

**Daniel Bagley Elementary
School Modernization
and Addition Project**

SEPA Checklist

PUBLIC DRAFT

February 2018

PREPARED FOR:

SEATTLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS
2445 THIRD AVENUE SOUTH
SEATTLE, WA 98134

PREPARED BY:

ESA
5309 SHILSHOLE AVENUE NW, STE. 200
SEATTLE, WA 98107

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST 1

A. BACKGROUND 1

B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS 3

1. Earth 3

2. Air 5

3. Water 6

4. Plants 8

5. Animals 10

6. Energy and Natural Resources 11

7. Environmental Health 11

8. Land and Shoreline Use 13

9. Housing 16

10. Aesthetics 16

11. Light and Glare 17

12. Recreation 17

13. Historic and Cultural Preservation 18

14. Transportation 19

15. Public Services 25

16. Utilities 26

C. SIGNATURE 27

REFERENCES 28

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

A. BACKGROUND

1. Name of the proposed project, if applicable:

Daniel Bagley Elementary School Modernization and Addition Project

2. Name of Applicant:

Seattle Public Schools (SPS)

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

Eric Becker
Seattle Public Schools
2445 3rd Ave S
Seattle, WA 98134
206-252-0697

4. Date checklist prepared:

February 2018

5. Agency requesting checklist:

Seattle Public Schools (SPS)

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

Construction would begin in the spring of 2019 and would be completed by the fall of 2020. The school would not remain open during construction; students and staff would attend John Marshall, in the Green Lake neighborhood, as the interim site for the 2019-2020 school year.

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

SPS may consider additional work at Bagley Elementary School in the future if needed to increase the enrollment capacity. Before pursuing a project to increase the enrollment capacity, the School Board would need to determine that the project should be included in a potential future capital projects levy. The capital projects levy would be subject to approval by a public vote. Future projects to increase enrollment capacity at Bagley Elementary School would undergo separate SEPA review prior to implementation.

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

Advanced Exceptional Tree and Landscape Assessment, Tree Solutions Inc., March 2017

Building Excellence Phase IV Capital Improvement Program Revised Final Environmental Impact Statement, ESA, July 2012

Building, Technology, and Academics/Athletics IV Program Final SEPA Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement, ESA, July 2016

Cultural Resources Assessment, Seattle, King County, WA, ESA, June 2017

Draft Subsurface Exploration, Geologic Hazards, and Preliminary Geotechnical Engineering Report, Daniel Bagley Elementary School Addition, Associated Earth Sciences Incorporated, September 2016

Transportation Technical Report, Heffron Transportation, Inc., February 2018

Tree Inventory and Site Assessment, Tree Solutions Inc., December 2016

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 applications known to be pending for the subject property.

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

Permits and approvals that will be needed for the project include:

- Demolition
- Grading
- Building/Mechanical
- Stormwater Control
- Electrical
- Puget Sound Clean Air Agency (PSCAA) permit
- Certificate of Approval from the City of Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board

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.

Seattle Public Schools (SPS) is proposing modernization and additions for the existing Daniel Bagley Elementary School. Modernization of the existing historic building is intended to repair and/or replace major systems that have outlived their useful lives; portions are funded by the BTA IV Capital Levy, which was approved by voters in February 2016, as well as the BEX IV Capital Levy approved by voters in February 2013. The additions are intended to address current and projected elementary enrollment growth in the area, as well as to upgrade the quality of student learning environments, and are funded by the BEX IV Capital Levy.

The existing Bagley Elementary School would be substantially modernized, including major systems replacements and seismic upgrades. Up to 10 new classrooms would be provided (up to eight in a new classroom addition and two from alteration of the existing building).

Eight portable classrooms on the site would be removed and replaced by a two-story classroom addition built to the southwest of and connected to the existing school. The classroom addition would include up to eight classrooms, add learning support spaces, and be organized to support better collaboration among grade-level teams than can be achieved among students and staff occupying individual disconnected portables.

A second addition would be built to the west of and connected to the existing school and would include an approximately 6,000 square foot gymnasium with additional ancillary spaces.

The relocation of physical education from the current gymnasium to the new gymnasium, as well as the potential enclosure of an existing playcourt, would create an additional two classrooms within the existing building. The total capacity of the school would thereby be increased to up to 600 students.

The new buildings would total approximately 21,500 square feet in size. Because a portion of the gymnasium addition would be located in the existing parking lot, parking would be reduced from 58 spaces to 46 spaces. The parent drop-off area would be located in the parking lot and would be accessible from N 80th Street. The bus drop-off area would remain in its existing location in front of the school on Stone Way North.

Figures illustrating the project vicinity and project site are available from SPS upon request.

- 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 project site is located at 7821 Stone Way North in Seattle, Washington (Section 6, Township 25 North, Range 4 East). The project site is located northwest of Green Lake in the Green Lake neighborhood. The site is located on King County Parcel 0625049048. The legal description of the site is "W 660 FT OF N 395 FT OF GL 2 IN NE 1/4 OF STR 06-25-04 LESS W 165 FT THOF LESS PORTIONS FOR STREETS; TGW NORTH 10 INCHES OF S 102.51 FT OF N 500.01 FT OF E 29 FT OF W 200 FT OF SD GL 2."

