

**Proposal for SEPA/Project Review  
CONSOLIDATED PROCESS  
ISSUES/ECOLOGY REACTION FOR COMMITTEE DISCUSSION  
4/4/13**

<b>PROPOSAL</b>	<b>ISSUES/DISCUSSION</b>	<b>Advisory Committee Comments</b>
<p>Counties' proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allow a consolidated permit application and environmental disclosure (i.e. SEPA review)</li> <li>• Master Application (under 36.70B) is a consolidated permit application and environmental disclosure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Separate environmental checklist would no longer be required</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Would apply to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any local government fully planning under GMA that chooses to use this process</li> <li>• Any application subject to SEPA and that requires a Notice of Application under RCW 36.70B</li> </ul> <p>Process description:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comment period is combined for both permit application and environmental disclosure</li> <li>• Local government determines whether EIS is required <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ If so, initiates scoping</li> <li>○ If not, continues review</li> </ul> </li> <li>• If project not subject to EIS, local government decision on permit application is combined with DNS or MDNS threshold determination.</li> </ul>	<p>What are the implications of not providing state-wide consistency for this proposal?</p> <p>Some reviewers may have concerns about not having a standard checklist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would the SEPA Rules need to specify some basic level of information and structure to provide some type of consistency?</li> <li>• Prior to considering this as a rule change, can we solicit and approve a pilot process to understand how it can improve permit efficiencies without loss of SEPA information?</li> </ul> <p>This should also be available to non-fully planning counties/cities that use the Local Project Review Act process.</p> <p>The overall proposal is similar to existing <i>Optional DNS process</i> – how does it differ other than the combined checklist/application?</p>	