

SEPA¹ Environmental Checklist

Purpose of checklist

Governmental agencies use this checklist to help determine whether the environmental impacts of your proposal are significant. This information is also helpful to determine if available avoidance, minimization, or compensatory mitigation measures will address the probable significant impacts or if an environmental impact statement will be prepared to further analyze the proposal.

Instructions for applicants

This environmental checklist asks you to describe some basic information about your proposal. Please answer each question accurately and carefully, to the best of your knowledge. You may need to consult with an agency specialist or private consultant for some questions. **You may use "not applicable" or "does not apply" only when you can explain why it does not apply and not when the answer is unknown.** You may also attach or incorporate by reference additional studies reports. Complete and accurate answers to these questions often avoid delays with the SEPA process as well as later in the decision-making process.

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.

Instructions for lead agencies

Please adjust the format of this template as needed. Additional information may be necessary to evaluate the existing environment, all interrelated aspects of the proposal and an analysis of adverse impacts. The checklist is considered the first but not necessarily the only source of information needed to make an adequate threshold determination. Once a threshold determination is made, the lead agency is responsible for the completeness and accuracy of the checklist and other supporting documents.

Use of checklist for nonproject proposals

For nonproject proposals (such as ordinances, regulations, plans and programs), complete the applicable parts of sections A and B, plus the Supplemental Sheet for Nonproject Actions (Part D). Please completely answer all questions that apply and note that the words "project," "applicant," and "property or site" should be read as "proposal," "proponent," and "affected geographic area," respectively. The lead agency may exclude (for non-projects) questions in "Part B: Environmental Elements" that do not contribute meaningfully to the analysis of the proposal.

¹ <https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/SEPA/Environmental-review/SEPA-guidance/Checklist-guidance>

A. Background

Find help answering background questions²

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable:

An ordinance making modifications to the regulations in K.C.C. 21A that apply to a Regional Motor Sports Facility Demonstration Project and Interim Use Permit.

2. Name of applicant:

The proposal was initiated by King County.

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

Jake Tracy, Senior Principal Legislative Analyst
King County Council
516 3rd Ave Ste 1200
Seattle, WA 98104
206-263-0875
jtracy@kingcounty.gov

4. Date checklist prepared:

October 6, 2025

5. Agency requesting checklist:

King County.

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

The King County Council anticipates possible action on the proposed ordinance in Quarter 1 of 2026.

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

There are no known plans to add or expand the proposed ordinance in the future.

If adopted, King County anticipates permit applications for individual developments that will be subject to the proposed regulations.

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

- SEPA checklist for this proposal
- SEPA Checklist for original Interim Use Permit ordinance, Ordinance 18184 (2015-0437)
- LUT417-0003 SEPA Checklist
- LUT417-0003 Environmental Noise, Air Quality, GHG and Light and Glare Report
- LUT417-0003 Traffic Impact Analysis

² <https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/SEPA/Environmental-review/SEPA-guidance/SEPA-checklist-guidance/SEPA-Checklist-Section-A-Background>

- LUT417-0003 Drainage Technical Information Report
- LUT417-0003 Geotech and Hydrology Report
- LUT417-0003 Assessment of Habitat for Species of Concern
- LUT417-0003 Preliminary Assessment of Potential Water Quality Impacts
- SEPA Checklist for Ordinance 19691 (Modifications to Interim Use Permit regulations)
- Determination of Significance for 2020 Amendments to the King County Comprehensive Plan Adoption of Existing Environmental Documents, and 2020 Addendum to Existing Environmental Documents (Ordinance 19146).

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.

The proposal is a nonproject action and applies to the properties that are subject to the regional motor sports facility master planning process demonstration project. The existing County Code and the proposed ordinance would require additional permits from the County's permitting agency for development activity to occur on the site. The interim use permit allowance would allow up to 205,000 square feet of structures; the interim use permit may be modified to allow up to this square footage and such future construction would require separate SEPA review.

King County maintains a list of pending applications online at <https://aca-prod.accela.com/kingco/Default.aspx>.

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

Approval by the King County Council is the only government approval required for adoption of the proposed ordinance. The proposed ordinance would also require approval of a development agreement and operating agreement to effectuate the demonstration project. Individual development projects that would be subject to the proposed ordinance would also be subject to all applicable federal, state and local permitting and licensing requirements.

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 Ordinance would amend K.C.C. 21A.06.973.C and K.C.C. 21A.55.105, which contain regulations for a regional motor sports facility demonstration project and interim use permit at Pacific Raceways.