B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS

1. Earth

A geotechnical investigation was performed at the project site by Associated Earth Sciences, Inc. in September 2016 (Associated Earth Sciences, Inc., 2016). The work included reviewing existing geologic literature for the property, conducting 15 soil borings on the project site, installing a groundwater observation well, and performing geologic studies to assess subsurface sediments and shallow groundwater on the project site. Information from this report is summarized in this section and incorporated throughout the SEPA Checklist, as appropriate.

a. General description of the site (underline):

Flat, rolling, hilly, steep slopes, mountainous, other _____

The site is characterized by generally very gentle sloping to flat topography, and was graded to its current configuration during previous site development. The topography within the vicinity of the proposed addition is generally flat to very gently sloping down to the south.

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

The steepest slopes (approximately 8 percent) are on the southern portion of the site. No slopes on the site meet applicable definitions as Steep Slope areas in accordance with Seattle Municipal Code (SMC) Section 25.09.020.

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.

Soil conditions in the site vicinity are characterized by 12 feet of variable density, generally granular fill underlain by glacial sediments consisting of medium dense Vashon recessional outwash and medium stiff to stiff Vashon recessional lacustrine deposits, very dense Vashon lodgment till, and very dense Vashon advance outwash (Associated Earth Sciences, Inc., 2016).

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

There are no potential slides, known slides, or liquefaction areas mapped by the City of Seattle on or near the project site.

e. Describe the purpose, type, total area, and approximate quantities of total affected area of any filling or grading proposed. Indicate source of fill.

Approximately 5,000 cubic yards would be excavated. Approximately 2,000 cubic yards of clean fill would be required and would be obtained from a source approved by the City of Seattle.

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

Construction activities could cause temporary erosion on the site. Erosion potential would be reduced through an erosion control plan consistent with City of Seattle standards (SMC 22.800) and implementation of best management practices (BMPs). BMPs could include installation of a rock construction entrance, catch basin filters, interceptor swales, hay bales, sediment traps, and other appropriate cover measures. g. About what percent of the site will be covered with impervious surfaces after project construction (for example, asphalt or buildings)?

Approximately 69 percent of the site is currently covered with impervious surfaces. Small amounts of landscaping would be replaced with new impervious

surface, but in other areas existing impervious surface would be removed and replaced with landscaping. After completion of the project, impervious surface coverage of the site would remain at 69 percent.

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

Temporary erosion and sedimentation control BMPs and construction water quality treatment measures would be installed to minimize erosion and to treat stormwater runoff during construction. BMPs specific to the site and project would be specified by SPS in the construction contract documents that the construction contractor would be required to implement.

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.

During construction, there would be a small increase in exhaust emissions from construction vehicles and equipment and a temporary increase in fugitive dust due to earthwork for the project. The most noticeable increase in emissions and fugitive dust would occur during demolition and earthwork. Construction employee and equipment traffic to and from the site would also generate minor increases in exhaust emissions.

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

There are no off-site sources of emissions or odors that would affect the proposed project.

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

The contractor chosen for the proposed project would be required to comply with applicable Puget Sound Clean Air Agency (PSCAA) regulations. Regulations that apply to the proposed project include Regulation I, Section 9.11 prohibiting the emission of air contaminants that would or could be injurious to human health, plant or animal life, or property; and Regulation I, Section 9.15 prohibiting the emission of fugitive dust, unless reasonable precautions are employed to minimize the emissions.

To reduce fugitive dust emissions from construction vehicles leaving the site, the contractor may be required to establish dust control measures as appropriate. Streets would be regularly swept to remove dust and debris from construction vehicles.

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.**

There are no surface water bodies on or in the immediate vicinity of the site. Green Lake is 1,000 feet southeast of Bagley Elementary at its closest point. Several blocks of developed parcels are located between Bagley Elementary and Green Lake. The proposed project would have no impact on the lake.

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, in, or adjacent to any surface water bodies.

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 project would not require any work in or near surface water, and it would not place any amount of fill or dredge material in surface waters or associated wetlands.

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

The proposed project would not require any surface water withdrawals or diversions.

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

The proposal 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 project would not involve the discharge of waste materials to any surface waters. All waste materials from the project, including grading spoils and demolition debris, would be transported off-site to appropriate disposal facilities.

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.**

No groundwater would be withdrawn as part of the project and no water would be discharged to groundwater. The geotechnical subsurface exploration found perched groundwater 8 to 20 feet below the ground surface within the lodgement till and advance outwash at various locations throughout the site (Associated Earth Sciences, Inc., 2016). This groundwater could be encountered during construction; however, extensive dewatering is not anticipated.

- 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. The project site would not utilize septic tanks.

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 existing site runoff is collected in an underground storm drain system and conveyed to the City's combined sewer overflow (CSO) system. The stormwater requirements for discharging to the combined sewer include flow control and on-site stormwater management. The project would include onsite stormwater management facilities such as bioretention and pervious pavement as well as underground stormwater detention facilities to provide flow control to the Peak Control Standard per City of Seattle requirements.

