

August 21, 2012

SEPA Rule Making Advisory Committee - Worksheet to recommend raised exemption threshold levels.

Prepared By: Allen Rozema

Representing: Agricultural Interest

Type of Construction	Current maximum	In City	County UGA	GMA County out of UGA	Non-GMA County	Discussion/Rationale
<u>(i). Single-family Residential</u>	20 units	30-35 With notification to special taxing districts	30-35 With notification to special taxing districts	No increase		Support increasing densities inside municipal boundaries and UGA. Increasing density in unincorporated areas would appear to be in conflict with goal/intent of GMA. Concerned that increasing exemption levels within municipal boundaries will eliminate notice(s) to special taxing districts such as drainage districts in unincorporated areas that ultimately receive and handle stormwater as it leaves the municipal boundaries.
<u>(ii). Multi-family Residential</u>	New in 6406: Separate thresholds for SF vs. MF.	40 With notification to special taxing districts)	40 With notification to special taxing districts)	No increase		Refer to rational for SFR
<u>(iii). Agricultural</u>	30k sq ft	Increase to 1 acre or more as infrastructure is present/available to support if other agricultural policies exist within municipal boundaries such as "right-to-farm" ordinance, etc.		Eastside increase to 2 acres. Westside Increase to 1 acre		It may be worth considering developing 2 thresholds, one for east of the cascade and one for west of the cascades. Rationale being the 2 different landscape scales involved and type of agriculture practiced east vs. west.

(iv). Commercial	12k sq ft & 40 parking	Up to 60 With notification to special taxing districts plus demonstrated ability to not impact special taxing districts such as drainage districts in unincorporated areas		No increase		Refer to rational for SFR
v). Stand-alone Parking lot	Considerations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leave unchanged, as this is not in SB 6406? • Revise to match Comm parking number? 	Up to 60 With notification to special taxing districts plus demonstrated ability to not impact special taxing districts such as drainage districts in unincorporated areas		No increase		Refer to rational for SFR
(vi) Landfill & Excavation 1	500 cu yds	Move to a new separate item (k) in subsection (2) and set threshold at _____ cubic yards. This will ensure that larger excavation-only projects trigger SEPA, and avoid triggering SEPA review of exempt projects.(see footnote above)	Move to separate subsection @ _____cubic yards.	Move to separate subsection @ _____ cubic yards.	Move to separate subsection @ _____ cubic yards.	

¹ Ecology proposes moving stand-alone excavation to its own subsection (and out of “minor new construction”) in order to avoid confusion. This item is intended for excavation *not associated with a development proposal*. However, it is triggering unnecessary SEPA reviews when the excavation and fill project type is considered as part of the clearing and grading for building construction. Our proposal is to move this exempt project type to a separate subsection and apply the current “maximum” existing level across the location types and jurisdictions.