

# SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

## ***Purpose of checklist:***

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

## ***Instructions for applicants:***

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

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

## ***Instructions for Lead Agencies:***

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

## ***Use of checklist for nonproject proposals:***

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

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

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

An ordinance making modifications to the regulations in K.C.C. 21A that apply to a Regional Motor Sports Facility Interim Use Permit

### **2. Name of applicant:**

The proposal was initiated by King County.

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

Jake Tracy, Principal Legislative Analyst  
King County Council  
516 3<sup>rd</sup> Ave Ste 1200  
Seattle, WA 98104  
206-263-0875  
jtracy@kingcounty.gov

### **4. Date checklist prepared:**

August 22, 2023

Jake Tracy

### **5. Agency requesting checklist:**

King County.

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

The King County Council anticipates possible action on the proposed ordinance in the fourth quarter of 2023.

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

There are no known plans to add or expand the proposed ordinance in the future.

If adopted, King County anticipates permit applications for development that will be subject to the proposed regulations.

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

- SEPA checklist for this proposal
- SEPA Checklist for original Interim Use Permit ordinance, Ordinance 19331 (2015-0437)
- LUT417-0003 [SEPA Checklist](#)
- LUT417-0003 [Environmental Noise, Air Quality, GHG and Light and Glare Report](#)

- LUT417-0003 [Traffic Impact Analysis](#)
- LUT417-0003 [Drainage Technical Information Report](#)
- LUT417-0003 [Geotech and Hydrology Report](#)
- LUT417-0003 [Assessment of Habitat for Species of Concern](#)
- LUT417-0003 [Preliminary Assessment of Potential Water Quality Impacts](#)

**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.**

The proposal is a nonproject action and applies to the properties that are subject to the regional motor sports facility master planning process demonstration project. The existing County Code and the proposed ordinance would require additional permits from the County's permitting agency for development activity to occur on the site. King County maintains a list of pending applications online at <https://aca-prod.accela.com/kingco/Default.aspx>.

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

Approval by the King County Council is the only government approval required for adoption of the proposed ordinance. Individual development projects that would be subject to the proposed ordinance would also be subject to all applicable federal, state, and local permitting and licensing requirements.

**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.)**

Proposed Ordinance 2023-0267 would adopt amendments to K.C.C. 21A.55.105, which currently contains regulations for a regional motor sports facility master planning process demonstration project, as well as for an interim use permit that allows for a subset of demonstration project-development activity to occur prior to permitting of the full demonstration project.

The proposed ordinance would make changes to the type and amount of development allowed under an interim use permit and would change the process for approval of modifications to an existing interim use permit. An interim use permit has previously been issued for the site.

The proposed ordinance would:

- Change allowed interim use permit activities to include:
  - Adding paved impervious surface area, including, but not limited to, parking, a new vehicular access point to SE 304th Street, and internal access roads, with total impervious surface area not to exceed thirty-three and one-third percent of the site;
  - Adding grandstands to accommodate up to 25,000 persons; and
  - Replacing existing grandstands.
- Clarify that excavation and processing of materials is limited to the materials necessary to undertake the updated list of allowed activities.
- Require a preliminary, rather than a final, drainage plan for interim use permit approval.
- Remove a requirement that the interim use permit contain a condition requiring all grading and construction activities to be completed within 60 months of February 27, 2016
- Stipulate that, upon interim use permit issuance, any subsequent modifications to the interim use permit be processed as a Type 1 land use decision (i.e., an administrative approval) rather than a Type 3 land use decision, which requires hearing examiner approval.

- Change the allowed time for establishment of the uses or activities authorized by an interim use permit or subsequent modification from five years with the option for five annual extensions to ten years with the option for five annual extensions.

Compliance with existing federal, state, and local regulations is presumed for purposes of this SEPA checklist, including compliance with the regulations in the proposed ordinance itself, as well as others such as those related to drinking water, stormwater, wastewater treatment, septic systems, critical areas, and zoning requirements. Any noncompliant uses or structures would be subject to code enforcement and would not be considered an impact related to the proposed ordinance.

The King County Council could modify the proposed ordinance and still accomplish the proposal’s objective. Depending on the modification, the likelihood, scale, or scope of potential impacts to various elements of the environment could be the same, greater, or less.

As would be the case for any nonproject or project action that undergoes changes after the publication of a SEPA threshold determination, the King County Executive branch, which pursuant to KCC 20.44.020 is the Lead Agency for SEPA for King County, would evaluate any modifications that are proposed to be made to the proposed ordinance and would update this environmental review in the case that changes would result in greater or different impacts than those identified in this checklist. The timing of additional environmental review process may vary depending on other variables, including future public processes.

**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 proposed ordinance would apply to all parcels subject to the regional motor sports facility master planning process demonstration project. The demonstration project applies to seven parcels: 1021059002, -9003, -9008, -9019 and -9029, 1121059035 and 0321059190. Collectively these parcels are known as the Pacific Raceways site. The site is located in unincorporated King County, just east of Highway 18 and the City of Auburn, at 31001 144<sup>th</sup> Ave SE.

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

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

**a. General description of the site:**

(circle one) Flat, rolling, hilly, steep slopes, mountainous, other \_\_\_\_\_

County maps show that the eastern portion of the site is generally flat, with some steep slopes along the western portion of the property.

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

County maps show that there are slopes that are greater than 40 % along the western portion of the site.

