

PC ISSUES MATRIX
SEPA Exemption Threshold Zoning Code Amendment
(LAND-2013-00579)

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
<p>1. Provide SEPA threshold data that goes back to 2004 (Biethan)</p>	<p><u>PC Preliminary Direction</u> Provide SEPA data that goes back to 2004 so the Commission has a better understanding of the threshold determinations issued by the City prior to the economic downturn.</p> <p><u>Staff Recommendation & Reasoning</u> Staff has provided this information in a separate document. Since 2004, 98.6% of the threshold determinations issued for the five general areas subject to increased threshold exemption levels were Determination of Non-Significances (DNS).</p> <p><u>Public Comments</u></p> <p><u>PC Discussion</u></p>	<p>5/22 Information Request</p>
<p>2. What was the SEPA Advisory Committee’s rationale for some of the new exemption level thresholds? (Gregory)</p>	<p><u>PC Preliminary Direction</u> It would be helpful to know the rationale for the new exemption level thresholds. This background information could be useful to the Commission’s deliberations.</p> <p><u>Staff Recommendation & Reasoning</u> Staff has reviewed the DOE website for SEPA Advisory Committee minutes. There is some information on the rationale for the new exemption level thresholds, but there are no specifics to deriving the actual numbers, with the exception of landfilling and excavation. Different interest groups had differing rationales. In general, however, the input is summarized as follows.</p> <p><i>Single Family Residential:</i> General interest in increasing levels in urban growth areas, and final number was in the range of various proposals discussed.</p> <p><i>Multi-Family Residential:</i> Similar to single family, there was a</p>	<p>5/22 Information Request</p>

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>range of numbers discussed. There was support to increase the exemption level since multi-family housing results in fewer environmental impacts, is more efficient to serve with infrastructure, and helps meet growth management targets.</p> <p><i>Agriculture:</i> Greater maximum in designated agricultural lands to advance GMA goal of fostering long term commercial agriculture in such areas and support right to farming provisions.</p> <p><i>Commercial:</i> Sizes discussed were considerable larger. Initially 60,000 sq. ft. was discussed as it is roughly the size of a Trader Joes plus a few supportive uses. This supports walkable communities and reduces traffic within urban growth areas. However, ultimately half that size (30,000 sq. ft.) was the result. Similarly, number for parking spaces discussed were as high as 200, but ended up being 90 parking spaces in the new rule.</p> <p><i>Landfill/Excavation:</i> 1,000 cubic yards is about what can be moved in two days</p> <p><u>Public Comments</u></p> <p><u>PC Discussion</u></p>	
<p>3. What would we have in place (such as regulations) if we didn't use SEPA? (Biethan, Miller, Murray)</p>	<p><u>PC Preliminary Direction</u> Commissioners raised the question of what would the City use in absence of SEPA. An example given was a 90 space parking lot and if we don't use SEPA to address impacts, what do we use.</p> <p><u>Staff Recommendation & Reasoning</u> The City has regulations in place through the zoning code, stormwater technical notebook, and other documents to address development impacts. Table 3 of the Technical Committee Report to the Planning Commission outlines each category on the SEPA checklist and corresponding city regulations. The example above, a 90 space parking lot,</p>	<p>5/22 Open</p>

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>would be subject to these code requirements, specifically the critical areas regulations, tree preservation regulations, landscaping and lighting standards, stormwater management code and technical notebook, and other citywide regulations, to name a few.</p> <p><u>Public Comments</u></p> <p><u>PC Discussion</u></p>	
<p>4. What are we losing by not having a SEPA checklist? In other words, how does this change impact our desire to mitigate? (Murray)</p>	<p><u>PC Preliminary Direction</u> Is the City losing any ability to review and mitigate development projects if we do not use SEPA’s substantive authority?</p> <p><u>Staff Recommendation & Reasoning</u> SEPA, as a tool for Redmond, is not as necessary as it was during its inception. This is due to the fact that the City has a very comprehensive set of development regulations in the Zoning Code, plus enforcement through the Municipal Code as well as Technical Notebooks. Increasing the threshold levels does not necessarily change our desire or ability to mitigate.</p> <p><u>Public Comments</u></p> <p><u>PC Discussion</u></p>	<p>5/22 Open</p>