

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

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable: [East Bay Redevelopment Site – East Bay Flats and Townhomes \(Lot A\)](#)
2. Name of applicant: [3rd Generation Investments, LLC](#).
3. Address and phone number of applicant and contact person: [PO Box 7534, Olympia, Washington 98507-7534. 360-705-2303. Contact Walker John.](#)

4. Date checklist prepared: [May 22, 2017](#)
5. Agency requesting checklist: [Department of Ecology \(Ecology\)/City of Olympia](#)
6. Proposed timing or schedule (including phasing, if applicable): [Construction to begin November 2017 and last approximately 14 months.](#)
7. Do you have any plans for future additions, expansion, or further activity related to or connected with this proposal? If yes, explain. [No future additions, expansion, or further activity related to or connected with this proposal are planned.](#)
8. List any environmental information you know about that has been prepared, or will be prepared, directly related to this proposal.
 - [Port of Olympia. 1994. Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Port of Olympia Strategic Plan. Olympia, WA. February.](#)
 - [Port of Olympia. 1994. Addendum to the Port of Olympia Strategic Plan Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Budd Inlet and Airdustrial Park Land Use Plans. Olympia, WA. December.](#)
 - [GeoEngineers. 2007. Phase II Environmental Site Assessment Hands on Children's Museum, Olympia, WA. February 6.](#)
 - [GeoEngineers. 2007. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, East Bay Redevelopment Project, Olympia, WA. March 14.](#)
 - [Brown and Caldwell. 2007. Environmental Investigation, East Bay Port of Olympia Property, Olympia, WA. March.](#)
 - [GeoEngineers. 2007. Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study \(RI/FS\) and Cleanup Action Plan, Potential City of Olympia City Hall, Port of Olympia East Bay Redevelopment. Ecology Facility/Site No.: 46126262. Ecology VCP No. SW0827. April 24.](#)
 - [Lacey, Olympia, Tumwater, and Thurston \(LOTT\) Clean Water Alliance. 2007. SEPA Environmental Checklist for the Budd Inlet Treatment Plant Master Plan. Olympia, WA. July.](#)
 - [GeoEngineers. 2007. Supplemental Site Use History and Soil and Groundwater Sampling Clarifications. East Bay Redevelopment Property. Olympia, Washington. Ecology Facility/Site No. 5785176. VCP No. SW0827. August 3.](#)
 - [GeoEngineers. 2007. Voluntary Cleanup Program Draft Remedial Investigation and Feasibility Study and Conceptual Cleanup Action Plan, East Bay Redevelopment, Port of Olympia. December.](#)
 - [LOTT Alliance. 2007. SEPA Environmental Checklist for the LOTT Alliance Administrative-Education Center and Water Quality Laboratory. December.](#)
 - [PIONEER. 2008. East Bay Remedial Investigation Phase 1 Summary. December.](#)
 - [GeoEngineers and PIONEER Technologies Corporation. 2009. Remedial Investigation Work Plan, East Bay Redevelopment, Port of Olympia. January.](#)
 - [Brown and Caldwell. 2009. Supplemental Phase II Environmental Site Assessment, Proposed LOTT Administration Building. January.](#)
 - [PIONEER. 2009. East Bay Site: Interim Action Work Plan. Final. Port of Olympia. May.](#)
 - [City of Olympia. 2009. SEPA Environmental Checklist for the Hands on Children's Museum and Surface Parking. Olympia, WA. November.](#)
 - [LOTT Alliance. 2010. Draft SEPA Environmental Checklist for the East Bay Redevelopment Project Public Plaza. Olympia, WA. May.](#)
 - [PIONEER. 2010. Infrastructure Interim Action Report for the East Bay Redevelopment Site. June.](#)
 - [Brown and Caldwell. 2010. Parcel 4/Parcel 5 Interim Action Work Plan. East Bay Redevelopment. June.](#)
 - [PIONEER. 2011. Empirical Evaluation for the Potential for Soil Constituents to](#)

Migrate to Surface Water via Groundwater at the Port of Olympia's East Bay Redevelopment Site. May.

