline Master Program. November 2015.**

Project-specific reviews will be prepared by applicants for individual development or restoration proposals under the proposed SMP.

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 known pending.

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

- **SEPA Review**
- **Adoption by the Walla Walla County Board of Commissioners**
- **Washington Department of Ecology Approval**

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

The proposed project is an update to the 1975 Walla Walla County SMP to be consistent with state law as required by the Washington Department of Ecology pursuant to SMP Grant Agreement No. G1400494.

This action implements the Washington State Shoreline Management Act (Chapter 90.58 RCW), which governs the development of Washington's shorelines. Local jurisdictions are required to update their SMPs in accordance with the Guidelines in Washington State Administrative Code (WAC) 173-26, which was revised in 2003 to reflect current knowledge regarding shoreline management and science.

The SMP includes goals and policies, development regulations, and shoreline jurisdiction maps with shoreline environment designations. Project elements also include a programmatic Shoreline Restoration Plan and a Cumulative Impacts Analysis (CIA). The CIA evaluates the cumulative impacts of reasonably foreseeable future development on shoreline ecological functions, and concludes with a statement that the SMP will not result in a net degradation of those functions.

This proposed non-project action would modify Chapter 3 of the Walla Walla County Comprehensive Plan (Shorelines Element), repeal the 1975 SMP, and create a new Walla Walla County Shoreline Master Program containing goals, policies and regulations to govern the use of County's shorelines.

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 updated SMP will apply to shoreline jurisdiction within Walla Walla County. Shoreline jurisdiction encompasses approximately 225 miles of river shoreline, including the Snake and Columbia Rivers, the Walla Walla and Touchet Rivers, Mill Creek and lower Yellowhawk Creek. Shoreline jurisdiction also includes the shoreline of Bennington Lake. For each of these water bodies, jurisdiction includes land within 200 feet of the ordinary high water mark (OHWM), its floodway, contiguous 100-year floodplain extending a maximum of 200 feet inland of the floodway, and any associated wetlands. The County did not elect to expand shoreline jurisdiction to encompass the entire 100-year floodplain or critical area buffers.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS

1. Earth

a. General description of the site

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

The topography of shoreline jurisdiction is varied throughout Walla Walla County. The Snake River channel in most areas has steeply sloped banks or is within steep-sided canyons with limited vegetation. The Columbia River shoreline jurisdiction is generally flat, with the exception of Reach 1 (as identified in the Shoreline Analysis Report) along Highway 730 which is characterized by armoring and cliffs. The Walla Walla River, Yellowhawk Creek, the Touchet River, and Bennington Lake are generally characterized by flat or rolling shorelines. Mill Creek through the City of Walla Walla Urban Growth Area and approaching the confluence with the Walla Walla River is also generally flat, but the upper Mill Creek watershed (Reaches 13-15 in the Shoreline Analysis Report), in the Blue Mountains where Mill Creek originates, contains steeper slopes and is more mountainous.

More detailed information at the watershed- and shoreline-specific scale can be found in the Shoreline Analysis Report. When required, site-specific information will be provided by applicants at the time of submittal for a project.

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

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal.

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.

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal.

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

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal.

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.

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal.

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

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal.

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

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal.

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

This proposal is a non-project action. The SMP contains policies and regulations addressing fill within shoreline jurisdiction (see Section 6.10 – Fill and Excavation), as well as a variety of other regulations that require appropriate stabilization of disturbed soils (e.g., Section 5.2 – Water Quality). When required, site-specific information will be provided by

applicants at the time of submittal for a project.

2. Air

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

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal.

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

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal.

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

This project is a non-project action. The SMP does not contain any specific policies or regulations governing air quality. When required, site-specific information will be provided by applicants at the time of submittal for a project.

3. Water

- a. Surface Water:

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

The updated SMP addresses all waters meeting the shoreline minimum flow or acreage requirement within unincorporated Walla Walla County, as well as any associated wetlands and any tributary streams within shoreline jurisdiction. The portion of non-shoreline streams and waterbodies that lie within shoreline jurisdiction are regulated by the critical areas regulations incorporated as Appendix A of the SMP. Detailed information about each of these water bodies (Walla Walla River, Bennington Lake, Touchet River, Yellowhawk Creek, Columbia River, Snake River, and Mill Creek) can be found in the Shoreline Analysis Report.