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

During construction, contamination could enter surface waters. Generally, this is limited to sedimentation loading from surface erosion. Measures to control contamination entering surface waters are discussed below in Section 3.d.

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

The project would not alter or otherwise affect drainage patterns in the vicinity of the site.

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

During construction, BMPs would be implemented to ensure that sediment originating from disturbed soils would be retained within the limits of disturbance. BMPs may include installation of a rock construction entrance, catch basin filters, interceptor swales, hay bales, sediment traps, and other appropriate cover measures. BMPs specific to the site and project would be specified by SPS in the construction contract documents that the construction contractor would be required to implement.

4. Plants

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

X deciduous tree: alder, maple, aspen, other

X evergreen tree: fir, cedar, pine, other

X shrubs

X 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

Vegetation on the site is limited to trees and to grass and landscaping associated with the school and its field. Tree Solutions, Inc. has prepared a tree inventory and assessment and an advanced Exceptional Tree and landscape assessment. The tree inventory and assessment found 37 trees on the school property (Tree Solutions Inc., 2016). The site has a wide range of species represented, including several native and non-native, non-invasive species. Native species include vine maple (*Acer circinatum*), western red cedar (*Thuja plicata*), Pacific dogwood (*Cornus nuttallii*), and shore pine (*Pinus contorta var. contorta*). Non-native species include eastern flowering dogwood (*C. florida*), Cornelian cherry dogwood (*C. mas*), incense cedar (*Calocedrus decurrens*), Norway maple (*A. platanoides*), European beeches (*Fagus sylvatica*), and English oak (*Quercus robur*) (Tree Solutions, 2016).

Eleven trees on site meet the City of Seattle's definition of an Exceptional Tree based on size thresholds (Tree Solutions, 2016). According to the Department of Construction and Inspection Director's Rule 16-2008, an Exceptional Tree is a tree that "1) is designated as a heritage tree by the City of Seattle or 2) is rare or

exceptional by virtue of its size, species, condition, cultural/historic importance, age, and/or contribution as part of a grove of trees.” All of the Exceptional Trees would be retained and protected during construction.

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

Seven trees would be removed. Four Norway maples (*Acer platanoides*) to the west of the existing school would be removed because they are located within the footprint of the gymnasium addition. Two European beeches (*Fagus sylvatica*) located on either side of the entrance to the existing school would be removed because of the need to modify the school entry to provide ADA access. A small ornamental conifer would also be removed. None of the trees that would be removed are Exceptional Trees.

The project footprint has been designed to retain two incense cedar trees located to the west of the existing school building that are considered Exceptional Trees. However, due to their proximity to construction, tree preservation measures would be required. The garden and landscaped areas adjacent to the trees would be retained to protect the roots of the trees (Tree Solutions, 2017).

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

No threatened or endangered plant species or critical habitat 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:

Existing trees on the site that would be retained would be protected to the extent possible using tree protection measures including, but not limited to, use of tree protection fences. SPS would replace removed trees according to City requirements.

Landscaping for the project would include planting of new street trees, restoration of lawn areas, restoration of a native plant garden, retention of the school garden, and new plantings at selected locations around the new additions.

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. The closest known noxious weed is Giant Hogweed (*Heracleum mantegazzianum*), which is located 0.6-mile to the northeast (King County, 2017). The project would not affect this noxious weed.

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:**

Animals observed on the site are restricted to typical urban animals and birds.

Fish: not applicable

Amphibians: none known

Reptiles: none known

Birds: species adapted to urban areas such as gulls, American crow, rock pigeon, chickadee, robin, Steller's jay.

Mammals: species adapted to urban areas such as Norway rat, raccoon, opossum

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

The Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) Priority Habitats and Species (PHS) database lists all known occurrences of threatened or endangered species and critical habitat. The database shows there are no threatened or endangered species or critical habitat in the project area (WDFW, 2017).

Two bald eagle nesting areas are located approximately 1 mile south of the project area (within Woodland Park and Woodland Park Zoo). The project would not affect the bald eagle nesting area.

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

The project 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 south to Mexico and South America. No portion of the proposed project would interfere with or alter the Pacific Flyway.

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

The project is not expected to have any negative impacts on animals within or near the project site; therefore, no mitigation is required. Some birds and animals may be disturbed during construction, but would likely return following construction because they are adapted to urban areas.

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

Invasive animal species likely to be in the area include rats and opossums, typical of an urban area. SPS would comply with its policy and hire a contractor to implement pest control measures prior to any demolition.

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.**

Electricity and natural gas would be required to operate the school's new classrooms and gymnasium.

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

The classrooms and gymnasium would not block the use of solar energy by adjacent properties. No other aspect of the project would interfere with solar energy use by others.