The proposed ordinance would:

- Expand the definition of "regional motor sports facility" (K.C.C. 21A.06.973.C) to:
 - Remove the requirement that accessory uses be limited to racing and racing-related vehicle uses, while maintain language that accessory uses be "accessory to racing activities."
 - Add recreational cycling and running events as permitted accessory uses.
 - Allow assembly-line or mass production, permanent lodging facilities, and general commercial, industrial, and manufacturing uses when consistent with the designation as a project of statewide significance.
 - Allow two-stroke vehicles; use of these vehicles on the kart track would be limited to one weekend per month during the racing season of May 1 – August 31.

- Revise the demonstration project process (K.C.C. 21A.55.105) to:
 - Appoint a special project manager to oversee the process.
 - Separate development agreements (site/building standards) from operating agreements (operational conditions).
 - For existing and allowed uses activities, prohibit the development agreement and operating agreement from having any conditions, including noise conditions, more restrictive than conditions and requirements in previously issued permits. If existing or allowed uses or activities are expanded in scope or size, they may be subject to additional conditions.
 - Modify existing allowances for critical area alterations:
 - In steep slope and landslide hazard areas, allow the Permitting Division to approve alterations for terracing of spectator seating, placement of spectator seating regardless of whether it is on the interior portion of the road course, and creation or improvement sight lines on the interior portion of the road course. Existing critical area regulations in K.C.C. chapter 21A.24 would continue to apply.
 - In category III and IV wetlands, wetland buffers, aquatic areas, and riparian areas, allow the Permitting Division to approve alterations for the terracing and placement of spectator seating, or to create or improve sight lines on the interior portion of the road course. Existing critical area regulations in K.C.C. chapter 21A.24 would continue to apply, and the applicant would continue to need to demonstrate that the proposed alteration is the minimum necessary to accommodate the development proposal and has the least possible adverse impact on the critical area and critical area buffer.
 - Remove specific requirements around water quality and stormwater management, while retaining the requirement for a water quality monitoring plan and compliance with the King County Surface Water Design Manual.
 - Allow for on-site crushing of excavated materials, in addition to extraction and sorting, in order to establish final grades.
 - Set new deadlines for public meetings (specify that two required).
 - Modify procedures for any appeal of Hearing Examiner's recommendation on the development agreement or operating agreement to Council, to streamline filings (e.g., single "appeal statement" replacing multi-step process).
 - Amend interim use permit (IUP) provisions (within 21A.55.105.U.-FF.) to:
 - Specify that the special project management for IUP modifications could be a consultant or a county employee.
 - Allow any of the uses in K.C.C. 21A.06.973.C. (the definition of a regional motor sports facility) to operate under the interim use permit, including that nonracing driving schools may operate on Mondays and Tuesdays.
 - Specify that for any modifications to the IUP, the special project manager could be a consultant or a county employee.
 - State that any uses or structures that are established under the IUP may continue to operate after the expiration of the interim use permit, in accordance with provisions for nonconforming uses and the p-suffix conditions.
 - Add code provisions mirroring the p-suffix condition that requires that to exceed the allowances under the IUP provisions, the applicant must go through the demonstration project requirements.
- Repeal Ordinance 17287 Sections 5 and 6 (meeting and SEPA provisions that would be superseded by this ordinance).

Compliance with existing federal, state, and local regulations is presumed for purposes of this SEPA checklist, including compliance with the regulations in the proposed ordinance itself, as well as others such

as those related to drinking water, stormwater, wastewater treatment, septic systems, critical areas, and zoning requirements. Any noncompliant uses or structures would be subject to code enforcement and would not be considered an impact related to the proposed ordinance.

The King County Council could modify the proposed ordinance and still accomplish the proposal's objective. Depending on the modification, the likelihood, scale, or scope of potential impacts to various elements of the environment could be the same, greater, or less.

As would be the case for any nonproject or project action that undergoes changes after the publication of a SEPA threshold determination, the King County Executive branch, which pursuant to KCC 20.44.020 is the Lead Agency for SEPA for King County, would evaluate any modifications that are proposed to be made to the proposed ordinance and would update this environmental review in the case that changes would result in greater or different impacts than those identified in this checklist. The timing of additional environmental review process may vary depending on other variables, including future public processes.

