WAC 197-11-960 Environmental checklist.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Purpose of checklist:

The State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), chapter 43.21C RCW, requires all governmental agencies to consider the environmental impacts of a proposal before making decisions. An environmental impact statement (EIS) must be prepared for all proposals with probable significant adverse impacts on the quality of the environment. The purpose of this checklist is to provide information to help you and the agency identify impacts from your proposal (and to reduce or avoid impacts from the proposal, if it can be done) and to help the agency decide whether an EIS is required.

Instructions for applicants:

This environmental checklist asks you to describe some basic information about your proposal. Governmental agencies use this checklist to determine whether the environmental impacts of your proposal are significant, requiring preparation of an EIS. Answer the questions briefly, with the most precise information known, or give the best description you can.

You must answer each question accurately and carefully, to the best of your knowledge. In most cases, you should be able to answer the questions from your own observations or project plans without the need to hire experts. If you really do not know the answer, or if a question does not apply to your proposal, write "do not know" or "does not apply." Complete answers to the questions now may avoid unnecessary delays later.

Some questions ask about governmental regulations, such as zoning, shoreline, and landmark designations. Answer these questions if you can. If you have problems, the governmental agencies can assist you.

The checklist questions apply to all parts of your proposal, even if you plan to do them over a period of time or on different parcels of land. Attach any additional information that will help describe your proposal or its environmental effects. The agency to which you submit this checklist may ask you to explain your answers or provide additional information reasonably related to determining if there may be significant adverse impact.

Use of checklist for nonproject proposals:

Complete this checklist for nonproject proposals, even though questions may be answered "does not apply." IN ADDITION, complete the SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS (part D).

For nonproject actions, the references in the checklist to the words "project," "applicant," and "property or site" should be read as "proposal," "proposer," and "affected geographic area," respectively.

A. BACKGROUND

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable:

Revising Washington Administrative Code (WAC) Chapter 173-351, Criteria for Municipal Solid Waste Landfills

2. Name of applicant:

Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology)

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

Wayne Krafft
Washington State Department of Ecology
Waste 2 Resources Program
4601 N. Monroe St.
Spokane, WA 99205-1295
Phone: (509) 329-3438

4. Date checklist prepared:

April 20, 2012

5. Agency requesting checklist:

Washington State Department of Ecology

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

The proposal is to revise Chapter 173-351, Criteria for Municipal Solid Waste Landfills updating the existing rule that became effective on October 26, 1993. The following must occur before the revised rule is finalized:

- **SEPA threshold determination by Ecology on this proposal**
- **fulfillment of public notice requirements**
- **fulfillment of public hearing requirements**
- **completion of the public comment period**
- **filing of the CR 103 documents and final revised rule with the Office of the Code Reviser.**

The rule will become effective 31 days after filing the CR 103 documents. The anticipated effective date is October of 2012.

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

Possibly. As new information is collected it may become necessary to amend the rule in order to ensure protection of human health and the environment. If this is the case, any additional SEPA and public notice requirements will be met at that time.

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

The official rule file for the previous rule revision in 1993 is housed in the Secretary of State Washington State Archives Building in Olympia, Washington. Ecology completed a SEPA Environmental Checklist and a DNS was issued on July 6, 1993.

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.

Not applicable to this proposal. The proposal is not for a specific property. All facilities covered by the proposed revised rule will be required to get a permit from their local health district or department. The applicant must meet SEPA requirements as required through the local permitting process.

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

Issuance of a threshold determination by the SEPA lead agency (Ecology).

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. (Lead agencies may modify this form to include additional specific information on project description.)

The proposed revised rule applies to all Municipal Solid waste landfills (MSWLFs) as defined in WAC 173-351.

The proposal is to revise the current state landfill design standards, WAC 173-351 Criteria for Municipal Solid Waste Landfills. Numerous revisions are being proposed to the existing rule. In all cases where changes are being proposed that

may have an impact on the environment, the proposed rule is at least as stringent as the governing federal regulations in 40 CFR 258—Criteria for Municipal Solid Waste Landfills.

As part of the solid waste landfill permitting process required under the proposed revised rule, facilities are responsible for submitting applications to the local health district or department and subject to SEPA and public notice requirements.