- 2) Will the project require any work over, in, or adjacent to (within 200 feet) the described waters? If yes, please describe and attach available plans.

This proposal is a non-project action. All project-specific proposals that include work over, in or adjacent to any of the County's shoreline waters (Walla Walla River, Bennington Lake, Touchet River, Yellowhawk Creek, Columbia River, Snake River, and Mill Creek) would be subject to the policies and regulations of the SMP (unless the provisions of Section 1.3.3 indicate the specific proposed activity is not subject to the SMP, such as existing agriculture). When required, site-specific information will be provided by applicants at the time of submittal for a project.

- 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 – this is not a site-specific project proposal.

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

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal.

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

Yes, shoreline jurisdiction includes portions of the 100-year floodplain within 200 feet of the OHWM and within 200 feet of floodways, as shown in the Official Shoreline Maps that accompany the SMP. When required, site-specific information will be provided by applicants at the time of submittal for a project.

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.

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal.

b. Ground Water:

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

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal.

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 – this is not a site-specific project proposal.

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.

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal.

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

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal.

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

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal.

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

This proposal is a non-project action. The entire SMP contains policies and regulations governing uses and modifications in and adjacent to shoreline waterbodies. Some of the key regulatory sections include 5.1 – Ecological Protection and Critical Areas, 5.2 – Water Quality, and Appendix A, 6.5(B)(2) –riparian habitat area buffer widths, among others. When required, site-specific information will be provided by applicants at the time of submittal for a project.

4. **Plants**

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

- deciduous tree: alder, maple, aspen, other
- 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

This is not a site-specific project proposal. A variety of vegetation types exist in shoreline jurisdiction. Detailed information at the watershed and County scale can be found in the Shoreline Analysis Report.

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

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal. When required, site-specific information will be provided by applicants at the time of submittal for a project.

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

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal. When required, site-specific information will be provided by applicants at the time of submittal for a project.

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

This proposal is a non-project action. The SMP contains policies and regulations governing alterations to shoreline vegetation, and requiring suitable mitigation, in Sections 5.3 – Vegetation Conservation and Appendix A –Critical Areas in Shoreline Jurisdiction, among others. When required, site-specific information will be provided by applicants at the time of submittal for a project.

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

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal. When required, site-specific information will be provided by applicants at the time of submittal for a project.

5. **Animals**

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

birds: other: mammals: bear, elk, beaver,
fish: _____

Habitat within shoreline jurisdiction in Walla Walla County is varied. Table 3-1 in the Shoreline Analysis Report (SAR) lists all priority habitats and species identified by WDFW in

Walla Wala -County and Maps 17-19 in the SAR Map Folio provides these PHS maps. The Walla Walla Subbasin Plan identifies more than 13 non-native species of fish, 17 native species of fish, 69 mammal species, 10 amphibian species, 207 bird species, and 15 reptile species inhabiting the Walla Walla subbasin. According to the Lower Snake Subbasin Plan there are approximately 18 introduced species of fish, 18 native species of fish and a variety of wildlife. Hundreds of fish and wildlife species reside in or migrate through the Columbia River. Additional information on species by shoreline and reach is available in the Shoreline Analysis Report.

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

Shoreline jurisdiction may contain the following state or federally listed threatened or endangered species which are known to be present in Walla Walla County: Bull Trout/Dolly Varden, Chinook salmon, Sockeye Salmon, Coho, Rainbow Trout/Inland Redband Trout, Steelhead, American white pelican, ferruginous hawk, upland sandpiper and gray wolf.

Additionally, the following state or federal candidate species may be present in shoreline jurisdiction: leopard dace, Umatilla dace, mountain sucker, sockeye, Columbia spotted frog, Rocky Mountain tailed frog, Western toad, striped whipsnake, sagebrush lizard, western grebe, golden eagle, northern goshawk, burrowing owl, flammulated owl, Vaux's swift, black-backed woodpecker, Lewis's woodpecker, pileated woodpecker, Loggerhead shrike, sage thrasher, Merriam's shrew, Preble's shrew, Townsend's big-eared bat, black-tailed jackrabbit, white-tailed jackrabbit, Washington ground squirrel, California floater.

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

Certain areas of Walla Walla County contain annual migratory birds and waterfowl. Other localized areas provide migration corridors for deer and other small terrestrial species.