- PIONEER. 2011. Data Gap Investigation Work Plan and Schedule. East Bay Redevelopment Site. Olympia, Washington. October 7.
- PIONEER. 2012. Terrestrial Ecological Evaluation for the East Bay Redevelopment Site. March.
- PIONEER. 2013. Data Gap Work Plan for the Soil-to-Indoor Air Pathway and Response to Comments for Ecology's March 14, 2013 Comments. East Bay Redevelopment Site. April.
- PIONEER. 2014. TPH-G and Total Naphthalenes Screening Level Exceedances for the Soil-to-Indoor Air Pathway. East Bay Redevelopment Site. April.
- PIONEER. 2014. SAP/QAPP for Point of Compliance Groundwater Monitoring. East Bay Redevelopment Site. Olympia, Washington. June 18.
- PIONEER. 2015. September 2014 Point of Compliance GWM Results and Discussion. East Bay Redevelopment Site. Olympia, Washington. January 6.
- Brown and Caldwell. 2015. Parcel 4/Parcel 5 Interim Action Report. East Bay Redevelopment. February.
- PIONEER. 2016. Draft Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study Report. East Bay Redevelopment Site. December.
- PIONEER. 2016. Draft Cleanup Action Plan. East Bay Redevelopment Site. December.
- PIONEER. 2016. Data Gap Work Plan for Evaluating Methane in Soil Gas at the East Bay Redevelopment Site. September.
- PIONEER. 2016. Draft Engineering Design Report for Cleanup Implementation. East Bay Redevelopment Site. December.

All of the documents cited above are available for review. For more information or a copy of the documents on CD, contact Rachael Jamison at (360) 528-8020. Documents can also be downloaded from: <https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/gsp/sitepage.aspx?csid=407>.

9. Do you know whether applications are pending for governmental approvals of other proposals directly affecting the property covered by your proposal? If yes, explain. There are no other pending applications.

10. List any government approvals or permits that will be needed for your proposal, if known. Guiding project documents are required to be approved by Ecology. Also, this work would be conducted under an Ecology Agreed Order. Laws and regulations addressing permits or federal, state, or local requirements that Ecology believes may be applicable at the time of entry of the Agreed Order are listed below. This list may not include all pertinent laws and regulations. Work performed would be in accordance within the substantive requirements of any applicable law or regulation.

1. Chapter 90.48 RCW (State Water Pollution Control Act) and Chapter 173-220 WAC (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System [NPDES] Permit Program Regulations).
2. Chapter 70.105D RCW (Model Toxics Control Act), and Chapter 173-340 WAC (MTCA Regulations).
3. Chapter 70.105 RCW (Washington State Hazardous Waste Management Act), and Chapter 173-303 WAC (State Dangerous Waste Regulations).
4. Chapter 173-160 RCW (Minimum Standards for Construction and Maintenance of Wells).
5. Chapter 43.21C RCW (State Environmental Policy Act) and Chapter 197-11 WAC (State Environmental Policy Act Rules).
6. Washington Industrial Safety and Health Act (WISHA).
7. Applicable Thurston County Codes.

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 parcel is currently a vacant lot. Improvements would include the construction of a four-story, multi-use building (containing new market rate apartments, townhomes, common spaces, a courtyard, and commercial properties) as well as ground-level covered parking. The existing site is approximately 1.4 acres in size and the parcel is 2.7 acres.

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 project is located on the southeast corner of a peninsula that extends from downtown Olympia into Budd Inlet (often referred to as the Port Peninsula). The East Bay of Budd Inlet is located directly northeast of the site. The Site address is 510 State Avenue NE, Olympia, WA 98501 (Township 18 North, Range 2 West, Section 14) and is presented on a vicinity map (see Section 2 of Concept Design Review Packet).

B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS

1. Earth

a. General description of the site: Flat

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

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

The site has a slope of no more than 1 percent.

c. What general types of soils are found on the site (for example, clay, sand, gravel, peat, muck)? If you know the classification of agricultural soils, specify them and note any agricultural land of long-term commercial significance and whether the proposal results in removing any of these soils.

The Soil Survey of Thurston County, Washington (1990) mapped the Site as having Xerothents soils. These moderately to well-drained to excessively-drained soils are located on uplands and tidelands, and largely consist of sandy fill material. Surface soils on the Site have been highly disturbed by earlier Site activities, including dredge soils placement. Soils found on-Site generally consist of sand or silty-sand interspersed with clay (Brown and Caldwell 2007).

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

No surface indications or history of unstable soils in the immediate vicinity have been identified. This area is susceptible to liquefaction; however, there is no evidence of unstable soil or liquefaction.

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.

Approximately 61,000 square feet of existing surface would be removed for installation of building foundation and parking lot base material. No fill material is anticipated. Source for

any fill shall be from a local pit. An estimated 2,500 CY of excavation is assumed for foundation and utility work.