**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.**

According to the Geotechnical Report submitted as part of the interim use permit application, “the near surface soils at the site consist of Vashon glacial outwash with localized areas of lacustrine or lake sediments. The outwash sand and gravel material overlies glacial till and advance outwash sand and gravel deposits. Based on our subsurface explorations in the area, the till is between 40 feet and 70 feet below the existing ground surface at the site. The recessional outwash material consists of sand with gravel and occasional cobbles, and minor silt. The outwash material is in a medium dense to dense condition. The lacustrine soils consist of medium dense to dense sand with variable gravel and silt. The lacustrine sediments generally occur in the northeast portion of the kart track site, west of the subject development site.”<sup>1</sup>

As the geotechnical report only focused on a portion of the Pacific Raceways site, soil conditions may be different elsewhere on site.

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

According to the Geotechnical Report submitted as part of the interim use permit application, “Most of the soil at the site contains sufficient fines to produce an unstable mixture when wet. Such soil is highly susceptible to changes in water content and tends to become unstable and impossible to proof-roll and compact if the moisture content exceeds the optimum. In addition, during wet weather months, the groundwater levels could increase, resulting in seepage into site excavations.” The report therefore recommended that earthwork occur during dry months if possible.<sup>2</sup>

**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.**

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not directly authorize any fill, excavation, or grading. Fill, excavation, or grading could be allowed through the interim use permit process, and any such activity would continue to be subject to existing development regulations related to stormwater management, impervious surfaces, critical areas, clearing and grading, and/or landscaping. Unless exempt under state and county requirements, filling, excavation, and grading is also subject to SEPA review.

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

Although the proposed ordinance would not direct any development activities, potential erosion can result from clearing, construction, or use of land for development that is subject to the proposed ordinance. The proposed ordinance does not amend existing regulations on clearing, grading, or construction that could cause erosion. For example, the King County Surface Water Design Manual and shorelines and critical areas regulations would be unchanged by the proposed ordinance and would continue to apply to development projects subject to the proposed ordinance.

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

---

<sup>1</sup> Page 4 of GeoResources *Geotechnical Engineering & Hydrogeologic Report* (linked above).

<sup>2</sup> Page 17 of GeoResources *Geotechnical Engineering & Hydrogeologic Report* (linked above).

The proposed ordinance would not have any direct impacts to impervious surface percentages. The proposed ordinance would allow additional impervious surface on the Pacific Raceways site under an interim use permit, not to exceed 33.33% of the total site. This level of impervious surface is already allowed on the site through the full demonstration project, so the proposed ordinance would only change the process for approving such proposals. The impervious surface maximum for the I zone, in which the project is located, is 70%.

All development projects would continue to be subject to existing development regulations related to impervious surface coverage. Unless exempt under state and county requirements, projects proposing development that would add impervious surfaces would also be subject to SEPA review.

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

Because the proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not have any direct impacts, no measures to control erosion or other impacts to the earth are proposed. King County's existing regulations related to erosion and soils would apply to any development to which the proposed ordinance would apply.

**2. Air** [\[help\]](#)

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not result in any direct emissions to the air. Projects subject to the proposed ordinance might result in air emissions from construction and operation activities but would be subject to existing federal, state, and local regulations for these types of emissions. The proposed ordinance would not modify any federal, state, or local codes that provide standards or controls for these types of emissions. Air emissions are discussed in more detail in Part D of this checklist.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not be affected by off-site sources of emissions or odor. Highway 18 is within a few hundred feet of the western edge of the Pacific Raceways site but is not likely to impact implementation of the proposed ordinance. More information on environmental air quality near the site can be found in the Environmental Noise, Air Quality, GHG, and Light and Glare Report linked at the beginning of this checklist.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action and would not have any direct impacts to air emissions, and development projects to which it would apply would be subject to existing regulations regarding emissions and reporting requirements. Additional federal, state, and local codes may provide standards and controls for these types of emissions and would not be modified by the proposed ordinance. As a result, no measures to reduce or control emissions or other potential impacts to air are proposed.

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

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

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

Soosette Creek (shown as Class 2S on County maps) is located along the western portion of the site, and Big Soos Creek (shown as Class 1 on County maps) is located south of the site. In 2021, a conservation easement was recorded protecting the areas of the site surrounding these two streams.

**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.**

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not directly require any work over, in, or adjacent to the described waters. Big Soos Creek is within the shoreline jurisdiction and is just south of the Pacific Raceways site. State and local shoreline regulations would apply to any development subject to the proposed ordinance that is within 200 feet of waters within unincorporated King County's shoreline jurisdiction. Other development regulations, including critical areas regulations, concerning the protection of waterbodies may also apply depending on the proximity of any development to these waters.

**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.**

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not authorize filling or dredging from surface water or wetlands. Individual development projects subject to the proposed ordinance would also be subject to all state, local, and federal regulations, including mitigation requirements, concerning fill or dredge material placed in or removed from surface water or wetlands.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not require any surface water withdrawals or diversions. Individual development projects subject to the proposed ordinance would also be subject to existing regulations concerning surface water diversions and withdrawals, including those regarding in-stream flows, if applicable.

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

The property is not located within a 100-year floodplain.

**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.**

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not directly involve any discharges of waste materials to surface waters. Development projects subject to the proposed ordinance would also be subject to existing state, local, and federal regulations concerning the protection of and discharge of waste materials to surface waters, including state regulations on water usage, wastewater disposal, and state antidegradation standards.

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

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action and would not directly involve any withdrawals of groundwater or discharge to groundwater. Development projects subject to the proposed ordinance that use groundwater or discharge to groundwater would be subject to all existing state, local, and federal regulations concerning groundwater removal and protection. The Pacific Raceways site is served by the Covington Water District.