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 proposed revised rule will be applicable statewide.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS

1. **Earth**

a. General description of the site (circle one): Flat, rolling, hilly, steep slopes, mountainous,

Location Restrictions. The proposed rule would apply to all of Washington state with location restrictions for siting new or expanding municipal solid waste landfill (MSWLF) facilities, including but not limited to:

- **proximity to airports**
- **within floodplains**
- **within wetlands**
- **within faults or seismic impact zones**
- **unstable areas**
- **sole source aquifers**
- **land use designations.**

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

Owners and operators of new MSWLF units, existing MSWLF units, and/or lateral expansions that are located in an unstable area as defined by this rule must demonstrate that engineering measures have been designed into unit and/or facility to ensure that structural integrity will not be disrupted by unstable areas. The proposed rule would apply to all of Washington state.

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 prime farmland.

The proposed rule would apply to all of Washington state subject to the location restrictions specified in 1(a).

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

The proposed rule would apply to all Washington state subject to the location restrictions specified in 1(a). New facilities, new units, and/or lateral expansions are required to evaluate the stability of the site. Through engineering measures incorporated into the design, all existing facilities located in unstable areas must demonstrate that the integrity of the structural components of any unit will be stable.

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

The proposed rule would apply to all of Washington state. WAC 173-351 final cover criteria may require three or more feet of soil to be placed over the landfill units. The soils for final cover may come from on-site or off-site borrow pit material.

At off-site borrow sites, impacts may occur as a result of noise, dust, possible run-on and run-off problems in the disturbed area, and erosion potential. Transportation impacts may also occur moving material from borrow sites to the landfill facility.

Daily cover is also required at all facilities. On site material along with barrow pit material will be used for daily cover.

Project specific fill and grade issues would be addressed during the site specific SEPA review process.

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

Erosion could occur during the clearing, construction, and operation of the facility. As part of the facility design erosion must be addressed along with mitigation measures through run-on and run-off controls.

Project specific erosion issues would be addressed during the site specific SEPA review process.

The proposed changes to the rule have no impact to erosion potential at landfill facilities.

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

At minimum, a scale house along with some type of maintenance shed or shop will be located on-site. Some facilities may have administrative offices also located on-site. These facilities will take less than one percent of the surface area, including parking areas.

Each landfill cell will have an impervious bottom liner (synthetic or clay) that will cover substantial portions of the facility. Ground water monitoring is required to assure that any potential contamination to ground water will be detected.

The proposed changes to the rule have no impact to the percent of impervious surfaces required at landfill facilities.

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

Within the operating criteria section of the rule all facilities must design, construct, and maintain run-on and run-off control systems to prevent flow (water) onto the active portion(s) of the landfill during the peak discharge from a 25 year storm. Additionally, facilities must not discharge pollutants into the waters of the state. These requirements are also included in the federal rule.

Project specific issues related to erosion control would be addressed during the site specific SEPA process.

2. **Air**

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

This proposal applies to all of Washington state. During the construction and operation phases of a facility, new unit, or new lateral expansion, dust may be generated from the use of heavy equipment. Dust control measures are included in the rule. During the operation phase dust may be generated due to trucks moving in and out of the facility along with heavy equipment being operated on site during hours of operation. Some facilities allow the general public to dispose their own waste at the facility. To the extent that occurs, some automobile and light truck use can be expected.

Trucks and heavy equipment will be operating during the facility's hours of operation. State air emission standards will apply to all facilities.

Some odor may occur at some facilities. To mitigate this, daily cover is required at all facilities.

The proposed changes to the rule have no impact on air emissions at landfill facilities.

Project specific issues related to air emissions would be addressed during the site specific SEPA review process.

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

The proposed rule would apply to all of Washington state. Project specific issues related to emissions or odors would be addressed during the site specific SEPA review process. The following off-site sources may contribute to odor or emissions:

- **borrow sites off-site used by facilities for daily or final cover**
- **during the construction and operations, emissions from excavating equipment and trucks used to haul material to a facility.**

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

The rule requires all facilities to comply with all other applicable environmental laws and rules including: prohibitions on open burning, methane gas monitoring, and compliance with the federal laws and state Clean Air Act. Project specific issues to reduce or control emissions would be addressed during the site specific SEPA review process.

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.

