

# DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

---

---

*for the proposed*

## *Coe Elementary School Addition Project*

*prepared by*



**June 2019**

---

---

*EA Engineering, Science, and Technology, Inc., PBC  
Associated Earth Sciences, Inc.  
Tree Solutions, Inc.  
Heffron Transportation, Inc.*

---

---

# PREFACE

The purpose of this Draft Environmental Checklist is to identify and evaluate probable environmental impacts that could result from the **Coe Elementary School Addition Project** and to identify measures to mitigate those impacts. The **Coe Elementary School Addition Project** would involve development of a three-story addition that would be located immediately east of the existing elementary school building.

The State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA)<sup>1</sup> requires that all governmental agencies consider the environmental impacts of a proposal before the proposal is decided upon. This Draft Environmental Checklist has been prepared in compliance with the State Environmental Policy Act; the SEPA Rules, effective April 4, 1984, as amended (Chapter 197-11, Washington Administrative Code); and the Seattle City Code (25.05), which implements SEPA.

This document is intended to serve as SEPA review for site preparation work, building construction, and operation of the proposed development comprising the **Coe Elementary School Addition Project**. Analysis associated with the proposed project contained in this Environmental Checklist is based on Schematic Design plans for the project, which are on-file with Seattle Public Schools. While not construction-level detail, the schematic plans accurately represent the eventual size, location and configuration of the proposed project and are considered adequate for analysis and disclosure of environmental impacts.

This Environmental Checklist is organized into three major sections. *Section A* of the Checklist (starting on page 1) provides background information concerning the *Proposed Action* (e.g., purpose, proponent/contact person, project description, project location, etc.). *Section B* (beginning on page 5) contains the analysis of environmental impacts that could result from implementation of the proposed project, based on review of major environmental parameters. This section also identifies possible mitigation measures. *Section C* (page 30) contains the signature of the proponent, confirming the completeness of this Environmental Checklist.

Project-relevant analyses that served as a basis for this Environmental Checklist include: the *Geotechnical Engineering Services Report* (Associated Earth Sciences, Inc., 2019), the *Greenhouse Gas Emissions Worksheet* (EA Engineering, 2019), the *Tree Inventory Report* (Tree Solutions, Inc.), and the *Transportation Technical Report* (Heffron Transportation, Inc., 2019). These reports are included as appendices to this SEPA Checklist.

---

<sup>1</sup> Chapter 43.21C. RCW

# Table of Contents

---

<b>A. BACKGROUND .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1. Name of Proposed Project:.....	1
2. Name of Applicant: .....	1
3. Address and Phone Number of Applicant and Contact Person: .....	1
4. Date Checklist Prepared .....	1
5. Agency Requesting Checklist .....	1
6. Proposed Timing or Schedule (including phasing, if applicable):.....	1
7. Future Plans. ....	2
8. Additional Environmental Information.....	2
9. Pending Applications .....	2
10. Government Approvals or Permits .....	2
11. Project Description .....	3
12. Location of the Proposal. ....	4
<b>B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS .....</b>	<b>5</b>
1. Earth.....	5
2. Air .....	7
3. Water.....	8
4. Plants .....	11
5. Animals.....	12
6. Energy and Natural Resources .....	13
7. Environmental Health.....	14
8. Land and Shoreline Use .....	17
9. Housing .....	20
10. Aesthetics.....	20
11. Light and Glare .....	21
12. Recreation .....	22
13. Historic and Cultural Preservation.....	23
14. Transportation .....	25
15. Public Services .....	28
16. Utilities.....	29
<b>C. SIGNATURES.....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>FIGURES.....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>APPENDICES.....</b>	<b>36</b>

## PURPOSE

The State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), Chapter 43.21 RCW, requires all governmental agencies to consider the environmental impacts of a proposal before making decisions. The purpose of this checklist is to provide information to help identify impacts from the proposal (and to reduce or avoid impacts, if possible) and to help Seattle Public Schools to make a SEPA threshold determination.

### A. BACKGROUND

1. Name of Proposed Project:

***Coe Elementary School Addition Project***

2. Name of Applicant:

Seattle School District No. 1 (Seattle Public Schools)

3. Address and Phone Number of Applicant and Contact Person:

**Jeanette Imanishi**  
Project Manager  
Seattle Public Schools  
2445 – 3<sup>rd</sup> Ave. S.  
MS 22-332, P.O. Box 34165  
Seattle, WA 98124-1165  
206-252-0663

4. Date Checklist Prepared

June 11, 2019

5. Agency Requesting Checklist

Seattle School District No. 1  
2445 – 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue South  
MS 22-332, P.O. Box 34165  
Seattle, WA 98124-1165

6. Proposed Timing or Schedule (including phasing, if applicable):

The ***Coe Elementary School Addition Project*** that is analyzed in this Draft Environmental Checklist involves site preparation work, construction, and operation of the project referred to as the ***Coe Elementary School Addition Project***. Site preparation and construction could begin in approximately January 2020 with building occupancy in January 2021. It should be noted that the existing school would remain operational during the construction period.

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 plans for further development of the project site are proposed.