- f. Could erosion occur as a result of clearing, construction, or use? If so, generally describe.
As with all projects, erosion could occur as a result of construction activities; however, the flat grade of the Site would limit the potential for erosion. The potential for erosion would be minimized by following best management practices (BMPs), as discussed in the response to question 1h below.
- g. About what percent of the site will be covered with impervious surfaces after project construction (for example, asphalt or buildings)?
Approximately 88 percent of the Site would be covered with a building and asphalt. Approximately 12 percent of the Site would be landscaped. The existing Site is a 100 percent capped soils.
- h. Proposed measures to reduce or control erosion, or other impacts to the earth, if any:
The general contractor would prepare a Temporary Erosion and Sediment Control plan. Furthermore, stormwater would be treated on-Site and delivered to the Port of Olympia's stormwater treatment facility. To prevent untreated stormwater from leaving the Site during construction activities, BMPs for construction stormwater would be implemented as necessary.

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.
General construction equipment for a typical construction project such as fork lifts, scissor lifts, saws, pile driver, earth moving equipment, etc. would be used as construction progresses over a period of about 1 year. Once construction is complete, anticipated emissions to the air would be generated by residents of the project and their vehicles, waste management vehicles, and other typical emissions for a mixed-use/residential development.
- b. Are there any off-site sources of emissions or odor that may affect your proposal? If so, generally describe.
No off-site sources of emissions or odors are expected to affect the proposed project.
- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control emissions or other impacts to air, if any:
The general contractor would implement BMPs for particulate control. BMPs that would be incorporated during construction to minimize impacts to air quality as needed include:
- Watering construction surfaces to control dust, installing temporary ground covers, sprinkling the site with approved dust palliatives, or using temporary stabilization practices upon completion of grading.
 - Storm drain inlets and/or culverts would be protected that could potentially receive construction stormwater and/or potentially contaminated street stormwater and/or wash water.
 - Vehicles leaving the site would be inspected and dry decontamination would be conducted by scrub/brush and/or the use of rumble strips prior to the stabilized construction entrance.
 - Wheel-cleaning stations would be provided if necessary to ensure construction-vehicle wheels and undercarriages do not carry excess dirt from the Site onto nearby roads.
 - Streets would be cleaned regularly to conform to City of Olympia requirements to ensure excess dust and debris are not transported from the Site onto nearby roads. All wash water would be contained and prevented from entering storm drain inlets.
 - Contractors would be required to use ultra-low sulfur diesel fuel in off-road equipment

and instructed to turn off construction equipment when not in use.

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.
Budd Inlet is located on the northeastern border of the Site. Indian Creek runs adjacent to the Site on the Chestnut Street alignment in a city culvert that spans from the Budd Inlet to Interstate-5.
- 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 project would not require any work over or in Budd Inlet. The proposed project would require work adjacent to Budd Inlet; however, Budd Inlet is separated from the Site by Marine Drive NE and Olympia Avenue NE.
- 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.
No fill or dredge material would be placed in or removed from surface waters or wetlands.
- 4) Will the proposal require surface water withdrawals or diversions? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.
No surface water withdrawals or diversions are required for this project.
- 5) Does the proposal lie within a 100-year floodplain? If so, note location on the site plan.
The Site does not lie 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.
No waste materials would be discharged to surface water as a part of this project.

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.
Grounderwater would not be withdrawn from a well.
- 2) Describe waste material that will be discharged into the ground from septic tanks or other sources, if any (for example: Domestic sewage; industrial, containing the following chemicals. . . ; agricultural; etc.). Describe the general size of the system, the number of such systems, the number of houses to be served (if applicable), or the number of animals or humans the system(s) are expected to serve.
No waste material would be discharged into the ground from septic tanks or other sources.

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.

Water from the building (roof) and associated sidewalks and outdoor common areas would be collected and treated on-site and piped to the Port of Olympia's wastewater treatment facility.

2) Could waste materials enter ground or surface waters? If so, generally describe.
No waste materials can enter ground or surface water. Wastewater would be collected and piped to the Port of Olympia's wastewater treatment facility.

3) Does the proposal alter or otherwise affect drainage patterns in the vicinity of the site? If so, describe.
The proposed project would not alter or otherwise affect drainage patterns in the vicinity of the Site. The majority of the site would be covered by a roof, the roof runoff would be collected and discharged to the Port of Olympia's wastewater treatment facility.

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

Silt fences, catch basin blocks, and other materials (e.g., straw bales) would be used to reduce or control potential surface, ground, runoff water, and drainage pattern impacts during construction. Post-construction, water would be collected from the roof of the new building as well as surface runoff from the sidewalks and discharged to the Port of Olympia's wastewater treatment facility.