- 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 conservation features would include those required to meet or exceed the requirements of the Washington Sustainable Schools Protocol, which is equivalent to LEED Silver or better, and the Seattle Energy Code. Energy conservation features would include high efficiency boilers, dedicated outdoor air system (DOAS) ventilation, heat recovery on DOAS system, high efficiency direct drive electronically controlled motor (ECM) fans, displacement ventilation, decoupled low temperature finned tube convectors, ceiling fans (to eliminate mechanical cooling), daylighting, light emitting diode (LED) lighting and plug load controls.

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.**

Accidental spills of hazardous materials from equipment and vehicles could occur during construction. However, a spill prevention and control plan would be developed to prevent the accidental release of contaminants into the environment.

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

According to the Department of Ecology Facility/Site(s) database, no known contaminated sites are located on the Bagley Elementary site (Ecology, 2017).

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.**

Hazardous materials, such as asbestos-containing material, lead-containing paint/components, PCB light ballasts, and mercury-containing light tubes are potentially present on-site.

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.**

Chemicals stored and used during construction would be limited to gasoline and other petroleum-based products required for maintenance and operation of construction equipment and vehicles.

During operation of the elementary school, chemicals stored and used on site would be limited to cleaning supplies. These chemicals would be stored in safe locations.

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:**

Site-specific pollution prevention plans and spill prevention and control plans would be developed to prevent or minimize impacts from hazardous materials.

Where hazardous materials, such as asbestos-containing materials, lead-containing paint/components, PCB light ballasts, and mercury-containing light tubes, are present, construction would comply with applicable regulations for removal and disposal.

b. Noise

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

There are no existing sources of noise in the area that would adversely affect the proposal. Bagley Elementary is located near Aurora Avenue North (Highway 99), a major arterial that generates substantial traffic noise.

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

Vehicle and equipment operation during construction could cause noise impacts to nearby residents. Construction hours and noise levels would comply with the City of Seattle noise standards.

Maximum permissible sound levels in residential communities are not to exceed 55 A-weighted decibels (dB(A)s). However, construction activities are permitted to exceed the established maximum level by 25 dB(A) by the Seattle Noise Control Ordinance (SMC 25.08.425).

Maximum permissible sound levels established in SMC 25.08.425 may be exceeded by construction activities between 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. on weekdays, and between the hours of 9:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. on weekends.

Expanded capacity at Bagley Elementary would cause a minor increase in sound from human voices and from cars in the immediate vicinity during daytime hours. If more evening events are held at the school, they would generate some additional noise as people arrive and depart the building. This increased noise is expected to be minor and no events would be scheduled to end past 10:00 p.m. Increases in noise would be short-term and would not violate noise regulations.

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

Construction activities would be restricted to hours and levels designated by SMC 25.08.425. If construction activities exceed permitted noise levels, SPS would instruct the contractor to implement measures to reduce noise impacts to comply with the Noise Control Ordinance, which could include additional muffling of equipment. While construction noise is permitted during evenings and weekends, construction would generally occur between 7:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on weekdays.

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 Bagley Elementary site has been used as a school since 1906. The site currently holds one two-story school building built in 1930 (Bagley Elementary), a grass field, a basketball court, two wood-chip play areas, two gardens, eight portable classrooms (six portables), and a parking lot.

The school is located in a predominantly single-family residential neighborhood that is primarily comprised of low-rise housing to the north, east, and south of the school, with the exception of the Bethany Community Church, which is located immediately to the north of the school.

Properties immediately to the west of the school abut Aurora Avenue North and are commercial businesses. Uses include a paint store, an auto shop, a discount store, and a dollar store. The project would not affect current land uses. The site has been used as a school and would continue to be used as a school.

- 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?**

The site is not currently and has not been previously used for working farmlands or working forest lands. No agricultural or forest land would be converted to other uses.

- 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 working farm or forest lands are located near the proposed project, so the project would not affect or be affected by farm or forest land operations.

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

Structures on the project site include a brick building, eight portable classrooms (6 portables), and play equipment. The site also includes a parking lot on the north side of the site.

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

Two of the existing one-classroom portables, located directly south of the existing building, would be demolished on site. The remaining portables would be relocated off site. Some interior partitions in the existing building would also be demolished.

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

The current zoning classification of the school site is Single Family Residential, 5,000 square-foot lots (SF 5000) (City of Seattle, 2017b). Public schools are permitted uses in this zone.

The Seattle Municipal Code contains development standards for public schools in residential zones in SMC 23.51B.002. The Seattle Land Use Code (Chapter

23.79) includes a procedure by which departures from the required development standards of the code can be granted for public school structures. The departure process requires SPS to apply to the Director of the Department of Construction and Inspections (DCI) for departures. The project could require a departure for parking.

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

The current comprehensive plan designation for the site is Single Family Residential (City of Seattle, 2016).

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

The project site is not within a shoreline jurisdiction; therefore, there is no applicable shoreline master plan designation.

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

Review of the City of Seattle DCI GIS mapping database for environmental critical areas indicated that there are no critical areas on the site.

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

No people would reside in the completed project. The completed school would house up to 600 students with a staff of 41 full time and five part time. This represents an increase of approximately 175 students and four staff.

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

The completed project would not displace any people.

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

No displacement would occur; therefore, no mitigation measures are needed.