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 ordinance would apply to all parcels subject to the regional motor sports facility master planning process demonstration project. The demonstration project applies to seven parcels: 1021059002, -9003, -9008, -9019 and -9029, 1121059035 and 0321059190. Collectively these parcels are known as the Pacific Raceways site. The site is located in unincorporated King County, just east of Highway 18 and the City of Auburn, at 31001 144th Ave SE in unincorporated King County.

B. Environmental Elements

1. Earth

[Find help answering earth questions³](#)

a. General description of the site:

Circle or highlight one: Flat, rolling, hilly, steep slopes, mountainous, other:

County maps show that the eastern portion of the site is generally flat, with some steep slopes along the western portion of the property.

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

County maps show that there are slopes that are greater than 40% along the western portion of the site.

³ <https://ecology.wa.gov/regulations-permits/sepa/environmental-review/sepa-guidance/sepa-checklist-guidance/sepa-checklist-section-b-environmental-elements/environmental-elements-earth>

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.

According to the Geotechnical Report submitted as part of the interim use permit application, “the near surface soils at the site consist of Vashon glacial outwash with localized areas of lacustrine or lake sediments. The outwash sand and gravel material overlies glacial till and advance outwash sand and gravel deposits. Based on our subsurface explorations in the area, the till is between 40 feet and 70 feet below the existing ground surface at the site. The recessional outwash material consists of sand with gravel and occasional cobbles, and minor silt. The outwash material is in a medium dense to dense condition. The lacustrine soils consist of medium dense to dense sand with variable gravel and silt. The lacustrine sediments generally occur in the northeast portion of the kart track site, west of the subject development site.”⁴

As the geotechnical report only focused on a portion of the Pacific Raceways site, soil conditions may be different elsewhere on site.

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

According to the Geotechnical Report submitted as part of the interim use permit application, “Most of the soil at the site contains sufficient fines to produce an unstable mixture when wet. Such soil is highly susceptible to changes in water content and tends to become unstable and impossible to proof-roll and compact if the moisture content exceeds the optimum. In addition, during wet weather months, the groundwater levels could increase, resulting in seepage into site excavations.” The report therefore recommended that earthwork occur during dry months if possible.⁵

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

Although the proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not directly authorize any fill, excavation, or grading, individual projects subject to the proposed ordinance could include fill, excavation or grading. Some sections in the proposed ordinance may indirectly affect filling, grading and excavation to a minor extent. These include the following:

- Section 3.I. would allow on-site crushing of materials excavated during construction under the master planning process; and
- Section 3.U. would remove a restriction that crushed materials under the IUP approval be used for on-site construction and site improvements only.

However, all such development projects would continue to be subject to existing development regulations related to stormwater management, impervious surfaces, critical areas, clearing and grading, and/or landscaping. Unless exempt under state and county requirements, filling, excavation and grading is also subject to SEPA review.

⁴ Page 4 of GeoResources *Geotechnical Engineering & Hydrogeologic Report*.

⁵ Page 17 of GeoResources *Geotechnical Engineering & Hydrogeologic Report*.

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

Although the proposed ordinance would not direct any development activities, potential erosion can result from clearing, construction or use of land for development that is subject to the proposed ordinance. The proposed ordinance does not amend existing regulations on clearing, grading, or construction that could cause erosion. For example, the King County Surface Water Design Manual, and shorelines and critical areas regulations contained in K.C.C. 21A, would be unchanged by the proposed ordinance, and would continue to apply to development projects subject to the proposed ordinance.

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

The proposed ordinance would not have any direct impacts to impervious surface percentages. The proposed ordinance would not change the existing IUP-specific impervious surface limitation of 33.33% of the total site.

All development projects would continue to be subject to existing development regulations related to impervious surface coverage. Unless exempt under state and county requirements, projects proposing development that would add impervious surfaces would also be subject to SEPA review.

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

Because the proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not have any direct impacts, no measures to control erosion or other impacts to the earth are proposed. King County's existing regulations related to erosion and soils would apply to any development to which the proposed ordinance would apply.

2. Air

[Find help answering air questions⁶](#)

a. What types of emissions to the air would result from the proposal during construction, operation, and maintenance when the project is completed? If any, generally describe and give approximate quantities if known.