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

- *Geotechnical Engineering Services Report* (AESI, 2019);
- *Greenhouse Gas Emission Worksheet* (EA Engineering, 2019);
- *Tree Inventory Report* (Tree Solutions, 2019);
- *Transportation Technical Report* (Heffron Transportation, 2019).

These reports are included as appendices to this Checklist.

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 known other applications that are pending approval for the **Coe Elementary School Addition Project** site.

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

### **City of Seattle**

- *Department of Construction and Inspections*

Permits/approvals associated with the proposed project, including:

- Grading/Shoring Permit
- Tree Removal Authorization
- Building Permit
- Mechanical Permits
- Electrical and Fire Alarm Permits
- Drainage and Side Sewer Permit
- Comprehensive Drainage Control Plan Approval
- Drainage Control Plan with Construction Best Management Practices, Erosion and Sediment Control Approval

- *Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT)*

- Street Use and Construction Use Permit (temporary – construction related)
- Street Use and Utility Permit

### **King County**

- Plumbing Permit
- Sewer Treatment Capacity Charge Approval

### **Puget Sound Clean Air Agency**

- Air Quality Permit – Asbestos (demolition)

### **WA Department of Ecology**

- NPDES Construction Stormwater Permit

11. Give a 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.

### **Existing Site Conditions**

The proposed **Coe Elementary School Addition Project** site is located within Seattle's Queen Anne neighborhood (see **Figures 1** and **2**). The school campus is generally bounded by W Smith Street to the north, 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue W to the east, retail/commercial uses and single family residences to the south, and 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue W to the west.

The existing three-story Coe Elementary School includes approximately 75,000 sq. ft. of building space with 27 classrooms, offices/administrative space, a library, a gymnasium, and a cafeteria. A playground and play areas are located to the south of the existing building. A parking lot with approximately 19 parking stalls (including two accessible stalls) is located to the northeast of the existing building. Coe Elementary School has a capacity for approximately 450 students; however, current enrollment for the existing school is approximately 535 students.

The site of the proposed **Coe Elementary School Addition Project** is currently comprised of paved areas, grass and shrubs and paved walkways.

### **Proposed Project**

The proposed **Coe Elementary School Addition Project** is intended to address current over-crowded conditions in the existing facility and upgrade the quality of the student learning environment at the school. The proposed project would include a new three-story addition that would be located on the east side of the existing building (See **Figure 3**). The addition would be funded by a Distressed Schools Grant awarded by the State of Washington in January 2018 with security improvements to the existing building funded by the BEX V Capital Improvement Program which was approved by voters in February 2019.

The approximately 10,500-square foot, three-story building addition would be located on the east side of the existing classroom building. The addition would consist of two new classrooms on each level of the new addition (total of six new classrooms), along with storage/classroom support space, learning commons areas, a small group collaboration room, restrooms and circulation areas. The proposed addition would

increase the student capacity of the school from an existing capacity of 450 students to a new capacity of 580 students.

No changes to existing play areas and recreation space on the school campus would occur as part of the proposal.

Vehicle and bus access to the site would continue to remain the same as under existing conditions and there would be no changes to the existing onsite parking lot (19 total parking spaces). Bus loading/unloading would continue to occur along W Smith Street, and parent vehicle loading/unloading would continue to occur along 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue W and 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue W.

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. If a proposal would occur over a range of area, provide the range or boundaries of the site(s).

The proposed **Coe Elementary School Addition Project** site is located at 2424 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue W within Seattle's Queen Anne neighborhood. The project site is generally bounded by W Smith Street to the north, 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue W to the east, retail/commercial uses and single family residences to the south, and 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue W to the west. See **Figure 1** and **Figure 2** for vicinity maps of the project site

B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS

1. Earth

a. **General description of the site (circle one):**

Flat, rolling, hilly, steep slopes, mountainous,  
other: \_\_\_\_\_

The majority of the *Coe Elementary School Addition Project* site is flat with a slight slope to the northwest.

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

The overall vertical change of the project site is approximately 10 feet, which equates to the slope of approximately two percent (*AESI, 2019*). According to the City of Seattle's Environmentally Critical Areas (ECA) Maps, there are no existing steep slopes on or in the vicinity of the project site.

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

Two exploration borings (including one as a groundwater monitoring well) were completed on the site as part of the Geotechnical Report prepared by AESI for the project (see **Appendix A** for further details). Explorations were completed to a depth ranging from 26 to 61 feet. Soils on the site generally consisted of fill, Vashon lodgement glacial till, and Vashon advance outwash.

The project site does not contain any agricultural land of long-term commercial significance.

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

There are no indications or history of unstable soils on the site or in the site vicinity. According to the City of Seattle's Environmentally Critical Areas (ECA) Maps, there are no potential slide areas or liquefaction-prone areas on the site or in the site vicinity (*City of Seattle, 2019*).

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

Approximately 500 cubic yards of material would be excavated from the site during construction activities and approximately 500 cubic yards of structural fill would be imported to the site. The specific source of fill material is not known at this time but it 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.**

Temporary erosion is possible in conjunction with any construction activity. Site work would expose soils on the site, but the implementation of a Temporary Erosion Sedimentation Control (TESC) plan that is consistent with City of Seattle standards and the implementation of best management practices (BMPs) during construction would mitigate any potential impacts.