**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.**

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not result in any discharge of waste material into the ground. The Pacific Raceways site is served by a private on-site septic system. Development projects subject to the proposed ordinance may discharge waste material from septic tanks or other sources and would be required to treat and dispose of any waste in a manner compliant with state and local regulations.

**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.**

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not directly generate or affect water runoff. Individual development projects subject to the proposed ordinance might generate some water runoff. As with any development in unincorporated King County, on-site stormwater management would be required to comply with the King County Surface Water Design Manual, including applicable Best Management Practices (BMPs) for treatment and flow prior to discharge, and existing maximum impervious surface regulations.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not directly result in any waste material entering ground or surface waters. Development projects subject to the proposed ordinance might result in waste matter that could enter ground or surface waters, but such projects would be subject to existing state, local, and federal regulations concerning the protection of surface and ground water.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action and would not alter or otherwise affect drainage patterns. Development projects subject to the proposed ordinance would be subject to existing drainage regulations, which are unchanged by the subject ordinance. The proposed ordinance would not change the amount of impervious surface allowed on site, only the permitting process necessary to achieve a certain amount of impervious surface.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not have any direct impacts to surface or ground water, runoff water, or drainage patterns. Existing federal, state, and local regulations related to surface water discharge and withdrawal, groundwater discharge and withdrawal, runoff water (stormwater), and drainage would apply to any development projects subject to the proposed ordinance. No additional measures to reduce or control any potential surface, ground, and runoff water and drainage pattern impacts are proposed under this ordinance. Individual development proposals might be required to provide these measures.

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

**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

Although the proposed ordinance is a nonproject action, the Pacific Raceways site contains a variety of trees, shrubs, and grass. As Soosette Creek is located on the western portion of the site, it is likely that wet-soil plants and water plants are also present in that area. The 2021 conservation easement requires revegetation of the conserved areas around Big Soos and Soosette creeks with native species.

As part of the 2017 interim use permit application, the property owner hired a consulting firm to conduct a habitat survey on a portion of the site, namely the eastern portion of parcel 1021059003. The firm's report states, in part:

"Habitat types found were mowed grassland dominated by unknown grasses and invasive forbs, gravel pad, Himalayan blackberry and scotch broom brush areas, and conifer forest dominated by Douglas-fir with some western hemlock, a patch of cottonwoods, and one bigleaf maple sapling (Table 1). The understory of the conifer forest was mainly salal, with Oregon grape, Himalayan blackberry, scotch broom, and the occasional wild rose. Other plants were found at lower frequency and many of the invasive forbs were found at the forest edge outside of the trees but not in the mowed area."<sup>3</sup>

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

Although the proposed ordinance is a nonproject action, the proposed ordinance would allow creation of additional impervious surface under the interim use permit, which might involve vegetation removal. However, as noted above, the proposed ordinance does not allow for more impervious surface than is allowed on the site currently, but rather changes the permitting process by which impervious surface can be added to the site. The kind and amount of vegetation to be removed or altered would be determined and evaluated during the permitting process.

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

The United States Fish and Wildlife Service lists the following endangered or threatened plant species in Washington state: golden paintbrush, Kincaid's Lupine, Marsh Sandwort, Nelson's checker-mallow, Showy stickseed, Spalding's Catchfly, Umtanum desert buckwheat, Ute ladies'-tresses, Wenatchee Mountains checkermallow, White Bluffs bladderpod. The Wenatchee Mountains checkermallow is known to be in eastern King County; none of these other plant species are known to be located in King County.

Ramboll's 2017 assessment did not find any threatened or endangered plant species on the portion of parcel 1021059003 subject to the survey. It is unknown if any threatened or endangered plant species are present on the Pacific Raceways site.

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

---

<sup>3</sup> Page 3 of Ramboll's *Pacific Raceways: Assessment of Habitat for Species of Concern* report (linked above).

The proposed ordinance does not include any specific code provisions relating to landscaping. Development projects subject to the proposed ordinance would be subject to existing regulations governing landscaping, use of native plants, and vegetation preservation on their respective sites. The existing conservation easement on the site protects in perpetuity the portion of the site adjacent to Big Soos and Soosette Creeks, which is to be “retained forever in its open space, and natural forested habitat condition.”<sup>4</sup>

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

The King County Noxious Weed Program regulates invasive plant species, and requires eradication or control, or recommends control, for over 150 plant species. Class A noxious weeds, adopted in accordance with RCW 17.10 and WAC 16-750, that are known to or have been located in King County, and require eradication by property owners, include Common Cordgrass, Dyers Woad, Eggleaf Spurge, False Brome, Floating Primrose-Willow, French Broom, Garlic Mustard, Giant Hogweed, Goastrue, Hydrilla, Bighead Knapweed, Reed Sweetgrass, Ricefield Bulrush, Clary Sage, Small-Flowered Jewelweed, Spanish Broom, and Milk Thistle. Class B noxious weeds, that are known to have been located in King County, and require control by property owners, include Viper's Bugloss Blueweed, Annual Bugloss, Common Bugloss, Common Reed, Dalmation Toadflax, Brazilian Elodea Egeria, European Coltsfoot, Gorse, Hairy Willowherb, Hawkweeds (Non-native species and hybrids of meadow subgenus), European Hawkweed, Orange Hawkweed, Houndstongue, Brown Knapweed, Diffuse Knapweed, Meadow Knapweed, Spotted Knapweed, Kochia, Garden Loosestrife, Purple Loosestrife, Parrotfeather, Perennial Pepperweed, Poison-Hemlock, Policeman's Helmet, Rush Skeltonweed, Saltcedar, Shiny Geranium, Leafy Spurge, Yellow Starthistle, Sulfur Cinquefoil, Tansy Ragwort, Musk Thistle, Scotch Thistle, Velvetleaf, Water Primrose, Wild Chervil, Yellow Floatingheart, and Yellow Nutsedge.