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not result in any direct emissions to the air. Projects subject to the proposed ordinance, such as manufacturing uses and automotive uses, and an proposed allowance for two-stroke vehicles, which are currently allowed by code but prohibited by approved permits on the site, may result in air emissions from construction and operation activities, but would be subject to existing federal, state, and local regulations for these types of emissions. The proposed ordinance would not modify any federal, state, or local codes that provide standards or controls for these types of emissions. Air emissions are discussed in more detail in Part D of this checklist.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not be affected by off-site sources of emissions or odor. Highway 18 is within a few hundred feet of the western edge of the Pacific Raceways site but is

⁶ <https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/SEPA/Environmental-review/SEPA-guidance/SEPA-checklist-guidance/SEPA-Checklist-Section-B-Environmental-elements/Environmental-elements-Air>

not likely to impact implementation of the proposed ordinance. More information on environmental air quality near the site can be found in the Environmental Noise, Air Quality, GHG, and Light and Glare Report completed for the interim use permit.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action and would not have any direct impacts to air emissions, and the development projects to which it would apply would be subject to existing regulations regarding emissions and reporting requirements. Additional federal, state, and local codes may provide standards and controls for these types of emissions and would not be modified by the proposed ordinance. As a result, no measures to reduce or control emissions or other potential impacts to air are proposed.

Emissions and uses regulated by the Puget Sound Clean Air Authority (PSCAA) will need to obtain appropriate permitting and demonstrate compliance with standards.

3. Water

[Find help answering water questions](#)⁷

a. Surface:

[Find help answering surface water questions](#)⁸

- 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.**

Soosette Creek (shown as Class F on County maps) is located along the western portion of the site, and Big Soos Creek (shown as Class S on County maps) is located south of the site. In 2021, a conservation easement was recorded protecting the areas of the site surrounding these two streams.

- 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 ordinance is a nonproject action that would not directly require any work over, in, or adjacent to the described waters. Big Soos Creek is within the shoreline jurisdiction and is just south of the Pacific Raceways site. State and local shoreline regulations would apply to any development subject to the proposed ordinance that is within 200 feet of waters within unincorporated King County's shoreline jurisdiction. Other development regulations, including critical areas regulations, concerning the protection of waterbodies may also apply depending on the proximity of any development to these waters.

- 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.**

⁷ <https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/SEPA/Environmental-review/SEPA-guidance/SEPA-checklist-guidance/SEPA-Checklist-Section-B-Environmental-elements/Environmental-elements-3-Water>

⁸ <https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/SEPA/Environmental-review/SEPA-guidance/SEPA-checklist-guidance/SEPA-Checklist-Section-B-Environmental-elements/Environmental-elements-3-Water/Environmental-elements-Surface-water>

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not authorize filling or dredging from surface water or wetlands. Individual development projects subject to the proposed ordinance would also be subject to all state, local, and federal regulations, including mitigation requirements, concerning fill or dredge material placed in or removed from surface water or wetlands. The future demonstration project would allow alterations within Category III and IV wetlands, subject to minimization criteria and mitigation requirements.

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

There could be withdrawals of ground water as a result of the proposed ordinance to the extent that new uses allowed on the site could utilize ground water as their water source, but the approximate quantities are unknown.

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

The property is not located within a mapped 100-year floodplain. The project site may have unmapped floodplains associated with Soosette Creek along the western site boundary.

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 proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not directly involve any discharges of waste materials to surface waters.

The proposed ordinance, in K.C.C. 21.55.105.H., would remove: a requirement to use enhanced basic water quality measures to treat stormwater and use stormwater infiltration facilities to manage stormwater to protect aquatic life in Big Soos and Soosette creeks and operation of the Soos Creek Hatchery, while protecting groundwater quality; direction that the County consider the proposed use in determining whether spill control or special oil control measures in excess of the King County surface water design manual requirements are necessary to achieve the required environmental protections; a requirement to use best management practices to ensure that auto-related fluids, brake dust, and other products are properly managed and disposed of to avoid contamination of soils, surface water, and groundwater; and the requirement for an adaptive management program to correct any flow, surface or ground water quality, or biotic problem in Big Soos or Soosette creeks caused by the development.

A requirement to develop and implement a water quality monitoring plan would be retained and expanded to apply not only to points of discharge for on-site surface water drainage, but also for groundwater discharges and infiltration points, to determine that copper, other metals, hydrocarbons, and other contaminants are not elevated in down gradient ground water on- site and in Big Soos and Soosette creeks.