Once the project is operational, no erosion is anticipated.

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

Under the current conditions, approximately 75 percent of the campus is covered with impervious surfaces, including buildings, paved play areas, walkways, parking areas and other impervious surfaces. The site of the proposed addition is primarily comprised of paved areas, walkways, and landscape areas.

With the completion of the project, approximately 76 percent of the campus would be covered with impervious surfaces. New impervious surfaces would primarily consist of the proposed building addition.

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

The proposed project would comply with City of Seattle regulations, including providing a Temporary Erosion and Sedimentation Control (TESC) Plan and Best Management Practices (BMPs). **Appendix B** also provides a summary of Construction BMPs that are typically utilized by Seattle Public Schools during the construction process. The following measures would be implemented during construction to control erosion:

- Provide storm drain inlet protection;
- Route surface water away from work areas;

- Keep staging areas and travel areas clean and free of track-out;
- Cover work areas and stockpiled soils when not in use; and,
- Complete earthwork during dry weather and site conditions, if possible.

## 2. Air

- a. **What type of emissions to the air would result from the proposal (i.e., dust, automobile, odors, industrial wood smoke) during construction and when the project is completed? If any, generally describe and give approximate quantities if known.**

During construction, the *Coe Elementary School Addition Project* could result in temporary increases in localized air emissions associated with particulates and construction-related vehicles. It is anticipated that the primary source of temporary, localized increases in air quality emissions would result from particulates associated with demolition, on-site excavation and site preparation. While the potential for increased air quality emissions could occur throughout the construction process, the timeframe of greatest potential impact would be at the outset of the project in conjunction with the site preparation and excavation/grading activities. However, as described above under the Earth discussion, minimal amounts of excavation would be required for the project and air quality emission impacts are not anticipated to be significant.

Temporary, localized emissions associated with carbon monoxide and hydrocarbons would result from diesel and gasoline-powered construction equipment operating on-site, construction traffic accessing the project site, and construction worker traffic. However, emissions from these vehicles and equipment would be small and temporary and are not anticipated to result in a significant impact.

Upon completion of the project, the primary source of emissions would be from vehicles travelling to and from the site. Seattle Public Schools maintains an anti-idling policy for buses which minimizes potential emissions. As a result, significant adverse air quality impacts would not be anticipated.

Another consideration with regard to air quality and climate relates to Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHG). In order to evaluate climate change impacts of the proposed project relative to the requirements of the City of Seattle, a Greenhouse Gas Emissions Worksheet has been prepared (**Appendix C** of this Environmental Checklist). This Worksheet estimates the emissions from the following sources: embodied emissions; energy-related emissions; and, transportation-related emissions. In total, the estimated lifespan emissions for the

proposed project would approximate 10,997 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e<sup>2</sup>. Based on an assumed building life of 62.5 years,<sup>3</sup> the proposed building would be estimated to generate approximately 176 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e annually.

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

The primary off-site source of emissions in the site vicinity is vehicle traffic on surrounding roadways, including 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue W, 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue W, and W McGraw Street. There are no known offsite sources of air emissions or odors that may affect the proposed project.

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

The following measure would be provided to reduce/control air quality impacts during construction:

- Construction activities would be required to comply with Puget Sound Clean Air Agency (PSCAA) regulations, including Regulation I, Section 9.11 (prohibiting the emission of air contaminants that would be injurious to human health) and Regulation I, Section 9.15 (prohibiting the emission of fugitive dust, unless reasonable precautions are employed). Additional mitigation measures to minimize air quality impacts during construction are identified in **Appendix B**.

3. Water

**a. Surface:**

**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 is no surface water body on or in the immediate vicinity of the **Coe Elementary School Addition Project** site. The nearest surface water body is the Lake Washington Ship Canal, which is located approximately one mile to the north of the project site (see **Figure 1**).

---

<sup>2</sup> MTCO<sub>2</sub>e is defined as Metric Ton Carbon Dioxide Equivalent and is a standard measure of amount of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions reduced or sequestered.

<sup>3</sup> According to the Greenhouse Gas Emissions Worksheet, 62.5 years is the assumed building life for educational buildings.

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

The proposed project will not require any work over, in, or adjacent (within 200 feet) of any water body.

- 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 any surface water body as a result of the proposed project.

- 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 proposed project site does not lie within a 100-year floodplain and is not identified as a flood prone area on the City of Seattle Environmentally Critical Areas map (*City of Seattle, 2019*).

- 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.**

There would be no discharge of waste materials to surface waters.

**b. Ground:**

- 1) Will ground water be withdrawn, or will water be discharged to ground water? 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 or water discharged to ground water as part of the proposed project. During geotechnical investigations on the site (*AESI, 2019*), a groundwater monitoring well was installed at a depth of approximately 60 feet below ground surface within one of the exploration borings. Groundwater was not encountered within the monitoring well; however, perched

groundwater could be encountered if construction occurs during wetter months.

- 2) Describe waste material that will be discharged into the ground from septic tanks or other sources; 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.**

Waste material would not be discharged into the ground from septic tanks or other sources as a result of the proposed project.