The proposed rule would apply to all of Washington state.

With regard to surface water bodies, WAC 173-351-140(2) states, "New MSWLF units or lateral expansions must not be located in a channel migration zone or within two hundred feet (sixty-one meters) measured horizontally from the ordinary high water mark, of a shoreline of the state as defined in RCW 90.58.030 (which includes some wetlands associated with waters of the state), nor any public land that is being used by a public water system for watershed control for municipal drinking water purposes in accordance with WAC 246-290-450."

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.

Not applicable to this proposal.

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 rule does not allow construction of a solid waste landfill within a wetland.

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

Not applicable to this proposal.

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

The proposed rule would apply to all of Washington state. Any new MSWLF facility, unit, or lateral expansion located within a 100 year floodplain must demonstrate that the unit will not restrict the flow of the 100 year flood, reduce the temporary water storage capacity of the floodplain, or result in a washout if that poses a hazard to human health and the environment. Project specific analysis on this issue would occur during the site specific SEPA review process.

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 intent of the proposed rule is to minimize the possibility of any discharges to surface waters. Run-on and run-off requirements are included in the proposed rule to minimize the possibility of contaminated surface water discharge. If a discharge should occur the rule requires a specific process be followed to remediate any potential environmental problem. Project specific analysis on this issue would occur during the site specific SEPA review process.

b. Ground:

1) Will ground water be withdrawn, or will water be discharged to ground water? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.

The proposed rule requires systems to be designed and maintained during the operating life of the facility, and closed to minimize any potential discharge to groundwater. In addition, continuous monitoring of the facility will occur during its operating life and for the thirty years after closure to assure no contamination occurs to ground water. Should detection of a contaminant occur the operator must immediately assess the nature and magnitude of the contamination to determine if it poses a threat to human health or the environment. Remedial actions must be implemented if a threat is indiccated. The rule is structured to minimize any possible ground water contamination.

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.

Collected leachate may be discharged to ground water but only after treatment and permitting under Washington Water Quality laws and regulations.

A septic system is likely on-site to address the personal hygiene of the on-site staff during work hours.

Project specific issues will be addressed during the SEPA review process.

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 proposed rule would apply to all of Washington state. Run-on and run-off control systems are required in facility design. The run-on system must prevent flow onto the active portion of the landfill during the peak discharge from a twenty-five year storm. Landfills must not discharge pollutants into waters of the state. Project specific issues would be addressed during the site specific SEPA review process.

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

The proposed rule is designed to minimize the potential for waste material to enter ground water or surface water. This rule includes designs and ground water monitoring requirements to detect (as soon as possible) any potential contamination. The groundwater protection component of this rule is structured to immediately commence remedial action should any contamination occur to return the ground or surface waters back into compliance with ground and/or surface water requirements.

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

The proposed rule is designed to minimize the potential for waste material to enter ground water or surface water. To minimize this possibility, the ground water monitoring requirements included in this rule are designed to detect any potential contamination as soon as possible. The groundwater protection component of this rule is structured to immediately commence remedial action should any contamination occur to return the ground or surface waters back into compliance with ground and/or surface water requirements.

4. **Plants**

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

———— deciduous tree: alder, maple, aspen, other

———— evergreen tree: fir, cedar, pine, other

———— 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

The proposed rule would apply to all of Washington state. The kind or quantity of vegetation removed from a site during construction or operation of a specific facility would be addressed during SEPA review process for a site specific proposal.

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

The kind or quantity of any vegetation removed from a site during construction or operation of a specific facility would be addressed during the SEPA review process for a site specific proposal.

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

The proposed rule would apply to all of Washington state. Any threatened or endangered species known would be specific to the site of the proposed facility and would be addressed during the site specific SEPA review process.

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

Re-vegetation with native plants is required to be included in the facility closure plan. Additionally, site monitoring is to occur for thirty years. Included in this monitoring is examination of the site to assure no erosion or other environmental problem occurs that would prevent native plants from thriving. Any post-closure problems related to landscaping or native plants must be remediated.

5. **Animals**

a. Circle any birds and animals which have been observed on or near the site or are known to be on or near the site:

birds: hawk, heron, eagle, songbirds, other:
mammals: deer, bear, elk, beaver, other:
fish: bass, salmon, trout, herring, shellfish, other:

The proposed rule would apply to all of Washington state. Project specific issues would be addressed during the site specific SEPA review.