King County’s Noxious Weed map does not show any noxious weeds on the Pacific Raceways site. However, Tansy Ragwort, Dalmation Toadflax, Spotted Knapweed, and Bohemian Knotweed are all shown on properties adjacent to the site.<sup>5</sup>

**5. Animals [\[help\]](#)**

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

Examples include:

birds: hawk, heron, eagle, songbirds, other:  
mammals: deer, bear, elk, beaver, other:  
fish: bass, salmon, trout, herring, shellfish, other \_\_\_\_\_

The Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) shows that several fish species are present in Big Soos and Soosette Creeks. Otherwise, it is unknown which species, and at what quantities those species, exist on the Pacific Raceways site.

The 2017 habitat assessment by Ramboll of a portion of parcel 1021059003 identified the birds shown in the table below on that property:

<sup>4</sup> Pacific Raceways Conservation Easement Recording Instrument No. 20210222000229

<sup>5</sup> Noxious Weed layer of King County iMap accessed 7/18/23

Table 2. Bird species found on Lot A on 12/11/2017

	Common name*	Scientific name	Native
<b>Mowed field</b>	Killdeer	<i>Charadrius vociferus</i>	Y
<b>Forested border</b>	American crow	<i>Corvus brachyrhynchos</i>	Y
	Chickadee (either black capped or chestnut backed)	<i>Poecile rufescens</i> or <i>P. atricapillus</i>	Y
	European starling (v)	<i>Sturnus vulgaris</i>	N
	Northern flicker	<i>Colaptes auratus</i>	Y
	Pileated woodpecker (V)	<i>Dryocopus pileatus</i>	Y
	Red breasted nuthatch (v)	<i>Sitta canadensis</i>	Y
	Song sparrow	<i>Melospiza melodia</i>	Y
	Spotted towhee	<i>Pipilo maculatus</i>	Y
	Steller's jay	<i>Cyanocitta stelleri</i>	Y

NOTES:

\* (v) indicates identified by vocalization only

The assessment also noted signs of rabbit and coyote on the site.

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

Although the proposed ordinance is a nonproject action, there are several federally threatened and endangered species in King County according to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. These species include the Marbled murrelet, Northern spotted owl, Streaked horned lark, Yellow-billed cuckoo, Bull Trout, Taylor's Checkerspot, Canada lynx, Gray wolf, Blue whale, Fin whale, Humpback whale, Southern resident killer whale, Oregon spotted frog, Sei whale, Sperm whale, Bocaccio rockfish, and yelloweye rockfish. One additional species, Grizzly bear, was historically in King County but is thought to now be extinct in this area.

The Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife lists the following salmonid species as those federally threatened that are known to occur in King County. Skykomish Bull Trout, White River (Puyallup) Bull Trout, Cedar Chinook, Green River (Duwamish) Chinook, Sammamish Chinook, Snoqualmie Chinook, White River Chinook, Cedar River Winter Steelhead, Green River (Duwamish) Winter Steelhead, North Lake Washington and Lake Sammamish Winter Steelhead, Snoqualmie Winter Steelhead, Tolt Summer Steelhead, and White River (Puyallup) Winter Steelhead.

In addition to the federally listed species above, the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife lists additional threatened and endangered species not included with the federally listed species include the Western gray squirrel, Northwestern pond turtle, and Oregon vesper sparrow. One additional species, fisher, was historically in King County but is thought to now be extinct in this area.

WDFW lists both Big Soos and Soosette Creeks as habitat for Steelhead, which are federally listed as threatened. Big Soos Creek is also shown to be habitat for Chinook Salmon, which are likewise federally listed as threatened. The 2017 habitat assessment by Ramboll did not find evidence of any threatened or endangered animal species on site.

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

Although the proposed ordinance is a nonproject action, King County is within the Pacific Flyway migratory pathway for birds, and migratory birds use water bodies, shorelines, mud flats, and grassy areas/meadows throughout King County. Big Soos and Soosette Creeks are identified by WDFW as bearing anadromous fish. Elk, other mammals, and bird species migrate seasonally. Daily movements include animal species moving around to get their daily needs met, and this movement can be impacted by fences, roads, culverts, and land use cover and change. Mammals, amphibians, and reptiles are most affected by barriers to movement.

WDFW’s PHS<sup>6</sup> on the Web map does not show the Pacific Raceways site as being part of a terrestrial migration corridor.

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

There are no specific measures proposed to preserve or enhance wildlife. Projects subject to the proposed ordinance will be required to comply with all existing codes regarding critical areas and landscaping. As noted above, the area of the site adjacent to Big Soos and Soosette Creeks, which are fish bearing, is subject to a permanent conservation easement.

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

The Washington Invasive Species Council, established by the Washington State Legislature, has identified 16 animal species and 13 insect species that are considered invasive in Washington State. King County is known or suspected to have the following invasive animal and insect species: Apple Maggot, Brown Marmorated Stink Bugs, European Chafer, Gypsy Moth, Scarlet Lily Beetles, Spotted Winged Drosophila, African Clawed Frog, Bullfrog, Invasive Crayfish, Invasive Copepods, New Zealand Mud Snail, Northern Pike, Nutria, Tunicate (*iona savignyi*, *styela clava*, and *didenmun*).

Invasive species might be located on the Pacific Raceways site. A list of invasive animal species within King County can be found here: <https://kingcounty.gov/services/environment/animals-and-plants/biodiversity/threats/Invasives.aspx>.