4. Plants

a. Check the types of vegetation found on the site: [No vegetation 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

b. What kind and amount of vegetation will be removed or altered? [No vegetation on the Site](#)

c. List threatened and endangered species known to be on or near the site.
[No threatened or endangered plant species are known to be on or near the Site.](#)

d. Proposed landscaping, use of native plants, or other measures to preserve or enhance vegetation on the site, if any:
[Landscaping would include native trees and shrubs as well as some ornamental plantings. See Section 4 Landscape of the Concept Design Packet\)](#)

e. List all noxious weeds and invasive species known to be on or near the site.
[No noxious weeds or invasive species are known to be on or near the Site.](#)

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: hawk, heron, eagle, songbirds, other:

mammals: deer, bear, elk, beaver, other:

fish: bass, salmon, trout, herring, shellfish, other _____

- Salmon, trout, forage fish, and shellfish in Budd Inlet
- Raptors, heron, swallows, purple martin, pigeons, songbirds
- Ducks, sea gulls
- Frogs

- b. List any threatened and endangered species known to be on or near the site.
- Listed as threatened Puget Sound Chinook salmon and steelhead in Budd Inlet
- c. Is the site part of a migration route? If so, explain.
The Site is located within the Pacific Flyway, which is a flight corridor for migrating waterfowl and other avian fauna. The Pacific Flyway extends from Alaska to Mexico and South America.
- d. Proposed measures to preserve or enhance wildlife, if any:
Impacts to wildlife are not anticipated as a result of this project; therefore, measures to preserve or enhance wildlife are not proposed.
- e. List any invasive animal species known to be on or near the site.
No invasive animal species are known to be on or near the Site.

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.
Electric power would be used for water heaters, heating units, and power for the proposed building.
- b. Would your project affect the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties?
If so, generally describe.
The project would not affect the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties.
- c. What kinds of energy conservation features are included in the plans of this proposal?
List other proposed measures to reduce or control energy impacts, if any:
Energy efficient lighting, insulation, window units and water heaters would be incorporated into the proposed building.

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. No environmental health hazards would occur as a result of this project.
- 1) Describe any known or possible contamination at the site from present or past uses.

In general the types of contaminants found previously on the Site included petroleum hydrocarbons, carcinogenic polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, metals, semi-volatile organic compounds, and dioxins and furans. The site has been cleaned as part the Port of Olympia East Bay Redevelopment Project.

- 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.

There are no existing hazardous chemicals/conditions that might affect project development and design.

- 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.

None anticipated over and above the common course of standard construction. Labor and Industry practices would be used during construction.

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

No special emergency services would be required.

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

Labor and Industry best practices would be used for construction.

b. Noise

- 1) What types of noise exist in the area which may affect your project (for example: traffic, equipment, operation, other)? No existing noise would affect this project.

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

Typical construction noise would be present under construction but it is unlikely that the construction and operation of the project would cause an increase over other industrial noise in the area. The times of construction would meet the City of Olympia noise ordinance practices and procedures.

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

Construction practices to control noise would make use of the City of Olympia noise ordinance practices and procedures.

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.

The current land use of the Site addressed in this proposed project is vacant land awaiting redevelopment. Adjacent properties are composed of offices and retail. The proposed project would not effect current land uses on nearby or adjacent properties.

- b. Has the project site been used as working farmlands or working forest lands? If so, describe. How much agricultural or forest land of long-term commercial significance will be converted to other uses as a result of the proposal, if any? If resource lands have not been designated, how many acres in farmland or forest land tax status will be converted to nonfarm or nonforest use?

No. The Site has not been used for working farm 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:

No, the Site is not surrounded by working farm or forest land.

c. Describe any structures on the site.

No structures on Site.

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

No structures will be demolished.

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

The Site is zoned urban waterfront and is considered part of the Commercial District. The urban waterfront zone allows a wide range of uses including open space, retail, office, limited light industrial, and multi-family residential development.

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

The current comprehensive plan designation is urban waterfront.

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

Not applicable. However, Budd Inlet near the Site is designated as urban waterfront in the current Shoreline Master Program.

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

The Site has not been classified as a critical area by the city or county.

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

The new building would have an approximate occupant load of 260-300 people.

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

None, the new building is planned over an abandoned lot.

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

Not applicable.

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

The project would be market rate housing and commercial space which is compatible with the long term planning vision of the downtown area.

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

Not applicable.

9. Housing

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

74 apartment units and 12 townhome style apartment units would be provided in the middle income market rate housing range.