**c. *Water Runoff (including storm water):***

- 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.**

Approximately 75 percent of the existing campus is in impervious surfaces, including existing buildings and paved surfaces (parking areas, play areas, walkways, etc.). The site of the proposed addition on campus is generally comprised of paved areas, walkways and grass/shrubs. Existing stormwater is collected via an existing underground storm drainage system and discharged to an existing 15-inch main within 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue W or a 12-inch main within 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue W, both of which ultimately discharge into a designated receiving water body.

Stormwater from the proposed building addition would be collected and conveyed to the north to connect with an existing catch basin in the existing parking lot, or to the south to connect with an existing catch basin in the existing play area. Prior to entering the existing stormwater lines, stormwater runoff would be mitigated by bioretention planters that would serve as onsite stormwater BMPs.

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

The existing stormwater management system for the site would continue to ensure that waste materials would not enter ground or surface waters as a result of the proposed project.

- 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 site vicinity.

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

The following measures would be implemented to control surface, ground and runoff water impacts:

- A Temporary Erosion and Sedimentation Control (TESC) Plan and Best Management Practices (BMPs) would be implemented during construction to reduce erosion and minimize impacts to water resources.
- Stormwater management for the proposed addition would comply with applicable City requirements, include the City's Stormwater Code (SMC 22.800).

4. Plants

**a. Check or circle types of vegetation found on the site:**

deciduous tree:

evergreen tree:

shrubs

grass

pasture

crop or grain

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?**

Existing ornamental shrubs and grass areas are located on the project site, near the eastern entrance to the existing school building. A Tree Inventory Report was completed by Tree Solutions, Inc. to document the existing trees within the project area (see **Appendix D**). Eight trees are located within the project area, including four trees near the existing building entry and four trees within a planter area to the south of the existing building. Seven of the trees are less than six inches in diameter, which is the threshold for trees to be assessed for development projects; one tree (a Streetwise trident maple) is over six inches in diameter.

It is anticipated that existing shrubs and grass within the project area would be removed as part of construction. Five trees would be removed as part of the project to accommodate the proposed building addition. All of the trees proposed for removal are less than six inches in diameter; three of the existing Streetwise trident maple would be retained. As noted in **Appendix D**, one of the trees proposed for removal (Tree 5) could be potentially transplanted to another area of the school campus and SPS would assess the feasibility of relocation

of that tree. See **Appendix D** for details on the location of the existing trees and proposed tree removal.

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

No known threatened or endangered species are located on or proximate to the project site.

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

Five new trees would be planted on the site as part of the **Coe Elementary School Addition Project** to replace trees that are removed from the project area during construction. New landscaping would be provide adjacent to the proposed building addition, including drought tolerant shrubs and grass. New plantings at the proposed bioretention areas would also include native shrubs and groundcovers.

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

Noxious weeds or invasive species that could be present in the vicinity of the site include giant hogweed, English Ivy and Himalayan blackberry.

5. Animals

**a. Circle (underlined) any birds and animals that have been observed on or near the site or are known to be on or near the site:**

**birds:** songbirds, hawk, heron, eagle, **other:** seagulls, pigeons,  
**mammals:** deer, bear, elk, beaver, **other:** squirrels, raccoons,  
rats, mice  
**fish:** bass, salmon, trout, herring, shellfish, **other:** None.

Birds and small mammals tolerant of urban conditions may use and may be present on and near the **Coe Elementary School Addition Project** site. Mammals likely to be present in the site vicinity include: raccoon, eastern gray squirrel, mouse, rat, and opossum.

Birds common to the area include: European starling, house sparrow, rock dove, American crow, seagull, western gull, Canada goose, American robin, and house finch.

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

The following are listed threatened or endangered species that could be affected by development on the project site, based on data from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service: marbled murrelet, streaked horned lark, yellow-billed cuckoo, bull trout, grey wolf, and north american wolverine<sup>4</sup>. However, it should be noted that none of these species have been observed at the site and due to the urban location of the site, it is unlikely that these animals are present on or near the site

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

The entire Puget Sound area is within the Pacific Flyway, which is a major north-south flyway for migratory birds in America—extending from Alaska to Patagonia. Every year, migratory birds travel some or all of this distance both in spring and in fall, following food sources, heading to breeding grounds, or travelling to overwintering sites.

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

Existing trees on the site would be retained to the extent feasible. Five new trees would be planted on the site as part of the project to replace trees that would be removed during construction. New landscaping would be provided adjacent to the proposed building addition and new plantings would be included within the proposed bioretention areas.

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

Invasive species known to be located in King County include European starling, house sparrow and eastern gray squirrel.

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 are the primary source of energy that would serve the proposed **Coe Elementary School Addition Project** and would generally be utilized for lighting, electronics, and heating.

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

---

<sup>4</sup> U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. IPaC. <https://ecos.fws.gov/ipac/location/index>. Accessed May 2019.