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

The proposed rule would apply to all of Washington state. During the site specific SEPA review, the possibility of threatened or endangered species at or near the site would be evaluated.

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

The proposed rule would apply to all of Washington state. This issue would be addressed as part of the site specific SEPA process that would occur as part of any permitting process.

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

The proposed rule would apply to all of Washington state. This issue would be addressed as part of the site specific SEPA process that would occur as part of any permitting process.

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.

During the construction phase of all new or expanded facilities, oil (diesel fuel typically) will be used to operate the heavy equipment. During the operating life of a facility oil will be the primary energy source being used.

Landfills produce methane gas during their operating life and post-closure period that could be captured and sold, reused or burnt off. The proposed rule would apply to all of Washington state. Project specific issues would be addressed during the site specific SEPA review process.

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

The proposed rule would apply to all of Washington state. This type of facility would not typically affect the use of solar power by adjoining property owners; however, this issue would also be addressed during the site specific SEPA process as part of the permitting process for any proposed landfill site.

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 rule would apply to all of Washington state. Project specific issues would be addressed during the site specific SEPA review process.

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.

Under normal operating conditions new or expanded facilities are not likely to have a problem with toxic chemicals. Fire is always a potential issue at all landfills because of the amount and concentration of combustible materials. Requirements for daily cover will minimize the potential fire hazard.

Methane gas is produced at landfill sites. WAC 173-351-200(4) addresses explosive gas control requirements to ensure potential explosive problems are addressed. Gas concentration must not exceed 25% of the lower explosive limit for methane in facility structures. Monitoring programs must be included as part of the facility operation plans.

Run-on and run-off controls are required as part of the facility design. In addition, most facilities have leachate collection systems as part of the facility design.

Hazardous waste is prohibited from entering municipal solid waste landfills. Household hazardous waste is allowed to be disposed of at a municipal solid waste landfill as allowed in WAC 173-303, Dangerous Waste Regulations. However, moderate risk waste facilities are present at most landfills and attempt to segregate the waste and dispose of it in such a manner as to minimize potential environmental health problems.

1) Describe special emergency services that might be required.

As part of the operation plan emergency service needs are identified along with a notification process to the appropriate legal authorities included should a situation warrant these services.

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

The purpose of this proposed rule is to minimize potential environmental health hazards. The rule is structured so that the infrastructure is in place to minimize any potential event impacts to the environment should an environmental health hazard event occur during the operation or closure of the facility.

b. **Noise**

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

The proposed rule will apply to all of Washington state. The construction of any solid waste facility will increase the noise level of the area surrounding the site. During the construction phase of a new cell, new facility, or lateral expansion noise will increase during the operation of the site.

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 the site.

Facilities will have typical hours of operation 8:00 to 5:00, five to seven days a week depending on the facility. During those hours noise would come from vehicle traffic and heavy equipment operated on site. A significant number of facilities statewide are not open to the public. At those facilities heavy trucks will be the only vehicle traffic. At some facilities where the public is allowed, cars, pickup trucks, and heavy trucks may be present.

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

In the location standards for new cells or lateral expansion, specific distance from other types of activities are required. Additionally, new facilities are typically located in sparsely populated areas. At every facility noise suppressant devices (mufflers) would be required as prescribed by existing statute(s) and/or rule(s) on all vehicle equipment.

8. **Land and shoreline use**

a. What is the current use of the site and adjacent properties?

Individual sites would be evaluated during the site specific SEPA review process for a proposed facility. The proposed rule would apply to all of Washington state.

b. Has the site been used for agriculture? If so, describe.

The proposed rule would apply to all of Washington state. Site specific issues would be addressed during the SEPA process for specific sites.

c. Describe any structures on the site.

The proposed rule would apply to all of Washington state. Site specific issues would be addressed during the SEPA process for specific sites.

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

The proposed rule would apply to all of Washington state. Site specific issues would be addressed during the SEPA process for a specific site proposal.

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

The proposed rule would apply to all of Washington state. Site specific issues would be addressed during the SEPA process for a site specific proposal.

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

The proposed rule would apply to all of Washington state. Site specific issues would be addressed during the SEPA process for a site specific proposal.