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

The project is consistent with existing land use regulations and plans. The project could require a departure for parking (SMC 23.79). SPS would comply with the requirements of the Master Use Permit (MUP) and results of the departure process.

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

The project is not located near any agricultural or forest lands, so no measures to ensure compatibility are required.

9. Housing

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

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

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

No housing units would be eliminated.

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

The project would not cause housing impacts; therefore, mitigation measures to control housing impacts would not be required.

10. Aesthetics

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

The highest point of the existing school building is the parapet at the entry, which is 44 feet and 11 inches tall. The highest point of the new construction would be 34 feet at the parapets on the classroom addition and the new gymnasium.

The existing building includes brick masonry, cast stone ornamentation, concrete, and painted wood windows. Exterior building materials for the addition would include brick masonry, concrete, metal panel siding and extruded aluminum storefront glazing assemblies.

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

The new additions would be visible from N. 80th Street. Residences on the south side of the project site would have views changed from portables to the new two-story classroom addition. The classroom addition would be taller than the portables but not as tall as the existing school building. The classroom addition would be designed to be compatible with the architecture of the existing building.

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

The project would not cause aesthetic impacts; therefore, mitigation measures to control aesthetic impacts would not be required.

11. Light and Glare

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

Lighting on the site would remain similar to present conditions. There would be an increase in light when the addition is being used during school hours. However, this would occur predominately during daylight hours and would not be visible from surrounding buildings. New exterior site lighting would consist of warm-colored LED lights on full cut-off fixtures and would be located away from the property line, so new lighting would not impact adjacent properties.

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

Exterior building and property lighting from the completed project would not be a safety hazard and would not be expected to interfere with views.

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

No off-site sources of light or glare would affect this proposal. The site is located near Aurora Avenue (Highway 99), a major arterial that generates ambient lighting in the area.

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

It is anticipated that both exterior and interior lighting would be scheduled by a Building Automation system so that the site would be mostly dark at night. Evening activities and events could cause increased light, but impacts on adjacent structures are anticipated to be minor.

12. Recreation

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

Recreational opportunities on the project site currently include a grass field, a basketball court, and two wood-chip play areas. The nearest City of Seattle park, Green Lake Park, is located approximately 1,055 feet (0.2 miles) southwest of Bagley Elementary School.

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

An existing playcourt would potentially be enclosed as part of the project. Some existing play equipment would be removed during construction. Following

construction, suitable existing equipment would be reinstalled and new equipment would be installed.

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

The project would include upgraded recreational facilities, including a new approximately 6,000 square foot gymnasium and a new approximately 2,000 square foot covered play area with new equipment. Some play equipment would be replaced on site, but equipment that is outmoded may not be replaced.

13. Historic and Cultural Preservation

A Cultural Resources Review for the Bagley Elementary site was developed by ESA (ESA, 2017). Cultural resources reports are exempt from public disclosure under RCW 42.56.300, but a redacted version can be acquired from the Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation. Information from the review is summarized in this section.

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

Bagley Elementary School was constructed in 1930 and is a designated Seattle Landmark. It is listed in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and the Washington Heritage Register (WHR). In addition to Bagley Elementary, six commercial buildings, 18 residential buildings, and one church building were constructed over 25 years ago and are located in the area. Those properties would not be impacted by the project.

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.

There are no recorded ethnographic places within the project area, and the nearest is located 0.50 miles away. The project area is classified as "High Risk" for containing subsurface archaeological deposits in the Washington Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation's (DAHP's) Statewide Predictive Model (DAHP, 2010). However, geological records indicate significant land modification on the subject property. ESA archaeologists monitored the drilling of 15, truck-mounted, two-inch split-spoon boreholes conducted by Associated Earth Sciences, Inc. Monitoring showed an absence of an A- or B-horizon over the majority of the property. These soil horizons represent surfaces that may have been occupied during the historic or precontact periods. The lack of these soil horizons suggests that they have been stripped away during leveling in preparation for the original school/playground construction.

Fill was then overlaid on the remaining C-horizon (glacial till), which would have extremely low likelihood for containing cultural resources. A review of LiDAR data and observations made during the pedestrian survey also support that the property was leveled. Therefore, ESA considers the project area to have low potential for intact, buried cultural resources (ESA, 2017).

- 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.**

ESA conducted a literature review of the project area. The study area examined for this review included the parcel containing the school and those immediately adjacent. Information reviewed included any previous archaeological survey reports, ethnographic studies, historic maps, government landowner records, aerial photographs, regional histories, geologic maps, soils surveys, and environmental reports. These records were reviewed in order to determine the presence of any potentially significant cultural resources, including Traditional Cultural Properties (TCPs), within the project area. Relevant documents were examined at DAHP, the University of Washington Libraries, online, and within ESA's research library (ESA, 2017).

- 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.**

No impacts to historic or cultural resources are anticipated. SPS will develop an inadvertent discovery plan (IDP). The IDP will set forth procedures and protocols to follow in the event of an archaeological resources discovery, including discovery of human remains. The IDP stipulates pre-construction briefings and on-call response if required. SPS would provide tribal representatives, including those of the Duwamish Tribe, with one-week advance notification of the project schedule and invite them to observe construction. No on-site archaeological monitoring is recommended during project construction.