Development projects subject to the proposed ordinance would also be subject to existing state, local, and federal regulations concerning the protection of and discharge of waste materials to surface waters, including state regulations on water usage, wastewater disposal, and state antidegradation standards. Discharges to surface waters are discussed in more detail in Part D of this checklist.

b. Ground:

[Find help answering ground water questions](#)⁹

- 1. Will groundwater be withdrawn from a well for drinking water or other purposes? If so, give a general description of the well, proposed uses and approximate quantities withdrawn from the well. Will water be discharged to groundwater? Give a general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.**

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action and would not directly involve any withdrawals of groundwater or discharge to groundwater. Development projects subject to the proposed ordinance that use groundwater or discharge to groundwater would be subject to all existing state, local, and federal regulations concerning groundwater removal and protection. The Pacific Raceways site is served by the Covington Water District.

- 2. Describe waste material that will be discharged into the ground from septic tanks or other sources, if any (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.**

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not result in any discharge of waste material into the ground. Development projects subject to the proposed ordinance may discharge waste material from septic tanks or other sources, and would be required to treat and dispose of any waste in a manner compatible with state and local regulations. The Pacific Raceways site is served by a private on-site septic system.

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 ordinance is a nonproject action that would not directly generate or affect water runoff. New development or uses on the site may generate some water runoff. The primary source of would be stormwater.

As with any development in unincorporated King County, on-site stormwater management would need to comply with the King County Surface Water Design Manual, including applicable Best Management Practices (BMPs) for treatment and flow prior to discharge, and existing maximum impervious surface regulations.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not directly result in any waste material entering ground or surface waters.

⁹ <https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/SEPA/Environmental-review/SEPA-guidance/SEPA-checklist-guidance/SEPA-Checklist-Section-B-Environmental-elements/Environmental-elements-3-Water/Environmental-elements-Groundwater>

The proposed ordinance, in K.C.C. 21.55.105.H., would remove: a requirement to use enhanced basic water quality measures to treat stormwater and use stormwater infiltration facilities to manage stormwater to protect aquatic life in Big Soos and Soosette creeks and operation of the Soos Creek Hatchery, while protecting groundwater quality; direction that the County consider the proposed use in determining whether spill control or special oil control measures in excess of the King County surface water design manual requirements are necessary to achieve the required environmental protections; a requirement to use best management practices to ensure that auto-related fluids, brake dust, and other products are properly managed and disposed of to avoid contamination of soils, surface water, and groundwater; and the requirement for an adaptive management program to correct any flow, surface or ground water quality, or biotic problem in Big Soos or Soosette creeks caused by the development.

A requirement to develop and implement a water quality monitoring plan would be retained and expanded to apply not only to points of discharge for on-site surface water drainage, but also for groundwater discharges and infiltration points, to determine that copper, other metals, hydrocarbons, and other contaminants are not elevated in down gradient ground water on- site and in Big Soos and Soosette creeks.

Development projects subject to the proposed ordinance may result in waste matter that could enter ground or surface waters, but such projects would be subject to existing state, local, and federal regulations concerning the protection of surface and ground water.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action and would not alter or otherwise affect drainage patterns. Development projects subject to the proposed ordinance would also be subject to existing drainage regulations, only modified by K.C.C. 21A.55.105.H. as described in the question above.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not have any direct impacts to surface or ground water, runoff water, or drainage patterns. Existing federal, state and local regulations related to surface water discharge and withdrawal, groundwater discharge and withdrawal, runoff water (stormwater), and drainage would apply to any development project that would be subject to the proposed ordinance. No additional measures to reduce or control any potential surface, ground, and runoff water and drainage pattern impacts are proposed under this ordinance. Individual development proposals may be required to provide these measures.

4. Plants

[Find help answering plants questions](#)

a. Check the 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

Orchards, vineyards or other permanent crops.

wet soil plants: cattail, buttercup, bullrush, skunk cabbage, other

water plants: water lily, eelgrass, milfoil, other

other types of vegetation

Although the proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that doesn't authorize any development, the Pacific Raceways site contains a variety of trees, shrubs, and grass. As Soosette Creek is located on the western portion of the site, it is likely that wet-soil plants and water plants are also present in that area.