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

The proposed rule would apply to all of Washington state. Site specific information would be addressed during the SEPA review process for a specific proposal.

h. Has any part of the site been classified as an "environmentally sensitive" area? If so, specify.

The proposed rule would apply to all of Washington state. Site specific issues would be addressed during the SEPA review process for a specific proposal.

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

Not applicable. This proposed rule would apply to all of Washington state.

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

The proposed rule would apply to all of Washington state. Site specific issues would be addressed during the SEPA review process for a specific proposal.

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

The proposed rule would apply to all of Washington state. Site specific issues would be addressed during the SEPA review process for a specific proposal.

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

The proposed rule would apply to all of Washington state. Site specific issues would be addressed during the SEPA review process for a specific proposal.

9. **Housing**

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

The proposed rule would apply to all of Washington state. Project specific issues would be evaluated during the site specific SEPA review process.

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

The proposed rule would apply to all of Washington state. Site specific issues would be addressed during the SEPA review process for a specific proposal.

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

The proposed rule would apply to all of Washington state. Site specific issues would be addressed during the SEPA review process for a specific proposal.

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 proposed rule would apply to all of Washington state. Site specific issues would be addressed during the SEPA review process for a specific proposal.

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

The proposed rule would apply to all of Washington state. Site specific issues would be addressed during the SEPA review process for a specific proposal.

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

The proposed rules require all facilities to be fenced, include litter control measures, limit accessibility to the facility, and provide daily cover along with final cover including native vegetation when a facility closes. The proposed rule would apply to all of Washington state.

11. **Light and glare**

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

The proposed rule would apply to all of Washington state. Site specific issues would be addressed during the SEPA review process for a specific proposal.

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

The proposed rule would apply to all of Washington state. Site specific issues would be addressed during the SEPA review process for a specific proposal.

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

The proposed rule would apply to all of Washington state. Site specific issues would be addressed during the SEPA review process for a specific proposal.

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

The proposed rule would apply to all of Washington state. Site specific issues would be addressed during the SEPA review process for a specific proposal.

12. **Recreation**

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

The proposed rule would apply to all of Washington state. Site specific issues would be addressed during the SEPA review process for a specific proposal.

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

The proposed rule would apply to all of Washington state. Site specific issues would be addressed during the SEPA review process for a specific proposal.

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

The proposed rule would apply to all of Washington state. Site specific issues would be addressed during the SEPA review process for a specific proposal.

13. **Historic and cultural preservation**

a. Are there any places or objects listed on, or proposed for, national, state, or local preservation registers known to be on or next to the site? If so, generally describe.

The proposed rule would apply to all of Washington state. Site specific issues will be addressed during the SEPA review process for a specific proposal.

b. Generally describe any landmarks or evidence of historic, archaeological, scientific, or cultural importance known to be on or next to the site.

The proposed rule would apply to all Washington state. Site specific issues would be addressed during the SEPA review process for a specific proposal.

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

The proposed rule would apply to all Washington state. Site specific issues would be addressed during the SEPA review process for a specific proposal.

14. **Transportation**

a. Identify public streets and highways serving the site, and describe proposed access to the existing street system. Show on site plans, if any.

The proposed rule would apply to all of Washington state. Site specific issues would be addressed during the SEPA review process for a specific proposal.

b. Is site currently served by public transit? If not, what is the approximate distance to the nearest transit stop?

The proposed rule would apply to all of Washington state. Site specific issues would be addressed during the SEPA review process for a specific proposal.

c. How many parking spaces would the completed project have? How many would the project eliminate?

The proposed rule would apply to all of Washington state. Site specific issues would be addressed during the SEPA review process for a specific proposal.

d. Will the proposal require any new roads or streets, or improvements to existing roads or streets, not including driveways? If so, generally describe (indicate whether public or private).

The proposed rule would apply to all of Washington state. Site specific issues would be addressed during the SEPA review process for a specific proposal.

e. Will the project use (or occur in the immediate vicinity of) water, rail, or air transportation? If so, generally describe.