The proposed project would not affect the 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:**

The proposed project would be required to meet or exceed the requirements of the City of Seattle Energy Code, as well as the Washington Sustainable Schools Protocol. The following features would be provided to conserve energy and minimize energy impacts of the proposed building addition:

- Demand control ventilation will be used to minimize ventilation air energy usage.
- High efficiency variable air volume (VAV) system exception to reduce fan energy.
- Daylight controls that automatically dim electric lighting in areas adjacent to windows.
- Plug load controllers that automatically switch off 50 percent of electrical outlets in classrooms and offices to reduce vampire loads from printers, monitors, and desk lamps during off hours.
- High performing windows with low-e coatings.
- Continuous air barrier and air leakage testing during construction to reduce infiltration and energy loss.
- Continuous insulation on exterior of building to prevent energy loss.

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.**

As with any construction project, accidental spills of hazardous materials from equipment or vehicles could occur; however, a spill prevention plan would minimize the potential of an accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment.

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

No known sources of potential contamination are present on the site

**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 surveys were conducted at Coe Elementary in 2012 and 2007 as part of prior projects within the building. Samples for asbestos-containing materials were taken from several classrooms within the school; however, each of the samples that were taken were determined to be non-asbestos-containing materials. Painted building components may contain lead-containing paint. In the event that potential areas of lead-containing paint are located within the project area, necessary precautions would be taken to prevent the release of lead into the air and surrounding environment and all construction activities would comply with applicable regulations, including WAC 296-155-176.

**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.**

During construction, gasoline and other petroleum-based products would be used for the operation of construction vehicles and equipment.

During the operation of the school, chemicals that would be used on the site would be limited to cleaning supplies and would be stored in an appropriate and safe location.

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

No special emergency services are anticipated to be required as a result of the project. As is typical of urban development, it is possible that normal fire, medical, and other emergency services may, on occasion, be needed from the City of Seattle for field activities (i.e. injuries during athletic events, etc.).

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

A spill prevention plan would be developed and implemented during construction to minimize the potential for an accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment.

In areas where hazardous materials (lead-containing paint, PCB light ballasts, and mercury-containing light bulbs, etc.) may be present during building demolition, the construction contractor

would comply with applicable regulations and standards for removal and disposal of such material.

**b. Noise**

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

Traffic noise associated with adjacent roadways (7<sup>th</sup> Avenue W, W Smith Street, 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue W, and W McGraw Street) is the primary source of noise in the vicinity of the project site. Existing noise in the site vicinity is not anticipated to adversely affect the proposed ***Coe Elementary School Addition 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 site.**

Short-Term Noise

Construction-related noise would occur as a result of on-site construction activities associated with the project. As noted previously, the existing school would remain operational during the construction process and noise from construction activity would be noticeable during the school day. Existing school uses and residential land uses (particularly those to the immediate north and northeast of the site) would be the most sensitive noise receptors and could experience occasional noise-related impacts throughout the construction process. Pursuant to Seattle's Noise Code (SMC, Chapter 25.08), maximum sound levels in residential communities shall not exceed 55 dBA. However, construction activities are allowed to exceed the maximum noise levels between 7 AM and 7 PM on weekdays and 9 AM to 7 PM on weekends. The proposed project would comply with provisions of Seattle's Noise Code (SMC, Chapter 25.08) as it relates to construction-related noise to reduce noise impacts during construction.

Long-Term Noise

The proposed ***Coe Elementary School Addition Project*** and associated increase in student capacity would likely result in a potential minor increase in noise from human voices and vehicles travelling to and from the site, particularly during student drop-off and pickup. The potential increase in noise is anticipated to be minor and would not extend beyond 10 PM. As a result, no significant noise impacts would be anticipated.

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

The following measures would be provided to reduce noise impacts:

- As noted, the project would comply with provisions of the City's Noise Ordinance (SMC 25.08); specifically: construction hours would be limited to standard construction hours (non-holiday) from 7 AM to 7 PM and Saturdays and Sundays from 9 AM to 7 PM.

### 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 Coe Elementary school campus is comprised of the existing three-story classroom building which is centrally located on the campus and the existing gymnasium/cafeteria building which located in the north portion of the campus. An existing surface parking lot is located in the northeast corner of the campus. The existing playground area comprises the southern portion of the campus. The site of the proposed **Coe Elementary School Addition Project** is located to the east of the existing classroom building and adjacent to 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue W. The project site is currently comprised of paved areas, grass and shrubs and paved walkways (see **Figure 2** for an aerial photo of the site and **Figure 3** for the site plan of the project).

Adjacent land uses north, east and west of the project site are generally comprised of one- to three-story single family residences. Land uses to the south of the site generally include retail and commercial service uses such as restaurants, dental office, salon, insurance offices, dry cleaners, etc.

The site would continue to be utilized as a school and would not be anticipated to affect current land uses on adjacent properties.

- b. **Has the 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 project site has no recent history of use as a working farmland 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:***

The project site is located in an urban area and would not affect or be affected by working farm or forest land; no working farm or forest land is located in the vicinity of this urban site.

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

The Coe Elementary School campus contains approximately 75,000 sq. ft. of existing building space, including a three-story classroom building and a one-story gymnasium and cafeteria building. Both buildings would be retained on the site and would remain operational during the development of the proposed project.

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

No structures would be demolished as a result of the proposed project. A portion of the existing building would be demolished to allow interior connections between the existing building and the proposed addition.