As part of the 2017 interim use permit application, the property owner hired a consulting firm to conduct a habitat survey on a portion of the site, namely the eastern portion of parcel 1021059003. The firm's report states, in part:

Habitat types found were mowed grassland dominated by unknown grasses and invasive forbs, gravel pad, Himalayan blackberry and scotch broom brush areas, and conifer forest dominated by Douglas-fir with some western hemlock, a patch of cottonwoods, and one bigleaf maple sapling (Table 1). The understory of the conifer forest was mainly salal, with Oregon grape, Himalayan blackberry, scotch broom, and the occasional wild rose. Other plants were found at lower frequency and many of the invasive forbs were found at the forest edge outside of the trees but not in the mowed area.¹⁰

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

Although the proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not directly remove any vegetation, the development of individual development projects subject to the proposed ordinance could include the removal or alteration of vegetation (potentially of the types identified in question 4.a). Such development projects would be subject to existing state and local regulations that regulate vegetation removal or alteration, in the same manner as other uses.

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

The United States Fish and Wildlife Service lists the following endangered or threatened plant species in Washington state: Kincaid's Lupine, Showy stickseed, Spalding's Catchfly, Umtanum desert buckwheat, Ute ladies'-tresses, Wenatchee Mountains checkermallow, White Bluffs bladderpod, and Whitebark pine. The Wenatchee Mountains checkermallow is known to be in eastern King County; none of these other plant species are known to be located in King County.

Ramboll's 2017 assessment did not find any threatened or endangered plant species on the portion of parcel 1021059003 subject to the survey. It is unknown if any threatened or endangered plant species are present on the entire Pacific Raceways site.

¹⁰ Page 3 of Ramboll's *Pacific Raceways: Assessment of Habitat for Species of Concern* report

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

The proposed ordinance does not include any specific code provisions relating to landscaping. Development projects subject to the proposed ordinance would be subject to existing regulations governing landscaping, use of native plants, and vegetation preservation on their respective sites. The existing conservation easement on the site protects in perpetuity the portion of the site adjacent to Big Soos and Soosette Creeks, which is to be “retained forever in its open space, and natural forested habitat condition.”¹¹

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

The King County Noxious Weed Program regulates invasive plant species, and requires eradication or control, or recommends control, for over 150 plant species. Class A noxious weeds, adopted in accordance with RCW 17.10 and WAC 16-750, that are known to or have been located in King County, and require eradication by property owners, include Common crupina, Common cordgrass, Dense flower cordgrass, Salt meadow cordgrass, Smooth cordgrass, Dyers woad, Eggleaf spurge, False brome, Floating primrose-willow, Flowering-rush, French broom, Garlic mustard, Giant hogweed, Goatsrue, Hydrilla, Johnsongrass, Bighead knapweed, Short fringed knapweed, Kudzu, Meadow clary, Orange peel clematis, Purple starthistle, Reed sweetgrass, Ricefield bulrush, Rush broom, Clary sage, Mediterranean sage, Silverleaf nightshade, Small-flowered jewelweed, Smooth frogbit, Syrian bean-caper, Texas blueweed, Ashen thistle, Milk thistle, Shore thistle, Slenderflower thistle, Carduus tenuiflorus, Variable-leaf milfoil, and Wild four o'clock. Class B noxious weeds, that are known to have been located in King County, and require control by property owners, include Bluelweed (Viper's bugloss), Annual bugloss, Common bugloss, Camelthorn, Common reed (non-native genotypes), Dalmatian toadflax, Egeria, European coltsfoot, Fanwort, Gorse, Grass-leaved arrowhead, Hairy willowherb, Hawkweeds (all non-native species and hybrids of the meadow subgenus), European hawkweed, Orange hawkweed, Hawkweed ox-tongue, Hoary alyssum, Houndstongue, Indigo-bush, Black knapweed, Brown knapweed, Diffuse knapweed, Meadow knapweed, Russian knapweed, Spotted knapweed, Kochia, Garden loosestrife, Purple loosestrife, Parrotfeather, Perennial pepperweed, Policeman's helmet, Rush skeletonweed, Saltcedar, Leafy spurge, Yellow starthistle, Sulfur cinquefoil, Tansy ragwort, Musk thistle, Plumeless thistle, Scotch Thistle, Tocalote, Velvetleaf, Water primrose, White bryony, Wild basil, Wild chervil, Yellow floating heart, and Yellow nutsedge.

King County's Noxious Weed map does not show any noxious weeds on the Pacific Raceways site. However, Tansy Ragwort, Dalmatian Toadflax, Spotted Knapweed, and Bohemian Knotweed are all shown on properties adjacent to the site.¹²

5. Animals

Find help answering animal questions¹³

a. List any birds and other animals that have been observed on or near the site or are known to be on or near the site.