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

This proposal is a non-project action. The SMP contains a number of policies and regulations that directly or indirectly protect ecological functions and wildlife habitat. Some of the key regulatory sections include 5.1 – Ecological Protection and Critical Areas and Appendix A, Section 6.0 – Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas, among others. This proposal also includes a programmatic Shoreline Restoration Plan that identifies opportunities and mechanisms for achieving improvements in wildlife habitat. When required, site-specific information will be provided by applicants at the time of submittal for a project.

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

None known. This proposal is a non-project action. When required, site-specific information will be provided by applicants at the time of submittal for a project.

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.

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal.

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

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal.

- 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:

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal.

7. Environmental health

- a. Are there any environmental health hazards, including exposure to toxic chemicals, risk of fire and explosion, spill, or hazardous waste, that could occur as a result of this proposal? If so, describe.

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal.

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

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal.

- 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.

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal.

- 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.

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal.

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

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal.

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

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal. When required, site-specific information will be provided by applicants at the time of submittal for a project.

b. Noise

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

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal.

- 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.

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal.

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

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal. The proposed SMP does not govern noise. When required, site-specific information will be provided by applicants at the time of submittal for a project.

8. Land and shoreline use

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

Walla Walla County's shoreline jurisdiction encompasses approximately 225 miles of river shoreline as well as the shoreline of Bennington Lake and current uses along these

shorelines vary. The Bennington Lake shoreline is primarily classified as being in public use. In the Snake River shoreline the most prevalent use is agriculture, while undeveloped land and transportation/communication/utility facilities also occupy a large portion of the shoreline. The Columbia River shoreline is characterized by a mix of industrial, resource production/extraction, and government-owned public uses. The predominant land use on the Walla Walla River, Yellowhawk Creek, the Touchet River and Mill Creek is resource production/extraction (agriculture). Yellowhawk Creek and Mill Creek, near Walla Walla and College Place, also contain a larger percentage of shoreline in residential use. Overall the shoreline of Mill Creek has the most varied land uses is the most urbanized. There is limited commercial use in unincorporated Walla Walla County along the shorelines.

- 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?

As noted above, resource production/extraction in the form of agriculture is the dominant land use in all of the County's shorelines except for along Bennington Lake. Maintenance of existing agriculture is commercially and culturally important to Walla Walla County, which is recognized in the policies and regulations in the SMP. There is also limited forest land in some parts of shoreline jurisdiction. This is not a site-specific proposal and so it will not directly result in the conversion of any agricultural or forest land.

- 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:

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal. The proposed SMP includes policies and regulations relating to the use impacts of equipment and operations along the shoreline. When required, site-specific information will be provided by applicants at the time of submittal for a project.

- c. Describe any structures on the site.

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal.

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

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal.

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

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal.

In shoreline jurisdiction, zoning is predominately a mix of agricultural, public, industrial, rural, residential and limited commercial.

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

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal.

According to the County's Comprehensive Plan, land use designations include a mix of agricultural, public, industrial, rural, residential, and limited commercial.

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

The current shoreline environment designations in Walla Walla County are Urban, Rural, Conservancy and Natural.

The proposed SMP designates six upland shoreline environments: Natural, Rural

Conservancy, Urban Conservancy, Rural Residential, Urban Residential and High Intensity. With the exception of areas designated Mill Creek Flume, areas below the OHWM of shoreline waterbodies are designated Aquatic. For the portion of Mill Creek located within the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Mill Creek Flood Control Project between the Rooks Park Spillway and Gose Street which are not designated to promote physical access to the water there will be a special environment designation called Mill Creek Flume.

See the proposed shoreline environment designation maps that accompany the SMP for specific application of the designations.

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

The Walla Walla County shoreline jurisdiction includes frequently flooded areas, fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas, and wetlands, geologically hazardous areas and critical aquifer recharge areas. Maps of many of these features are included in the Shoreline Analysis Report. Site-specific development proposals will be reviewed for the presence of critical areas on or near the site and will be required to comply with the shoreline critical areas regulations found in Appendix A of the SMP.

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

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal.

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

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal.

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

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal.

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

The SMP policies, regulations and proposed shoreline designations have been analyzed by the County and compared to the policies, regulations and designations in the Comprehensive Plan and County regulations and codes, and have been deemed compatible. Site-specific development proposals will be reviewed for compliance with the Walla Walla County SMP and other County codes and ordinances.