14. Transportation

A *Transportation Technical Report* for the project was developed by Heffron Transportation, Inc. (Heffron, 2018). Information from the technical report is summarized in this section.

- 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 school site is bounded by N 80th Street to the north, Stone Avenue N to the east, private residences to the south, and commercial properties to the west.

Access to the on-site parking would remain at its existing location on N 80th Street. The school-bus load/unload zone would remain in its existing location in

front of the school on Stone Avenue N; Special Education (SPED) bus load/unload that currently occurs within the parking lot would be relocated to the school-bus load zone on Stone Avenue N.

No physical changes to site access are proposed; however, as described later, measures are proposed to limit turns from the driveway to right only during peak morning arrival and peak afternoon dismissal periods.

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?

King County Metro Transit (Metro) provides bus service in the site vicinity. The closest bus stops are located about 250 feet west of the site on Aurora Avenue N (SR 99). The northbound stop is located just north of the intersection with N 80th Street and the southbound stop is located just south of the intersection.

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

The existing parking lot would be modified and the number of spaces would be reduced from 58 spaces to approximately 46 spaces (a loss of approximately 12 spaces).

Based on parking demand estimates, the new school could have a midday peak parking demand of about 53 vehicles. The proposed project would provide a total of 46 parking spaces on site, which could accommodate all but seven vehicles during the midday peak demand period. It is expected that some staff or visitors would continue to park on street even if space is available in the parking lot. On-street parking within the site vicinity averaged 61 percent utilized midday when school is in session (ranging from 58 to 64 percent). When the supply located along and west of Aurora Avenue N is excluded from the utilization analyses, rates on school days ranged from 58 to 69 percent (average of 65 percent). For the purposes of evaluating the potential on-street parking impacts associated with new development, the City considers utilization rates of 85 percent or higher to be effectively full. Thus, the existing on-street supply could accommodate the excess midday demand generated by the additional staff and volunteers that may be added due to the school renovation and added enrollment.

The project would add a new gymnasium and would retain commons spaces that could be used for events at the school. The school is expected to continue hosting evening events periodically throughout the school year that could use these spaces. Evening events typically occur about once per month or once every other month with attendance that can range from 100 to over 300 people. With the project, the larger events (those other than Curriculum Night and drawing 140 to 425 attendees) could generate parking demand between 45 and 120 vehicles. At the lower end of the event range, most or all demand could

be accommodated within the on-site parking lot with 46 spaces). At the higher end of the range, about 74 vehicles would require off-site parking and would be expected to use on-street parking. Based on the on-street parking utilization analysis, there were over 200 on-street spaces available on a non-event night, which could accommodate those events. The parking overflow would be noticeable and would likely be full and congested along the roadways closest to the school. Due to the relative infrequency of those events (one per month or every other month), the increase in demand associated with the addition would not represent a significant adverse impact.

For the largest event—Curriculum Night— parking is already full (utilization on Curriculum Night was 89 percent; 98 percent on roadways east of Aurora Avenue N) and increases in demand associated with the larger school could cause demand to exceed supply (greater than 100 percent) or to extend beyond the 800-foot study area. To mitigate this potential impact, the school could identify additional parking supply (such as parking on play areas or in shared lots) and/or modify the event to reduce total peak demand (such as by separating it into two sessions or into two nights based on grade levels).

The Seattle School District has a shared parking agreement with Bethany Community Church (BCC) that allows church members to park in the Bagley Elementary lot. Observed Sunday use of the lot found 63 to 68 vehicles parked (there are 58 striped spaces); on-street parking on Sundays averaged 85 percent utilized (range from 81 to 88 percent). With the project, the school's lot would have 12 fewer spaces (reduced to a supply of 46 spaces), which could result in 17 to 22 vehicles being displaced from the school lot. On-street parking on Sundays was found to average 85 percent utilized. While some of the displaced demand could occur on-street, it was recommended that additional parking supply measures be coordinated with BCC to mitigate for the loss of available shared supply on Sundays. BCC already contracts with North Seattle College for use of its southeast lot located at N 92nd Street / Corliss Avenue and provides shuttles continuously for the 9:30 and 11:00 a.m. services. The District would coordinate with BCC to establish a shared-use agreement for a portion of the parking located at the Robert Eagle Staff Middle School or Cascadia Elementary School site (located on N 90th Street west of Wallingford Avenue N) for Sunday services. The shuttles that already operate near that site to serve North Seattle College could add a stop for parking at those schools. With this added shared parking option, the impacts of displaced Sunday parking demand could be mitigated.

- 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 proposal would not require any new or improvements to existing roads, streets, pedestrian, bicycle or state transportation facilities.

However, northbound and southbound movements at the N 80th Street/Stone Avenue N intersection are forecast to degrade from LOS D to LOS F during the morning peak hour with the project. The poor operations during the morning peak hour would affect a relatively small number of through- and left-turning vehicles (9 northbound and 34 southbound). Due to the low volumes, the intersection would likely not meet minimum volume warrants for signalization outlined in the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD). However, a mitigation measure that would restrict movements from Stone Avenue N to right-turns only at N 80th Street could address the poor operations.