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

No housing units would be eliminated as part of the project.

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

No measures are proposed to reduce or control housing impacts.

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?
The tallest part of the building would be approximately 53 feet. The principal exterior materials proposed include brick, concrete, metal, glazing, wood and fiber cement.
- b. What views in the immediate vicinity would be altered or obstructed?
Existing views would not be adversely obstructed as this project is located near the center of downtown.
- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control aesthetic impacts, if any:
The introduction of this building would greatly improve and enhance the existing aesthetics of the current abandoned lot.

11. Light and Glare

- a. What type of light or glare will the proposal produce? What time of day would it mainly occur?
All work (construction) would be performed during daylight hours. Furthermore, the project would produce lighting on the new building to enhance pedestrian and tenant safety, especially during nighttime hours.
- b. Could light or glare from the finished project be a safety hazard or interfere with views?
The addition of lighting as a result of the project would not create a safety hazard or interfere with views. The lighting would increase safety within the vicinity.
- c. What existing off-site sources of light or glare may affect your proposal?
None. The project is within the typical downtown environment meeting the lighting standards.
- d. Proposed measures to reduce or control light and glare impacts, if any:
Directional LED and CFL pedestrian and signage lighting would be directed downward, away from neighboring properties.

12. Recreation

- a. What designated and informal recreational opportunities are in the immediate vicinity?
Within the vicinity, Budd Inlet provides recreational walking and boating opportunities in the area. Also, there is a walking trail along the East Bay shoreline and several marinas located along Budd Inlet.
- b. Would the proposed project displace any existing recreational uses? If so, describe.
The proposed project would not displace any recreational opportunities in the area.
- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation, including recreation opportunities to be provided by the project or applicant, if any:
Bicycle storage provided for tenants and sidewalks for pedestrians.

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 ? If so, specifically describe.
 No buildings, structures, or sites located on or near the Site are over 45 years old or are eligible for listing in national, state, or local preservation registers.
- 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.
 Western Shore Heritage Services, Inc. conducted an archaeological review of the project area in April 2007. No landmarks or evidence of historical, archaeological, scientific, or cultural importance were discovered on or next to the Site.
- 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.
 Western Shore Heritage Services, Inc.'s April 2007 archaeological review of the project area was reviewed to assess the potential impacts to cultural and historical resources on or near the project site. No impacts are expected based on this review.
- 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.
 As described above, no impacts are expected as part of the project .

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.
 The Site is bordered by Jefferson St NE to the west, Olympia Ave NE to the north, Chestnut St SE to the east, and State Ave NE to the south. Jefferson St NE and Olympia Ave NE will provide access to the Site.
- 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?
 There is a transit stop along State Ave NE adjacent to the Site.
- c. How many additional parking spaces would the completed project or non-project proposal have? How many would the project or proposal eliminate?
 The completed project currently plans to eliminate one (1) existing on-street surface parking space and add 73 off street parking spaces.
- d. Will the proposal require any new or improvements to existing roads, streets, pedestrian, bicycle or state transportation facilities, not including driveways? If so, generally describe (indicate whether public or private).
 The project would provide new sidewalks open to the public.
- e. Will the project or proposal use (or occur in the immediate vicinity of) water, rail, or air transportation? If so, generally describe.
 The project would not use or occur in the vicinity of water or air transportation. A rail line runs on the opposite side of Jefferson Street from the project. The project frontage houses what appears to be a railroad crossing signal controller which will be protected.

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?

A TIA has been completed.

g. Will the proposal interfere with, affect or be affected by the movement of agricultural and forest products on roads or streets in the area? If so, generally describe.

The proposed project would not interfere with, affect, or be affected by the movement of agricultural and forest products on roads or streets.

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

Bicycle parking for long term and short term use, and proximity to downtown public transit.

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. Yes. Minimally for fire, police, health care and general life safety for housing tenants.

b. Proposed measures to reduce or control direct impacts on public services, if any. Compliance with all jurisdictional codes and regulations.

16. Utilities [help]

a. Circle utilities currently available at the site:

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

b. Describe the utilities that are proposed for the project, the utility providing the service, and the general construction activities on the site or in the immediate vicinity which might be needed.

Electricity is provided by Puget Sound Energy. Water, solid waste, and storm water collection utilities are provided by the City of Olympia. No general construction activities are needed on the Site or in the immediate vicinity.

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: Stanley Matthew Craig

Name of signee Stanley Matthew Craig

Position and Agency/Organization Civil Engineer / Parametrix

Date Submitted: 7/24/2017