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

See 8(L).

9. Housing

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

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal.

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

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal.

No policies or regulations in the SMP will require elimination of any housing units in Walla Walla County. All existing uses are allowed to continue as either conforming or non-

conforming uses. Single-family residential uses are a preferred use, as identified in the SMP.

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

This proposal is a non-project action. When required, site-specific information will be provided by applicants at the time of submittal for a project.

The SMP contains a number of policies and regulations that determine how and where residential development can be constructed, and require mitigation for any adverse impacts. Some of the key regulatory sections include Section 5.1 – Ecological Protection and Critical Areas and Section 6.17 – Residential Development.

10. Aesthetics

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

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal.

Height limits in the SMP are generally consistent with upland zoning, and have an upper limit of 35 feet except when certain criteria are met and/or a Shoreline Variance is obtained. The SMP does not govern the choice of building materials, other than certain chemical treatments are prohibited in or over water.

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

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal.

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

The SMP does not govern the appearance of structures specifically, although there are provisions to protect views through visual access to shorelines, with a focus on public properties. As mentioned above, height limits in the SMP are consistent with upland zoning and have an upper limit of 35 feet except when certain criteria are met and/or a Shoreline Variance is obtained.

11. Light and glare

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

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal.

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

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal.

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

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal.

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

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal.

The SMP contains a provision limiting lights directed on wetlands, but does not otherwise regulate light or glare. When required, site-specific information will be provided by applicants at the time of submittal for a project.

12. Recreation

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

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal.

There are several formal recreational opportunities in shoreline jurisdiction including the Bennington Lake Recreation Area. There are several recreational boat launches, campsites, and parks along the Snake River (Hood Park Carbonneau Park, Fish Hook Park, Lower Monumental Boat Launch, and Ayer Boat Basin). The entire length of the Snake River, and the Columbia, is a designated route for the Northwest Discovery Water Trail, which provides tourists with boating and camping opportunities along the river between the Clearwater River in Idaho to the Bonneville Dam on the Columbia River. The Columbia River shoreline includes the following formal parks and recreation areas: McNary trails, Wallula Gap National Natural Landmark Area (Twin Sisters), Port Kelley, and Madam Dorian Memorial Park. Several trails are also located along the Columbia.-Yellowhawk Creek does not have any parks and have limited recreational opportunities. Parks/trails on Mill Creek include the following: Whitman Mission National Historic Site, Mill Creek/Bennington Lake Recreation Area and the Mill Creek Recreation Trail. The Walla Walla River contains two public boat launches and a 4-mile equestrian trail. Most of the land along the Touchet River is in private ownership and public access is currently limited, there are no trails or boat launches. More information on formal and informal recreation opportunities is available in the Shoreline Analysis Report.

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

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal.

The policies and regulations in the SMP do not encourage displacement of recreational uses and encourage creation and enhancement of visual and physical public access opportunities.

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

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal.

Public access on public lands, including recreation, is an important goal of the Shoreline Management Act, and it is supported in a variety of ways in the SMP. Policies and regulations have been specifically crafted to facilitate appropriate expansion of existing private and public recreation facilities.

13. Historic and cultural preservation

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

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal.

The Columbia and Snake Rivers have been major regional waterways for centuries, providing fishing, hunting, and transportation for native peoples. After European settlement of the region and the rise of agriculture and mineral extraction operations, these rivers provided a means to transport goods. Numerous sections of the Snake and Columbia were dammed in the early and mid-20th Century to ease navigation, provide irrigation water, and generate hydroelectric power. The portion of the Snake that borders Walla Walla County contains two dams: the Ice Harbor Dam was completed in 1961, and the Lower Monumental Dam was completed in 1969. While these two structures are not included in local or national registers of historic sites, both are more than 50 years old.

In Walla Walla County, cultural resources sited on the Columbia River are concentrated at the McNary Wildlife Refuge, specifically at the northwest end of Burbank Slough. The wildlife refuge contains 9 documented historic structures, including quarters, storage and service buildings, a shop, and a set of granaries.

The Touchet and Snake Rivers are designated as part of the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail. While no physical trail facilities are provided for modern hikers, both SR 124 and U.S. 12 are part of the Lewis and Clark Auto Tour Route.