**6. Energy and Natural Resources [\[help\]](#)**

**a. What kinds of energy (electric, natural gas, oil, wood stove, solar) will be used to meet the completed project’s energy needs? Describe whether it will be used for heating, manufacturing, etc.**

Although the proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not have direct energy needs, the proposed ordinance would allow for new grandstands, parking, and access roads to be constructed through an interim use permit rather than through the full demonstration project process. It would also allow additional parking and access roads to be constructed through the interim use permit process. All of these uses would likely require electricity for lighting. Puget Sound Energy provides electricity to the site. As of 2020, Puget Sound Energy’s energy mix included the following:<sup>7</sup>

Fuel	Percentage
Coal	23%
Hydroelectric	24%
Natural Gas	27%

<sup>6</sup> Priority habitats and species

<sup>7</sup> <https://www.pse.com/en/pages/energy-supply/electric-supply> Accessed 7/18/23. Note that this represents the overall energy mix for Puget Sound Energy; individual properties could potentially receive a different mix.

Fuel	Percentage
Nuclear	<1%
Other*	1%
Solar	1%
Unspecified	14%
Wind	9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not have any direct impacts to the use of solar energy. Development projects subject to the proposed ordinance are also unlikely to affect the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties due to existing height and setback requirements that would be maintained by the proposed ordinance.

**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:**

The proposed ordinance a nonproject action that would not have any direct impacts to energy use, and therefore no energy conservation features are included. Development projects subject to the proposed ordinance could include energy conservation features or other measures to reduce any energy impacts.

**7. Environmental Health** [\[help\]](#)

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

Although the proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not directly cause any environmental health hazards, it is possible that development projects subject to the proposed ordinance could result in exposure to toxic chemicals, risk of fire and explosion, spills, or hazardous waste. To the extent any such development created such exposure or risk, those hazards would be regulated by existing state and local regulations.

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

According to the Washington Department of Ecology’s “What’s in My Neighborhood” database, no contaminated sites were identified within the Demonstration Project area.

**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.**

No contamination is known on the Pacific Raceways site. Any development would be subject to existing federal, state, and local regulations regarding chemical hazards and liquid and gas transmission pipelines.

**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.**

Although the proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not include the storage, use, or production of any toxic or hazardous chemicals, development projects subject to the proposed ordinance could require the use of toxic or hazardous chemicals, such as gasoline or diesel fuel, to operate construction equipment, and hot mix asphalt for paving. Individual development projects would be required to store, use, and produce any toxic or hazardous chemicals in accordance with applicable laws and regulations.

As noted in section 7.a. of this checklist, the proposed ordinance might affect design decisions of fossil fuel and nonhydroelectric generation facilities that may alter the type, volume, concentration or flow of gaseous and liquid products used, some of which may be toxic or hazardous.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not have any direct impacts, and implementation of the proposed ordinance is not anticipated to generate any additional special emergency services for the development projects to which it would apply.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not have any direct impact on the environment nor create environmental health hazards. Individual development projects would be required to meet all applicable regulations governing the storage, use, and disposal of contaminated, toxic, or hazardous materials that they are required to meet under existing regulations.

**b. Noise**

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action. Various types of noise exist in the area around the Pacific Raceways site, including noise from traffic, operation of equipment, and more. A report created for the facility's interim use permit states:

“The existing acoustic environment is typical of a relatively quiet suburban area with few continuous sources of dominant noise. Distant traffic from Highway SR-18 is at times audible, as is infrequent traffic noise on local roadways. Other sources of noise include Pacific Raceways event noises (i.e., races and other motor vehicle events), birds, and miscellaneous neighborhood noises.”<sup>8</sup>

These noise sources are not anticipated to affect implementation of the proposed ordinance.

**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.**

Although the proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not have any direct noise impacts, development allowed under the ordinance may result in noise from construction and operation. Although noise from spectators and their vehicles already occurs on the property, providing upgraded facilities for parking and spectating may

---

<sup>8</sup> Page 6 of the Ramboll's *Environmental Noise, Air Quality, GHG, and Light and Glare Report* (linked above).

increase attendance at events, or increase the attractiveness of the facility for new events, and therefore increase associated noise.

Any development activity on the site would be subject to the construction noise regulations in King County Code. K.C.C. 12.86.500 exempts sounds related to motor vehicle racing events and motor vehicle testing and training from the County's noise regulations, but such noise is subject to permit-specific requirements. Pacific Raceways' existing permits include quiet times during which events cannot take place:

- Monday and Tuesday are quiet days.
- From September 1<sup>st</sup> through April 30<sup>th</sup>, operating hours on Weds-Sun are limited to 9 AM to 5:30 PM or official sunset hours, whichever is earlier.
- Other times of year, operating hours are 9 AM to 5 PM or official sunset hours on Thursday and Sunday and 9 AM to 10PM or official sunset hours on Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday.

The proposed ordinance does not alter requirements relating to noise and does not change the allowed days or times during which racing or testing can take place. If upgraded facilities attract or facilitate bigger crowds or more events, those could lead to additional noise, but such events would have to occur within the dates and times prescribed by the facility's existing permits. Additionally, while the proposed ordinance may facilitate the permitting of additional development through a streamlined permitting process, it does not allow for types or intensity of development that is not already allowed under the current code.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not have any direct noise impacts. The Pacific Raceways site would be subject to the same noise requirements that exist today. As noted above, this includes specific noise-related conditions imposed on the Pacific Raceways site through existing permits. Noise impacts would be evaluated as part of individual development proposals. Unless exempt under state and county requirements, development proposals would also be subject to SEPA review.