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

The site is currently zoned as Single-Family Residential (SF 5000). Public schools are a permitted use in the SF 5000 zone. The Seattle Municipal Code includes a process for departures from the required development standards for public school uses. The proposed project is requesting a departure from the setback requirements of SMC 23.51B.002 in order to locate the addition to the east of the existing building to allow for efficient use of educational space within the building and on the overall school campus. The departure process requires that Seattle Public Schools apply to the Director of the Department of Construction and Inspections for any departures.

The surrounding areas to the north, east and west, are currently zoned as Single-Family Residential (SF 5000). The area to the south of the site that is currently comprised of commercial uses is zoned as Neighborhood Commercial 1-30 (NC1-30).

**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, 2018*).

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

The project site is not located within the City's designated shoreline boundary.

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

According to the City of Seattle Environmental Critical Areas Maps there are no Environmental Critical Areas located on the project site (*City of Seattle, 2019*).

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

The proposed ***Coe Elementary School Addition Project*** would not provide any residential opportunities. Development of the project would create new classroom space that would increase the student capacity for the school to approximately 580 students (current capacity is approximately 450 students). It should be noted that the current student enrollment at the school is approximately 535 students.

It is anticipated that the proposed addition would also provide space for approximately four new employees at the school.

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

The proposed project would not displace any people.

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

No displacement impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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

The proposed project is compatible with existing land uses and plans. The project requires a departure for setbacks and would comply with the requirements 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 site is not located near agricultural or forest lands and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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 *Coe Elementary School Addition Project*.

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

No housing presently exists on the site and none would be eliminated.

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

No housing impacts would occur and no mitigation would be necessary.

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 height of the school is approximately 47 feet tall at the eastern elevation, with a 62-foot high roof ridge at the gable. The proposed addition would be three stories tall and would match the existing height of the building.

The exterior building materials for the proposed *Coe Elementary School Addition Project* would be intended to match as closely as possible to the existing building materials. The ground floor will be clad in a brick rain screen. The second and third floor will be clad in painted fiber-cement siding. The roofline would match the existing roof, with the gable clad in asphalt shingles extending to cover the Learning Commons, and cornice detailing to match existing cornices.

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

Views of the site would generally remain similar to the existing conditions and would be reflective of the existing school uses on the

site. The proposed addition would increase the amount of building area on the site, but as noted above, it would be the same height as the existing building. Proposed building materials would also be selected to closely match the existing building.

The City's public view protection policies are intended to "protect public views of significant natural and human-made features: Mount Rainier, the Olympic and Cascade Mountains, the downtown skyline, and major bodies of water including Puget Sound, Lake Washington, Lake Union and the Ship Canal, from public places consisting of specified viewpoints, parks, scenic routes, and view corridors identified in Attachment 1" to the SEPA code<sup>5</sup>. No public view protection sites are located on or adjacent to the project site.

View protection from City-designated Scenic Routes is also encouraged<sup>6</sup>; however, there are no designated Scenic Routes adjacent to the project site. West McGraw Street is located south of the site and is designated as a Scenic Route, but the site of the proposed addition is located approximately 300 feet from the roadway area and would not be anticipated to affect views along the roadway.

Views of designated historic structures are also a consideration<sup>7</sup>. However, there are no designated landmarks or historic structures on or adjacent to the project site.

There are no designated views of the Space Needle on or adjacent to the project site<sup>8</sup>.

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

No significant impacts are anticipated with regard to aesthetic impacts and no measures are proposed.

11. Light and Glare

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

Short-Term Light and Glare

At times during the construction process, area lighting of the job site (to meet safety requirements) may be necessary, which would be noticeable proximate to the project site. In general, however, light and

---

<sup>5</sup> Seattle Municipal Code Chap. 25.05.675 P.2.a.i. and the accompanying *Seattle Views: An Inventory of 86 Public View Sites Protected under SEPA (May 2002)* document.

<sup>6</sup> Ord. #97025 (Scenic Routes Identified by the Seattle Engineering Department's Traffic Division) and Ord. #114057 (Seattle Mayor's Recommended Open Space Policies).

<sup>7</sup> Seattle Municipal Code Chapter 25.05.675 P.2.b.i.

<sup>8</sup> Seattle Municipal Code Chap. 25.05.675 P. and Seattle DCLU, 2001

glare from construction of the proposed project are not anticipated to adversely affect adjacent land uses.

#### Long-Term Light and Glare

Under the proposed **Coe Elementary School Addition Project**, there would be an increase in light and glare with the proposed building addition; however, light and glare on the site would remain similar to the existing conditions and would primarily consist of interior and exterior building lighting, as well as vehicle lights travelling to and from the site. Exterior building lighting would be designed to focus light on the site and minimize impacts to adjacent properties.

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

Light and glare associated with the proposed project would not be expected to cause a safety hazard or 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 are anticipated to affect the proposed project.

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

Interior and exterior building lighting would be programmed as part of the building facilities system to limit the amount of light utilized when the building is not in use. Evening activities/events that currently occur periodically during the school year can increase light during the evening on those days; however, the number of activities/events is not anticipated to change as a result of the project and amount of light would not be anticipated to result in a significant impact.

## 12. Recreation

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

The Coe Elementary School campus includes open play areas at the south end of the campus with basketball courts, four square courts, and other paved open play space areas. Coe Play Park is also located adjacent in the southwest corner of the campus and includes a playground and play structures that are utilized by students during recess.