- 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.

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal.

Given the traditional tribal presence in Walla Walla County and the use of shorelines for sustenance and spiritual practices, archaeological features could be present along shorelines. When required, site-specific information will be provided by applicants at the time of submittal for a project and relevant Archaeological and Historic Resources policies and regulations (see 5.4) applicable to activity or development within the shoreline will apply.

- 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.

This proposal is a non-project action. The SMP contains a number of policies and regulations governing protection of historic and cultural resources (see 5.4 – Archaeological and Historic Resources). When required, site-specific information will be provided by applicants at the time of submittal for a project.

- 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.

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal. When required, site-specific information will be provided by applicants at the time of submittal for a project.

By regulation 5.2(B), if cultural resources are present, the Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation predictive Model shall be applied and survey recommendations should be followed based on the identified risk. All state laws applying to the protection of cultural resources must be followed.

14. Transportation

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

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal.

In general, transportation infrastructure in Walla Walla County shoreline jurisdiction includes County roads and bridges and State Highways.

- 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?

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal.

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

many would the project or proposal eliminate?

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal.

- 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).

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal.

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

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal.

Existing transportation infrastructure in shoreline jurisdiction includes roads, bridges, rail infrastructure, and parking areas. New transportation facilities are not generally anticipated; however, replacement, repair, and maintenance of existing facilities are likely. Some of the uses and modifications allowed by the SMP may use water or rail transportation during construction or operation.

- 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?

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal.

- 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.

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal.

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

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal.

Regulations in Section 6.21 (Transportation and Circulation) of the SMP control the impacts of transportation facilities on ecological functions and other land uses.

15. Public services

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

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal.

Policies and regulations in the SMP are not likely to increase the need for public services in Walla Walla County.

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

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal.

16. Utilities

- a. Circle utilities currently available at the site:

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

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal.

Electricity, public and domestic water, refuse service, communications, sanitary sewer, septic systems and cable television systems are provided throughout Walla Walla County by government and non-government providers.

- 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.

Not applicable – this is not a site-specific project proposal.

C. Signature

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

Signature: 

Name of signee: Lauren Prentice

Position and Agency/Organization Principal Planner, Walla Walla County Community Development
Department

Date Submitted: 3/15/16

D. supplemental sheet for nonproject actions

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

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

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

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

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are:

As a non-project action, adoption of the updated SMP would not increase discharges to water; emissions to air; production of noise; or production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances. Each project subject to the SMP will undergo a project-specific environmental review and will be required to comply with numerous policies and regulations designed to reduce (either directly or indirectly) environmental impacts.

There are management policies within the SMP located in the provisions for Environment Designations (Section 4.0); general regulations affecting all shoreline uses, modifications and activities (Section 5.0), such as vegetation conservation, mitigation sequencing, water quality protection, etc.; critical areas (Appendix A), such as wetlands protection, shoreline buffers, and wildlife and habitat preservation; and specific regulations affecting all shoreline uses, modifications and activities (Section 6.0), such as shoreline stabilization, boating facilities, dredging, fill, residential development, etc. Many of these policies and regulations are included in the document to provide regulatory authority in support of limiting impacts to the environment, such as discharges to water and emissions to the air. Noise and air quality are not elements specifically addressed in the SMP, but the County's other regulations and project review processes would still apply.

The entire SMP has been prepared and evaluated with the intent of meeting a "no net loss of ecological functions" standard, which is required by WAC 173-26. The Cumulative Impacts Analysis documents that evaluation and concludes with a determination that the updated SMP does in fact meet that standard.

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

The adoption of the proposed SMP will not directly affect any of these elements. Each project subject to the SMP will undergo an independent, project-specific environmental review conducted to address potential impacts to these elements of the environment. See response to Question 1 above.

As documented in the Cumulative Impacts Analysis, ecological function will either remain the same as current condition, or more likely improve over time (particularly with voluntary implementation of elements of the Shoreline Restoration Plan).

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

No additional measures are needed. Each project reviewed under the SMP will be required to comply with numerous policies and regulations designed to protect and conserve these resources. As needed, mitigation measures will be applied and implemented in order to provide no net loss of ecological function.