## **8. Land and Shoreline Use** [\[help\]](#)

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action and would not change the allowed uses on the Pacific Raceways site; it would only change the approval process for certain uses and activities already allowed under King County Code.

The site is currently used as a racetrack. This includes a 2.2-mile road track, a kart track, a drag strip, a dirt motocross track, paved and unpaved parking areas, and over 100,000 square feet of structures. An additional 120,000 square feet of structures have been permitted but not yet constructed. Nearby land uses include residential to the north, east and south, and highway 18 to the west. Additionally, a church, a golf course, and manufacturing uses are located less than a half mile from the southern boundary of the site.

### **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?**

There is no working farmland or forestland on the site. The site has been in racetrack use since 1959. Aerial photography from 1936 shows the property to be undeveloped, largely open grassland with scattered trees.<sup>9</sup> It is

---

<sup>9</sup> King County iMap accessed 7/18/23

unknown if forestry activities took place on the property prior to 1936, or if agriculture took place on the property between 1936 and 1959.

**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:**

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not directly affect or be affected by the normal business operations of working farmland or forestland. No impacts to such lands are anticipated from development proposals subject to the proposed ordinance. However, the possibility of such impacts would be evaluated during review of such development proposals.

**c. Describe any structures on the site.**

The King County Assessor's database identifies nine buildings on site, including offices, a press building, restrooms, a snack bar, and garages. There are also grandstands on site.

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

Although the proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not directly result in any demolition, existing structures on the Pacific Raceways site could be demolished as part of a development project that would be subject to the proposed ordinance. In particular, the proposed ordinance allows replacement of existing grandstands on the site, which would necessitate demolishing existing grandstands.

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

The Pacific Raceways site is zoned industrial (I), with a property-specific development condition (SC-P02). SC-P02 limits the site to racetrack use, regional motor sports facility use, and uses consistent with the site's designation as a project of statewide significance. It also requires the recording of a conservation easement on the site, which occurred in 2021.

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

The Pacific Raceways site is designated rural area (ra).

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

Big Soos Creek, south of the property, is within the shoreline jurisdiction, with aquatic and conservancy designations. The jurisdiction does not extend onto the Pacific Raceways site.

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

County maps show erosion and landslide hazards along the western and southern portions of the site. Soosette creek, a Class 2S stream, is located on the western portion of the site. These critical areas are within the conservation easement recorded in 2021.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not directly result in a completed project where people would reside or work. Development projects subject to the proposed regulations would not result in residences but could potentially result in more jobs at the site. This would be evaluated as part of individual development proposals.

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



The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action and would not directly result in any displacement, and as the Pacific Raceways site does not contain any residences, any development proposals subject to the proposed ordinance are not anticipated to displace anyone.

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

Because the proposal is not anticipated to affect the likelihood of displacement, no measures to avoid or reduce displacement impacts are proposed. Projects would be subject to existing policies and regulations governing displacements and relocations and would be evaluated during project-level environmental and permit reviews.

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

p

The proposed ordinance was drafted to be compatible with existing and projected land uses and plans. It would not alter the allowed uses on the site, only the process by which proposals to develop such uses are reviewed.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action and would not directly impact agricultural and forest lands of long-term commercial significance. There are no agricultural or forest lands of long-term commercial significance on the site. No measures to reduce or control impacts to such lands are proposed.

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

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that will not have direct impacts to housing, and the site is zoned industrial, meaning no residential uses are allowed.

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

Neither the proposed ordinance itself nor the development allowed under the ordinance would result in elimination of housing, as no housing is present on site.

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

No measures to reduce or control housing impacts are proposed.

**10. Aesthetics** [\[help\]](#)

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that does not directly involve the construction of any structures and does not regulate or change the height requirements of any structures or principal exterior building materials. The height and any exterior building material of any development project subject to the proposed ordinance will be subject to existing regulations.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not have any direct impacts to views. Any development projects subject to the proposed ordinance would not result in the alteration or obstruction of any views to a greater degree than any other development allowed under existing regulations.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not have any direct impacts to views or aesthetics, and as such, no measures are proposed to reduce or control aesthetic impacts.

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

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not directly cause any light or glare. Development projects subject to the proposed ordinance would need to comply with lighting standards that include general lighting design, lighting along the portions of development adjacent to streets, and lighting in parking lots. These provisions are not anticipated to cause additional light and glare beyond the development site, but to promote best-practice standards, minimize light pollution, and promote safety at night.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not have any direct impacts. Development projects subject to the proposed ordinance would not result in a greater increase in light or glare than any other development allowed under existing regulations. Any development projects subject to the proposed ordinance would have to comply with existing development regulations, including any related to light and glare.

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

Various off-site sources of light or glare exist throughout unincorporated King County. It is unlikely that any development projects subject to the proposed ordinance would be impacted by any off-site sources.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not have any direct light and glare impacts. No additional measures to reduce or control light and glare impacts are proposed beyond existing development regulations.

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

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

Pacific Raceways is a private recreational facility on the site, providing vehicle racing and spectating. The Soos Creek Park and Trail is located west and south of the site.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not directly displace any existing recreational uses.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action, and no measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation are proposed. The proposed ordinance would modify the permitting process for constructing certain facilities associated with a Regional Motor Sports Facility, which provides recreational activities. These modifications to the process might facilitate enhancements to the recreational use.

### **13. Historic and cultural preservation** [\[help\]](#)

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

There are buildings over 45 years old on the property. It is unknown whether they are eligible for listing on preservation registers. This would be determined and evaluated during review of individual development proposals.