There are several additional parks in the vicinity (approximately 0.5 miles) of the project site, including:

- David Rodgers Park is located immediately approximately 0.25 miles to the northeast of the site;
- West Queen Anne Playfield is located approximately 0.4 miles to the southeast of the site;
- Southwest Queen Anne Greenbelt is located approximately 0.5 miles to the southwest of the site; and,
- Mayfair Park is located approximately 0.5 miles to the northeast of the site.

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

The project would not displace any existing recreational uses.

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

No impacts to recreation would occur and no mitigation is necessary.

13. Historic and Cultural Preservation

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

Coe Elementary School was originally established in its current location in 1907. An addition of a north wing to the original building was constructed in 1914 and included eight classrooms, an auditorium and a gym. In 1972, two other building additions were constructed, including a new gymnasium and an open resource learning center. In 2000, a substantial renovation of the school took place which preserved and expanded the 1907 building and 1914 addition while demolishing the 1972 additions (*Marr, 2002*). In 2001, the 1907 and 1914 structures were destroyed in a fire and the current existing building was constructed in 2003 to replace those structures. The school is not listed as a City Landmark, on the Washington Heritage Register (WHR) or the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). There are no listed buildings immediately adjacent to the project site.

City Landmarks in the site vicinity include the Victorian Group/14<sup>th</sup> Avenue West Houses (located approximately 0.5 miles to the southwest), the Queen Anne Library (located approximately 0.5 miles to the south), and the Pacific Telephone and Telegraph Garfield Exchange (located approximately 0.5 miles to the south).

The Seattle Carnegie Library-Queen Anne Branch, the Queen Anne Public School, the Queen Anne Club, and the North Queen Anne Drive Bridge are all listed on the WHR and NRHP and are located approximately 0.5 mile or less from the project site.

- 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.**

As noted above, there are no designated landmarks located on or immediately adjacent to the project site.

The project site is not located within an area that is designated as the Government Meander Line Buffer area in the City of Seattle and only properties located within that area are required to prepare an archaeological investigation as part of the SEPA process. A review of Washington Information System for Architectural and Archaeological Records Data (WISAARD) indicates that the site and surrounding areas are considered a moderate potential for archaeological resources based on the WISAARD predictive model.

- 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.**

Potential impacts to historic and cultural resources on or near the site were evaluated by consulting the Seattle Public Schools building history information, the City of Seattle Landmarks map, and WISAARD.

- 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.**

Although no impacts to historic or cultural resources are anticipated with the proposed project, the following measure would be implemented to minimize impacts from a potential inadvertent discovery of cultural resources:

- Although archaeological resources are not anticipated on the site, it is possible that undiscovered pre-contact or historic cultural material could be present within the project area. In the event of an inadvertent discovery, King County, the Washington State

Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP) and affected Tribes (including the Duwamish) would be contacted.

#### 14. Transportation

A Transportation Technical Report for the **Coe Elementary School Addition Project** was prepared by Heffron Transportation, Inc. (*Heffron Transportation, 2019*). Information from the technical report is summarized in this section. See **Appendix E** for the full technical report.

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

Coe Elementary School is located at 2424 – 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue W in the Queen Anne neighborhood of Seattle. The school site is bounded by 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue W to the west, 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue N to the east, W Smith Street to the north, and commercial properties to the south. A small surface parking lot (with 19 parking spaces) is located on the northeast corner of the site with an access driveway on 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue W.

No changes to site access or parking are proposed.

- b. **Is site or affected geographic area currently served by public transit? 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 on 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue W with the northbound stop just north of W Smith Street and the southbound stop just north W McGraw Street. These stops are served by Metro Route 2, which provides all-day service seven days per week between Upper West Queen Anne, Downtown Seattle, First Hill, and the Madrona neighborhoods. On weekdays, the route operates from about 5:00 a.m. to 1:30 a.m. with headways (time between consecutive buses) of 20 to 40 minutes. There are also stops located about 1,000 feet east of the site at the W McGraw Street / 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue W intersection. These stops are served by Routes 3, 4, 13, and 29.

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

No additions or eliminations of on-site parking spaces is proposed. School-day parking demand may increase by approximately four to five vehicles with the project and there would be adequate onsite and on-street parking supply to accommodate the demand.

Added enrollment could also increase event-related demand at the school during evening events. However, due to the relative infrequency of large events and proportionally small project-related increase in demand, the event-related parking impacts would not be considered significant (see **Appendix E**).

- 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 proposed project would provide ADA compliant curb ramps at site corners as required by the City of Seattle. No other improvements to existing roads, streets, pedestrian, bicycle or state transportation facilities would be provided.

- 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 added classroom and increased enrollment capacity up to 580 students, an increase of 41 students compared to the existing school enrollment, which is at full capacity. Based on daily trip generation rates published for elementary schools by the Institute of Transportation Engineers, the classroom addition at Coe Elementary School is expected to generate a net increase of about 80 trips per day (40 in, 40 out). The peak traffic volumes are expected to 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 number of school-bus and delivery trips that already occur at the site are not expected to change with the classroom addition.