The proposed rule would apply to all of Washington state and requires minimum distance from:

- **surface water (within two hundred feet or sixty-one meters measured horizontally from the ordinary high water mark)**
- **airport runways (ten thousand feet used by turbojet aircraft)**
- **airport runways (five thousand feet used by only piston-type aircraft).**

For airports, the proponent must demonstrate that the units are designed and operated so that the MSWLF unit does not pose a bird hazard to aircraft and notify the effected airport and the FAA. The proposed rule prohibits landfill development within seismic areas (within 200 ft. of fault areas) and wetlands.

In some instances rail transportation may be used to transport the waste far distances. Rail spur lines would probably not be located at the facility; therefore, roads would be used to move the waste from rail lines to the facility for final disposal.

Site specific issues would be addressed during the SEPA review process for a specific proposal.

f. How many vehicular trips per day would be generated by the completed project? If known, indicate when peak volumes would occur.

The proposed rule would apply to all Washington state. Site specific issues would be addressed during the SEPA review process for a specific proposal.

g. Proposed measures to reduce or control transportation impacts, if any:

The proposed rule would apply to all of Washington state. Site specific issues would be addressed during the SEPA review process for a specific proposal.

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.

The proposed rule would apply to all of Washington state. Site specific issues would be addressed during the SEPA review process for a specific proposal.

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

The proposed rule would apply to all of Washington state. Site specific issues would be addressed during the SEPA review process for a specific proposal.

16. **Utilities**

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

The proposed rule would apply to all of Washington state. Site specific issues would be addressed during the SEPA review process for a specific proposal.

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.

The proposed rule would apply to all of Washington state. Site specific issues would be addressed during the SEPA review process for a specific proposal.

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: Laurie G. Davies

Date Submitted: 5/17/12

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT

EVALUATION FOR AGENCY USE ONLY

D. SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS

(do not use this sheet for project actions)

Because these questions are very general, it may be helpful to read them in conjunction with the list of the elements of the environment.

When answering these questions, be aware of the extent the proposal, or the types of activities likely to result from the proposal, would affect the item at a greater intensity or at a faster rate than if the proposal were not implemented. Respond briefly and in general terms.

1. How would the proposal be likely to increase discharge to water; emissions to air; production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or production of noise?

The proposed rule is not likely to increase discharge to water; emissions to air; production, storage or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or produce significant additional noise. Refer to the following sections of this SEPA environmental checklist for more information:

- **1. Earth**
- **3. Water (discharge to water)**
- **2. Air (emissions to air)**
- **7. Environmental health (toxics/hazardous substances)**
- **7b. Noise.**

This rule amendment would apply to all of Washington state. Any site specific issues would be addressed during the SEPA review process for a specific proposal.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are:

Not applicable.

2. How would the proposal be likely to affect plants, animals, fish, or marine life?

The proposed rule is not likely to adversely affect plants, animals, fish or marine life. Any site specific issues would be addressed during the SEPA review process for a specific proposal.

Proposed measures to protect or conserve plants, animals, fish, or marine life are:

Not applicable.

3. How would the proposal be likely to deplete energy or natural resources?

The proposed rule is not likely to deplete energy or natural resources.

Proposed measures to protect or conserve energy and natural resources are:

Not applicable.

4. How would the proposal be likely to use or affect environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated (or eligible or under study) for governmental protection; such as parks, wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, threatened or endangered species habitat, historic or cultural sites, wetlands, floodplains, or prime farmlands?

The proposed rule is not likely to use or affect environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated for governmental protection.

Proposed measures to protect such resources or to avoid or reduce impacts are:

Not applicable.

5. How would the proposal be likely to affect land and shoreline use, including whether it would allow or encourage land/or shoreline uses incompatible with existing plans?

The proposed rule is not likely to affect land or shoreline use.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce shoreline and land use impacts are:

Not applicable.

6. How would the proposal be likely to increase demands on transportation or public services and utilities?

The proposed rule would apply to all of Washington state. Site specific issues involved with increased demands on transportation or public services and utilities would be addressed during the SEPA review process for a specific proposal.

Proposed measures to reduce or respond to such demand(s) are:

Not applicable.

7. Identify, if possible, whether the proposal may conflict with local, state, or federal laws or requirements for the protection of the environment.

The proposed rule will not conflict with local, state or federal laws or requirements for the protection of the environment. Any site specific issues would be addressed during the SEPA review process for a specific proposal