- b. Are there any landmarks, features, or other evidence of Indian or historic use or occupation? This may include human burials or old cemeteries. Are there any material evidence, artifacts, or areas of cultural importance on or near the site? Please list any professional studies conducted at the site to identify such resources.**

None are known. The SEPA checklist for the interim use permit (LUT417-0003) did not identify any. Projects subject to the proposed ordinance would continue to be required to comply with federal, state, and local rules related to historic and cultural resources.

- 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.**

According to the SEPA checklist for LUT417-0003, the applicant consulted with and received input from the Muckleshoot tribe at that time, and concerns raised were focused on preservation of the area surrounding Soos and Soosette Creeks. Those areas are now protected by a permanent conservation easement.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that will not have any direct impacts to cultural or historic resources. However, King County's existing regulations related to avoidance, minimization of, or compensation for loss, changes to, and disturbances to cultural and historic resources would apply to any individual development proposals subject to the proposed ordinance.

### **14. Transportation** [\[help\]](#)

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

Access to the site is currently from Highway 18 via SE 304th Street. SE 304<sup>th</sup> St is identified as a collector arterial from Highway 18 up to the point that it intersects the access point to Pacific Raceways' site, after which it is identified as a local street.

- b. Is the site or affected geographic area currently served by public transit? If so, generally describe. If not, what is the approximate distance to the nearest transit stop?**

The site is not served by transit. The nearest transit stop is to the southwest, across highway 18. Two routes, the 165 and the 181, serve the Green River College. The College is over half a mile away from the property.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action and would not directly add or eliminate parking spaces. It would not allow for more parking than is allowed under the current code; it would, rather, change the permit process by which parking areas could be developed. This might include paving areas that are currently used as informal parking or expanding parking into new areas of the site. Impervious surface on the site, including parking, would be limited to 33.33% of the total site under an interim use permit. Any impervious surface beyond that amount would be required to go through the full master planning demonstration project process currently in code. The exact number of spaces added or eliminated would be evaluated as part of individual development proposals.

**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).**

Although the proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not directly involve any roadway, bicycle, or pedestrian improvements, improvements to existing roads, streets, or pedestrian or bicycle transportation may be associated with individual development under the proposed ordinance. Improvements might also be required as mitigation for a new structure, as a condition on an interim use permit.

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

The Pacific Raceways site is not in the immediate vicinity of water, rail, or air transportation and is not expected to make use of such modes.

**f. How many vehicular trips per day would be generated by the completed project or proposal? If known, indicate when peak volumes would occur and what percentage of the volume would be trucks (such as commercial and nonpassenger vehicles). What data or transportation models were used to make these estimates?**

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not directly generate any vehicular trips. Development projects subject to the proposed ordinance would likely generate vehicular trips, though the volume of those vehicle trips is unlikely to be greater as a result of implementing the proposed ordinance, as the proposed ordinance would alter the permit process, not the allowed uses, for the site.

**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.**

Although the proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not have any direct impact on the movement of agricultural and forest products on roads or streets on the area, individual development projects allowed under the ordinance could generate some additional traffic that could interfere with, affect, or be affected by the movement of agricultural and forest products. This would be evaluated as part of individual development projects.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not have any direct impacts to transportation. No additional measures to reduce or control transportation impacts are proposed. Development subject to the proposed

ordinance would be subject to existing zoning and development regulations, including, to the extent required, transportation analysis and mitigation.

**15. Public Services** [\[help\]](#)

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not directly result in an increased need for public services. Development projects subject to the proposed ordinance would need public services to be available at a similar level to what is currently required, as the proposal would only alter the permitting process, not the allowed uses on the site.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not have any direct impacts to public services, so no additional measures to reduce or control impacts on public services are proposed.

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

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

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

The Pacific Raceways site is served by Puget Sound Energy for electric service and Covington Water District for water. The site uses an on-site septic for wastewater.

**i. 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.**

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not have any direct connection to utilities. There is nothing within the proposed ordinance that would change the provision of utility services. All development on the site must comply with K.C.C. Title 13.

Development projects related to the proposed ordinance might generate higher electricity demand than exists on the site currently, but not more so than development currently allowed on the site under K.C.C. 21A.55.150.

**C. Signature** [\[HELP\]](#)

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

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ */s/ Jake Tracy* \_\_\_\_\_

Name of signee \_\_\_\_\_ Jake Tracy \_\_\_\_\_

Position and Agency/Organization \_\_\_\_\_ Principal Legislative Analyst, King County Council \_\_\_\_\_

Date Submitted: 8/23/2023

## **D. Supplemental sheet for nonproject actions** [\[HELP\]](#)

(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?**

Although the proposed ordinance does not allow for any uses not currently allowed on the Pacific Raceways site, it does provide a streamlined permitting process for certain activities to occur on the site, namely paving and construction of grandstands and other structures. As such, the proposed ordinance may incentivize the development of these on the site by reducing steps in the permitting process and making the process more predictable. However, all of the impacts discussed below could also occur under the current King County Code regulations governing the site, and any development proposal would be subject to SEPA review, unless exempt under state or county requirements.

Potential impacts to air emissions, discharges to water, and the release of toxic or hazardous substances are discussed below.

#### Discharges to Water

The proposed ordinance is not expected to result in development that would cause discharges to water. Conservation easements protect areas of the site that are near waterbodies. Additionally, whereas some parking currently occurs on pervious surfaces on the site, if these surfaces were to be converted to paved parking areas, those areas would be required to comply with all relevant surface water standards in King County Code and the Surface Water Design Manual.