Examples include:

- **Birds: hawk, heron, eagle, songbirds, other:**

¹¹ Pacific Raceways Conservation Easement Recording Instrument No. 20210222000229

¹² Noxious Weed layer of King County iMap accessed 7/18/23

¹³ <https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/SEPA/Environmental-review/SEPA-guidance/SEPA-checklist-guidance/SEPA-Checklist-Section-B-Environmental-elements/Environmental-elements-5-Animals>

- **Mammals: deer, bear, elk, beaver, other:**
- **Fish: bass, salmon, trout, herring, shellfish, other:**

The Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) shows that several fish species are present in Big Soos and Soosette Creeks. Otherwise, it is unknown which species, and at what quantities those species, exist on the Pacific Raceways site.

The 2017 habitat assessment by Ramboll of a portion of parcel 1021059003 identified the birds shown in the table below on that property:

Table 2. Bird species found on Lot A on 12/11/2017

	Common name*	Scientific name	Native
Mowed field	Killdeer	<i>Charadrius vociferus</i>	Y
Forested border	American crow	<i>Corvus brachyrhynchos</i>	Y
	Chickadee (either black capped or chestnut backed)	<i>Poecile rufescens</i> or <i>P. atricapillus</i>	Y
	European starling (v)	<i>Sturnus vulgaris</i>	N
	Northern flicker	<i>Colaptes auratus</i>	Y
	Pileated woodpecker (V)	<i>Dryocopus pileatus</i>	Y
	Red breasted nuthatch (v)	<i>Sitta canadensis</i>	Y
	Song sparrow	<i>Melospiza melodia</i>	Y
	Spotted towhee	<i>Pipilo maculatus</i>	Y
	Steller's jay	<i>Cyanocitta stelleri</i>	Y

NOTES:

* (v) indicates identified by vocalization only

The assessment also noted signs of rabbit and coyote on the site.

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

Although the proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that doesn't authorize any development there are a number of federally threatened and endangered species in King County according to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. These species include the Canada Lynx, Gray Wolf, North American Wolverine, Marbled Murrelet, Mt. Rainier White-tailed Ptarmigan, Northern Spotted Owl, Streaked Horned Lark, Yellow-billed Cuckoo, Blue whale, Bocaccio, Fin whale, Gray Whale, Humpback whale, Leatherback sea turtle, Southern resident killer whale, Sei whale, Sperm Whale, and Yelloweye Rockfish.

The Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife lists the following salmonid species as those federally threatened that are known to occur in King County. Skykomish Bull Trout, White River (Puyallup) Bull Trout, Cedar Chinook, Green River (Duwamish) Chinook, Sammamish Chinook, Snoqualmie Chinook, White River Chinook, Cedar River Winter Steelhead, Green River (Duwamish) Winter Steelhead, North Lake Washington and Lake Sammamish Winter Steelhead, Snoqualmie Winter Steelhead, Tolt Summer Steelhead, and White River (Puyallup) Winter Steelhead.

In addition to the federally listed species above, the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife lists additional threatened and endangered species not included with the federally listed species include the Western gray squirrel, Mardon skipper, Northwestern pond turtle, and Oregon vesper sparrow. One additional species, fisher, was historically in King County but is thought to now be extinct in this area.

WDFW lists both Big Soos and Soosette Creeks as habitat for Steelhead, which are federally listed as threatened. Big Soos Creek is also shown to be habitat for Chinook Salmon, which are likewise federally listed as threatened. The 2017 habitat assessment by Ramboll did not find evidence of any other threatened or endangered animal species on site.

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

Although the proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that doesn't authorize any development, King County is within the Pacific Flyway migratory pathway for birds, and migratory birds use water bodies, shorelines, mud flats, and grassy areas/meadows throughout King County. Big Soos and Soosette Creeks are identified by WDFW as bearing anadromous fish. Elk, other mammals, and bird species migrate seasonally. Daily movements include animal species moving around to get their daily needs met, and this movement can be impacted by fences, roads, culverts, and land use cover and change. Mammals, amphibians, and reptiles are most affected by barriers to movement.

WDFW's PHS¹⁴ on the Web map does not show the Pacific Raceways site as being part of a terrestrial migration corridor.

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

There are no specific measures proposed to preserve or enhance wildlife. Projects subject to the proposed ordinance will be required to comply with all existing codes regarding critical areas and landscaping. As noted above, the area of the site adjacent to Big Soos and Soosette Creeks, which are fish bearing, is subject to a permanent conservation easement.

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

Although the proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that doesn't authorize any development, numerous invasive animal species are known to exist in unincorporated King County. Invasive species may be located on a development project site that could be subject to the proposed ordinance.