Analysis of the site access driveway indicates that the overall level of service would degrade from LOS A to LOS B during the morning peak hour and the northbound movements would degrade from LOS D to LOS F due to added school trips. During the afternoon peak hour, the access would continue to operate at LOS A overall; northbound movements would continue to operate at LOS C with a small increase in delay. To address the poor operations and potential high delays within the site and to improve operations within the lot during morning drop-off and afternoon pick-up, it is recommended that turns from the driveway be limited to right only during these periods.

With these right-turn-only restrictions at the school access driveway and the N 80th Street/Stone Avenue N intersection, both locations would operate at LOS A overall during the morning and afternoon peak hours. Movements from Stone Avenue N to N 80th Street would be improved to LOS C or better. Access at the site driveway would also be improved to LOS C or better and the lot would be able to accommodate drop-off and pick-up trips with less delay. The effects of these restrictions on other study-area intersections (accounting for drivers using the alternate routes) would be minor. Therefore, it is recommended that, if approved by the Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT), SPS work with the City to install signage on Stone Avenue N restricting movements at N 80th Street to right turn only.

Since the poor operations exiting the school parking lot would only occur for short periods during morning drop-off and afternoon pick-up periods, and would involve families at the school, it is recommended that the turn restriction at the driveway be enacted using driver guidelines that are distributed with information materials throughout the school year. The driveway could continue to operate without limits during other times.

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 immediate vicinity of water, rail, or air transportation.

- 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 traffic analysis conducted for this SEPA Checklist reflected conditions with the renovation and addition that would increase enrollment capacity up to 600 students, an increase of 175 students compared to the existing school enrollment. Based on daily trip generation rates published for elementary schools by the Institute of Transportation Engineers and adjusted to reflect higher peak period rates observed at the site, the renovated and expanded Bagley Elementary School project is expected to generate net increases of about 250 trips per day (125 in, 125 out), 122 trips during the morning peak hour, and 59 trips during the afternoon peak hour. The peak traffic volumes occur in the morning just before classes begin (between 7:00 and 8:00 a.m.) and in the afternoon around dismissal (between 1:45 and 2:45 p.m.).

The estimates described above include school-bus and delivery trips to the and from the site. With the added enrollment capacity, the school could generate up to 16 additional school-bus trips each day (4 in and 4 out in the morning and 4 in and 4 out in the afternoon). Other commercial vehicle trips include occasional food and supply deliveries as well as trash and recycling pick-up that already occur at 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.**

There are no agricultural or forest product uses in the immediate site vicinity and the project would not interfere with, affect or be affected by the movement of agricultural or forest products.

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

Project construction would include earthwork that would consist of over-excavation for the footings and slabs on grade, basement, and stormwater detention that would remove about 5,000 cubic yards (cy) of material from the site and fill of about 2,000 cy for a net export of about 3,000 cy. Assuming an average of 20-cy per truck (truck/trailer combination), the excavation and fill would generate about 150 truckloads (150 trucks in and 150 trucks out). The bulk of the earthwork activities are likely to occur over six to eight weeks (30 to 40 days). This would correspond to an average of 7 to 10 truck trips per day and an average of about one truck trip per hour on a typical 8-hour construction work day. This volume of truck traffic may be noticeable to residents living near the site, but is not expected to result in significant impacts to traffic operations in the site vicinity.

The construction of the project would also generate employee and equipment trips to and from the site. It is anticipated that construction workers would arrive at the construction site before the AM peak traffic period on local area streets and depart the site prior to the PM peak period; construction work shifts for schools are usually from 7:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. with workers arriving between 6:30 and 6:45 a.m. The number of workers at the project site at any one time would vary depending upon the construction element being implemented. Some parking for construction personnel may be provided within the site, but some construction workers would park on-street along the site frontage.

The following measures are included as part of the proposal to reduce the traffic and parking impacts associated with the Daniel Bagley Elementary School Renovation and Addition project.

- A. **Construction Transportation Management Plan (CTMP):** SPS would require the selected contractor to develop a Construction Transportation Management Plan (CTMP) that addresses traffic and pedestrian control during school construction. It would define truck routes, lane closures, walkway closures, and parking or load/unload area disruptions, as necessary. To the extent possible, the CTMP would direct trucks along the shortest route to arterials and away from residential streets to avoid unnecessary conflicts with resident and pedestrian activity. The CTMP may also include measures to keep adjacent streets clean on a daily basis at the truck exit points (such as street sweeping or on-site truck wheel cleaning) to reduce tracking dirt offsite. The CTMP would identify parking locations for the construction staff; to the extent possible, construction employee parking would be contained on-site.
- B. **Restrict Movements from Stone Avenue N at N 80th Street to Right-Turns Only:** If approved by SDOT, SPS would coordinate with the City to implement restrictions for Stone Avenue N at N 80th Street.
- C. **Transportation Management Plan (TMP):** Prior to the school re-opening, SPS and the school principal would establish a Transportation Management Plan (TMP) to educate families about the access load/unload procedures for the site layout. The TMP would encourage school bus ridership, carpooling, and supervised walking (such as walking school buses). The plan would require the school to distribute information to families about drop-off and pick-up procedures, as well as travel routes for approaching and leaving the school (including restricting parking lot egress to right turn only). It would also instruct staff and parents not to block or partially block any residential driveways with parked or stopped vehicles.
- D. **Engage Seattle School Safety Committee:** SPS would engage the Seattle School Safety Committee (of which SDOT is a member) to review walk