For more information about the anticipated school traffic generation, refer to **Appendix E**.

**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.**

The school would be open and operating during construction, which is planned to start in January 2020, and end in early 2021 when the addition is planned to be ready for occupancy. The construction effort would include some earthwork that would consist of excavation and fill for foundations and grading. It is estimated to require removal of about 500 cubic yards (cy) of material from the site and import of about 500 cy of structural fill for a total transport amount of about 1,000 cy. Assuming an average of 20-cubic yards per truck (truck/trailer combination), the excavation and fill would generate about 50 truckloads (50 trucks in and 50 trucks out). The earthwork activities are likely to occur between January 2020 and May 2020. If both efforts each occurred in one week (e.g. export occurred in one week in January and import occurred in one week in May), this would correspond to an average of 10 truck trips per day (5 in, 5 out) and just over one truck trip per hour during the earthwork transport. This volume of truck traffic may be noticeable to residents living adjacent to the site, but would not 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., but work not starting until 7:00 a.m. Generally, it is preferred that construction employee arrival and departures as well as transport and delivery of materials for construction not occur during student arrival or dismissal times to avoid conflicts. The number of workers at the project site at any one time would vary depending upon the construction element being implemented.

The proposed new classroom addition would be constructed on the eastern portion of the site. Preliminary planning suggests that the existing parking lot would be used for staging and building access from the northeastern part of the site would be closed. The curb-side frontage on 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue W, which is currently used for passenger-car load/unload, may be unavailable or have reduced capacity during

construction. As a result, alternative temporary load/unload areas would be designated. The existing school-bus load/unload zone would remain and is not expected to be affected by construction.

During construction, pedestrians (including students) would be routed around or directed to avoid construction area using temporary walkways, fencing, and signage. Movements around the northeastern portion of the campus would likely be partially restricted.

Based on the above findings, the following measure is included as part of the proposal to reduce the traffic and parking impacts associated with the ***Coe Elementary School Addition Project***.

- **Construction Transportation Management Plan (CTMP):**  
The District will require the selected contractor to develop a CTMP that addresses traffic and pedestrian control during construction of the classroom addition. 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. To the extent possible, truck movements (including earthwork transport and deliveries of materials to the site) would not occur during morning arrival or afternoon dismissal periods for the school. 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.

## 15. Public Services

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

While the ***Coe Elementary School Addition Project*** would add student capacity to the school, it is not anticipated to generate a significant increase in the need for public services. To the extent that emergency service providers have planned for gradual increases in service demands, no significant impacts are anticipated.

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

The increase in capacity of the school and number of students on the site may result in incrementally greater demand for emergency

services; however, it is anticipated that adequate service capacity is available within the Queen Anne area to preclude the need for additional public facilities/services.

16. Utilities

- a. **Circle utilities currently available at the site: electricity, natural gas, water, refuse service, telephone, sanitary sewer, septic system, other.**

All utilities are currently available at the site, including cable/internet services.

- 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 immediate vicinity that might be needed.**

Electrical (Seattle City Light), natural gas (Puget Sound Energy) and telephone/internet would continue to be provided to the school and Seattle Public Schools would coordinate with each purveyor regarding service for the proposed addition.

Water service, sewer service and stormwater are provided by Seattle Public Utilities. The ***Coe Elementary School Addition Project*** would require rerouting the existing six-inch fire service water line and modifications to the existing side sewer line to serve the new building addition footprint. Connections to the existing stormwater laterals would also be required for the proposed stormwater management facilities.

C. SIGNATURES

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

**Signature:**



---

**Name of Signee:**

Jeanette Imanishi

---

**Position and Agency/Organization:**

Project Manager, Seattle Public Schools

---

**Date:**

June 11, 2019

---

## REFERENCES

- Associated Earth Sciences, Inc. *Subsurface Exploration and Geotechnical Engineering Report for Coe Elementary School*. March 21, 2019.
- City of Seattle. *City of Seattle Comprehensive Plan*. Accessed April 2019.
- City of Seattle. *City of Seattle Department of Neighborhoods Landmarks Website and Map*: <https://www.seattle.gov/neighborhoods/programs-and-services/historic-preservation/landmarks>. Accessed April 2019.
- City of Seattle. *City of Seattle GIS website*: <http://web1.seattle.gov/dpd/maps/dpdgis.aspx>. Accessed April 2019.
- City of Seattle. *City of Seattle Municipal Code*. Accessed April 2019.
- City of Seattle. *Ordinance No. 97025*. August 26, 1958.
- City of Seattle. *Ordinance No. 114057*. July 11, 1988.
- City of Seattle. *Seattle Views: An Inventory of 86 Public View Sites Protected under SEPA*. May 2002.
- Heffron Transportation, Inc. *Transportation Technical Report for Coe Elementary School*. June 11, 2019
- Marr, Carolyn J. *Building for Learning: Seattle's Public School Histories, 1862-2000*. 2002
- Tree Solutions, Inc. *Preliminary Tree Inventory Report – Coe Elementary School*. June 3, 2019.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. IPaC. <https://ecos.fws.gov/ipac/location/index>. Accessed May 2019
- Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation. *Washington Information System for Architectural and Archaeological Records Data*. Accessed April 2019.