#### Air Emissions

If paving and construction of grandstands subsequently occurs on this property, emissions are likely to occur during the construction process due to use of fossil fuel-powered machinery, as well as hot-mix asphalt for paving. Following construction, the upgraded parking and viewing facilities could potentially increase attendance at events, which could result in more tailpipe emissions from visitor vehicles.

#### Toxic or Hazardous Substances

Development resulting from the proposal is not expected to increase the production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances beyond what might occur under current regulations.

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

Existing regulations that aim to avoid or reduce increased discharges to water, emissions to air and the production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances, and to limit noise would also apply to development projects subject to the proposed ordinance and are not changed by the proposed ordinance. No additional measures to avoid or reduce such impacts are proposed.

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

The proposed ordinance is unlikely to result in activities that would cause a greater impact to plants, animals, fish, or marine life than might otherwise occur under the current code because the regulations protecting those resources are not changed by the proposed ordinance, and no new uses or greater intensity of development on the Pacific Raceways site would be allowed under the proposed ordinance compared with existing regulations.

Soosette Creek, on the western portion of the site, and Big Soos Creek, south of the site, are identified as habitat for anadromous fish. The portions of the site adjacent to these creeks is protected by a conservation easement and by King County's critical area regulations, and no development authorized under this proposal would occur in those areas.

Outside of these areas, much, but not all, of the site is cleared of vegetation or consists of mowed grassland. Construction activities proposed subsequent to passage of this proposed ordinance might involve additional clearing of vegetation.

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

Existing regulations that protect and conserve plants, animals, fish, and marine life would apply to development projects subject to the proposed ordinance and are not changed by the proposed ordinance, including the County's Shoreline and Critical Areas Code. Any clearing and grading activities would be in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations, including K.C.C. Chapter 16.82. No additional measures to avoid or reduce such impacts are proposed.

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

The proposed ordinance provides a streamlined permitting process for certain already-allowed activities to occur on the Pacific Raceways site. It is unlikely to deplete energy or natural resources more than any proposal allowed under the current regulations.

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

Existing regulations that protect and conserve energy and natural resources would apply to development on this site. Additionally, the proposed ordinance specifies that any excavation and processing of materials be limited to the quantity of materials necessary to undertake the activities allowed under the updated rules. This would prevent removal of more soil or gravel than necessary for paving, construction, etc.

## **4. How would the proposal be likely to use or affect environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated (or eligible or under study) for governmental protection; such as parks, wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, threatened or endangered species habitat, historic or cultural sites, wetlands, floodplains, or prime farmlands?**

The proposed ordinance is unlikely to result in activities that would cause a greater impact to environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated as eligible or under study for governmental protection than might otherwise occur under the existing code. Any facility developed under the proposed ordinance would be subject to the same development restrictions concerning environmentally sensitive areas as other allowable uses.

As noted above, Soosette Creek is located on the western portion of the site, Big Soos Creek is located south of the southern property boundary, and steep slopes exist on the southern portion of the property. These areas are protected by a conservation easement and by King County's critical area regulations, and development would not occur in these critical areas.

There are no known historic or cultural sites or prime farmlands on the property.

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

Existing regulations that protect such resources would apply to development projects subject to the proposed ordinance and are not changed by the proposed ordinance. Additionally, a conservation easement protects the critical areas on the site. No additional measures to avoid or reduce such impacts are proposed.

**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?**

While the streamlined permitting process in the proposed ordinance could allow development to be approved more quickly, the proposed ordinance does not alter, and is not anticipated to affect, currently allowed land uses or shoreline uses in King County.

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

As the proposed ordinance does not alter, and is not anticipated to affect, currently allowed land uses or shoreline uses in King County, no measures to avoid or reduce impacts are proposed.

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

Highway 18, which is the primary access to the site, is identified as a D level of service by WSDOT, meaning speed begins to decline with increasing volume, freedom to maneuver is further reduced, and the traffic stream has little space to absorb disruptions.<sup>10</sup> The proposed ordinance does not allow for new or more intensive uses on the property than are already allowed, but rather creates a streamlined permitting process for certain limited activities already allowed on site. While development proposals under the proposed ordinance may include upgraded parking and viewing facilities on the Pacific Raceways site, which might attract more spectators to events, these facilities could be constructed under the existing code. Additionally, the proposed ordinance would not make changes to current requirements regarding the timing and frequency of events on site. Therefore, the proposed ordinance is not anticipated to result in activities that would cause a greater demand on public services than what otherwise might occur under the former code. However, the streamlined permitting process that would be in place under this proposed ordinance could make development proposals to build additional parking and grandstand seating more likely than under the current process. If that is the case, then it could increase vehicle trips and attendance at events, and associated demand for public services and utilities.

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

As the proposed ordinance would not allow for any uses or development types that are not allowed under the current code and no additional impacts are anticipated, no 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 ordinance is consistent with local, state, and federal law requirements for the protection of the environment. Existing regulations related to the protection of the environment, including the County's Critical Areas Code, Shoreline Master Program, King County Code (particularly development regulations such as Title 9 Surface Water Management, Title 10 Solid Waste, Title 13 Water and Sewer Systems, Title 21A Zoning, and Title 23 Code Compliance), the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, and others, are not amended by the proposed ordinance.

---

<sup>10</sup> WSDOT Level of Service Standard Map, Accessed 7/20/23  
<https://www.arcgis.com/home/item.html?id=3f840aeeb1ba481c905270ca103cd1db>



These regulations would still apply to development projects subject to the proposed ordinance in unincorporated King County.