routes and determine if any changes should be made to crosswalk locations, signage, or pavement markings. It should also ensure that school zone speed limits are established and enforced and that crossing guard locations—particularly at crossings of N 80th Street at Stone Avenue N—are determined. Options for crosswalk enhancement at the Stone Avenue N crossing of N 80th Street, such as a pedestrian actuated rapid flashing beacon, could be considered.

- E. **Develop Neighborhood Communication Plan for School Events.** SPS and the school administration would develop a neighborhood communication plan to inform nearby neighbors of events each year. The plan would be updated annually (or as events are scheduled) and would provide information about the dates, times, and rough magnitude of attendance. The communication would be intended to allow neighbors to plan for the occasional increase in on-street parking demand that would occur with large events.
- F. **Event Management.** For the largest evening event held at the school—typically Curriculum Night—the school would work to identify additional parking supply (such as parking on play areas) and/or work to reduce total peak demand. Reductions in demand could be accomplished by separating the event into two sessions or into two nights based on grade levels.
- G. **Coordinate with SDOT and Safety Committee:** SPS would explore with SDOT the option to shift the travel lane on N 80th Street to the north and move the on-street parking that now occurs on the north (westbound) side to the south (eastbound) side of the street adjacent to the school. If approved by SDOT, this could allow for the establishment of a short-term passenger vehicle load/unload zone adjacent to the school in order to better accommodate morning arrival and afternoon dismissal volumes. The parking could be unrestricted during other times of the day.

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.**

The proposed project would add attendance to the facility, but is not anticipated to require additional public services above those already needed for operation.

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

An increased need for public services is not anticipated; therefore, mitigation to reduce impacts to public services is not proposed.

16. Utilities

a. Underline utilities currently available at the site:

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

In addition to those utilities indicated above, cable and internet services are also available at the site.

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, telephone, and natural gas would continue to be provided to the school. SPS would work with Seattle City Light, Puget Sound Energy, and its telephone provider to coordinate the extension of utilities to the additions, if needed.

The contractor would coordinate with utility purveyors to locate all existing utilities prior to proceeding with construction activity. Any active underground pipes encountered would be protected. Should undocumented piping or other utilities be encountered, the utility purveyor would be immediately contacted prior to resuming construction activity near the utility. Storm drains would be maintained and protected as catch basins.

C. SIGNATURE

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

Signature: _____

Name of signee: _____

Position and
Agency/Organization: _____

Date Submitted: _____

REFERENCES

- Associated Earth Sciences, Inc. 2016. Draft Subsurface Exploration, Geologic Hazards, and Preliminary Geotechnical Engineering Report, Daniel Bagley Elementary School Addition, Seattle, WA. Prepared for Seattle Public Schools. September 20, 2016.
- City of Seattle. 2016. Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan: Managing Growth to Become an Equitable and Sustainable City (2015 – 2035). November 2016.
- City of Seattle. 2017b. City of Seattle Zoning GIS Dataset. Updated March 7, 2017. Available at: <https://data.seattle.gov/dataset/City-Of-Seattle-Zoning/2hat-teay>
- Environmental Science Associates (ESA). 2017. Bagley Elementary School Addition Project, Cultural Resources Assessment, Seattle, King County, WA. June 15, 2017.
- Heffron Transportation, Inc. (Heffron). 2018. Transportation Technical Report for Bagley Elementary School Renovation and Addition. Prepared for Seattle Public Schools. February 1, 2018.
- King County. 2017. Review of the *King County iMap* Noxious Weeds Data, April 2017, at <http://gismaps.kingcounty.gov/iMap>
- Seattle Public Schools (SPS). 2012. *Building Excellence Phase IV Capital Improvement Program Revised Final Environmental Impact Statement*. July 2012.
- Seattle Public Schools (SPS). 2016. *Building, Technology, and Academics/Athletics IV Program Final SEPA Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement*. July 2016.
- Tree Solutions, Inc. 2016. Tree Inventory and Site Assessment. December 8, 2016.
- Tree Solutions, Inc. 2017. Advanced Exceptional Tree & Landscape Assessment. February 2, 2017; updated March 3, 2017.
- Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology). 2017. Facility/Site Search. Accessed April 11th, 2017. Available at: <https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/facilitysite/SearchData/ShowSearch.aspx?ModuleType=FacilitySite&RecordSearchMode=New>
- Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW). 2017. Review of the *Priority Habitats and Species (PHS) on the Web*, April 2017, at <http://wdfw.wa.gov/mapping/phs/>