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

Individual projects submitted for review under the new SMP will be required to comply with the policies and regulations in the SMP and the Walla Walla County Code. The proposed SMP contains management policies and regulations intended to encourage, and in some cases require, conservation of natural resources associated with the shoreline, in accordance with RCW 90.58 and WAC 173-26. The SMP does not have a significant effect on energy use. Consumptive new or redeveloped uses would only be allowed to the extent already planned for and evaluated in the County's Comprehensive Plan. County building codes would address energy conservation.

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

No additional measures are needed.

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 updated SMP has been prepared to comply with requirements in State law, including RCW 90.58 and WAC 173-26, for the protection of environmentally sensitive areas associated with shorelines of the State. There are policies and regulations throughout the document that are designed to protect and preserve shoreline habitat and functioning conditions to ensure no net loss of ecological functions. Examples include 1) environment designations that focus development on specific areas with existing development and shoreline alterations; 2) shoreline critical areas regulations that protect sensitive areas through appropriate science-based buffers and limitations on new uses; 3) mitigation sequencing, which directs potential development to first avoid, then minimize, and finally mitigate for unavoidable impacts; and 4) shoreline use and modification provisions, which ensure that likely development is guided by regulations that will protect existing functions while allowing priority shoreline activities to occur. The Shoreline Restoration Plan identifies ongoing and planned voluntary restoration that will provide an opportunity to improve shoreline conditions over time.

There prime agricultural land in unincorporated Walla Walla County, and the SMP appropriately designates those lands Rural Conservancy, which ensures Comprehensive Plan consistency.

Policies and regulations in the SMP will enhance public access to the shorelines and encourage continued protection of sensitive shoreline habitat, including those habitats occupied by state or federally listed fish and wildlife. Conditions for listed fish species, in particular, will remain the same or improve as a result of the updated SMP, including the Shoreline Restoration Plan, and other County and regional programs and activities targeting enhancement of shorelines. See additional discussion in the Cumulative Impacts Analysis.

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

No additional measures are needed. Each project reviewed under the SMP will be required to comply with numerous policies and regulations designed to protect and conserve environmentally sensitive areas. Adequate mitigation measures, based on the development standards in the code, will be applied to and implemented for site-specific proposals in order to provide no net loss of ecological function.

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 purpose of the SMP is to manage shorelines by planning for and fostering all reasonable and appropriate uses while ensuring development that will promote and enhance the public interest and protect against adverse effects to the public health, the land and its vegetation and wildlife, and the waters of the state and their aquatic life. For the portion of Mill Creek located within the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Mill Creek Flood Control Project between the Rooks Park Spillway and Gose Street which are not designated to promote physical access to the water there is a special environment designation called Mill Creek Flume. The SMP designates six upland shoreline environments: Natural, Rural Conservancy, Urban Conservancy, Rural Residential, Urban Residential and High Intensity. With the exception of areas designated Mill Creek Flume, areas below the OHWM of shoreline waterbodies are designated Aquatic. Each environment is provided designation criteria and management policies, and has been designed for consistency with existing uses, local zoning and future plans.

In addition, the SMP contains general provisions, policies and regulations for a variety of resources and uses within the shoreline environments. These management policies, provisions and regulations are intended to preserve shoreline processes, habitat, and functional values, while giving preference to water-dependent and water-related uses and encouraging public access. Uses with a significant adverse impact are prohibited or regulated so as to minimize impacts on the shoreline environment.

The SMP has been evaluated for consistency with Walla Walla County Code.

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

No additional measures are needed. Measures to avoid and reduce shoreline impacts are built into the SMP.

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

The SMP would not be likely to increase demands on transportation or public services and utilities beyond that already planned for and evaluated by the County. The SMP would guide the location and installation of transportation and public services and utilities, and these uses would need to follow standards for critical areas protection, vegetation conservation, and others.

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

No additional measures are needed.

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

The adoption of an updated Shoreline Master Program will ensure County compliance with requirements in Washington State law for environmental planning and regulation within areas of shoreline jurisdiction (RCW 90.58 and WAC 173-26). Critical Areas Regulations are included in the SMP, as required by WAC 173-26. In addition, the goals and policies of the SMP will be consistent with the Walla Walla County Code. The Shoreline Master Program does not supersede other agencies' authority to regulate projects within their jurisdiction (e.g., U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Washington Department of Ecology, Washington Department of Natural Resources, etc.).