Invasive species might be located on the Pacific Raceways site. A list of invasive animal species within King County can be found here: <https://kingcounty.gov/services/environment/animals-and-plants/biodiversity/threats/Invasives.aspx>.

¹⁴ Priority habitats and species

6. Energy and natural resources

[Find help answering energy and natural resource questions¹⁵](#)

- 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.**

Although the proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not have any direct energy needs, any additional uses or activities constructed under the proposed regulations may have energy needs such as lighting, heating/cooling, and operation of equipment. Any future development projects would also be subject to existing energy codes and regulations.

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

Although the proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not have any direct impacts to the use of solar energy, new uses allowed under the ordinance are also unlikely to affect the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties due to setback requirements that would be maintained by the ordinance.

- 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 ordinance a nonproject action that would not have any direct impacts to energy use, and therefore no energy conservation features are included. Development projects subject to the proposed ordinance could include energy conservation features or other measures to reduce any energy impacts.

7. Environmental health

[Health Find help with answering environmental health questions¹⁶](#)

- a. Are there any environmental health hazards, including exposure to toxic chemicals, risk of fire and explosion, spill, or hazardous waste, that could occur because of this proposal? If so, describe.**

Although the proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not directly cause any environmental health hazards, it is possible that development projects subject to the proposed ordinance could result in exposure to toxic chemicals, risk of fire and explosion, spills, or hazardous waste. To the extent any such development created such exposure or risk, those hazards would be regulated by existing state and local regulations. This topic is discussed in more detail in Part D of this checklist.

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

According to the Washington Department of Ecology's "What's in My Neighborhood" database, no contaminated sites were identified within the Demonstration Project area.

¹⁵ <https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/SEPA/Environmental-review/SEPA-guidance/SEPA-checklist-guidance/SEPA-Checklist-Section-B-Environmental-elements/Environmental-elements-6-Energy-natural-resources>

¹⁶ <https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/SEPA/Environmental-review/SEPA-guidance/SEPA-checklist-guidance/SEPA-Checklist-Section-B-Environmental-elements/Environmental-elements-7-Environmental-health>

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.

No contamination is known on the Pacific Raceways site. Any development would be subject to existing federal, state, and local regulations regarding chemical hazards and liquid and gas transmission pipelines.

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.

Although the proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not include the storage, use, or production of any toxic or hazardous chemicals, development projects subject to the proposed ordinance could require the use of toxic or hazardous chemicals, such as gasoline or diesel fuel, to operate construction equipment. Individual development projects would be required to store, use, and produce any toxic or hazardous chemicals, such as cleaning supplies, in accordance with applicable laws and regulations. This topic is discussed in more detail in Part D of this checklist.

4. Describe special emergency services that might be required.

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not have any direct impacts. It is not known if additional emergency services would be needed for development projects under the proposed ordinance.

5. Proposed measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards, if any.

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not have any direct impact on the environment nor create environmental health hazards. No measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards are proposed.

The proposed ordinance retains an existing requirement to develop and implement a water quality monitoring plan for the points of discharge for on-site surface water drainage to determine that copper, other metals, hydrocarbons, and other contaminants are not elevated in down gradient ground water on-site and in Big Soos and Soosette creeks, and expands the requirement to apply to groundwater discharges and infiltration points.

b. Noise

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that doesn't authorize any development. Various types of noise exist in the area around the Pacific Raceways site, including noise from traffic, operation of equipment, and more. A report created for the facility's interim use permit states:

“The existing acoustic environment is typical of a relatively quiet suburban area with few continuous sources of dominant noise. Distant traffic from Highway SR-18 is at times audible, as is infrequent traffic noise on local roadways. Other sources of noise include Pacific Raceways event noises (i.e., races and other motor vehicle events), birds, and miscellaneous neighborhood noises.”¹⁷

¹⁷ Page 6 of the Ramboll's *Environmental Noise, Air Quality, GHG, and Light and Glare Report*.

These noise sources are not anticipated to affect implementation of the proposed ordinance.

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)?

Although the proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not have any direct noise impacts, development allowed under the ordinance may result in noise from construction and operation. Although noise from spectators, vehicles, race-related performances, and vehicle fabrication already occurs on the property, providing new uses on site, such as a mass production manufacturing uses, may introduce additional noise.

K.C.C. 12.86.500 exempts sounds related to motor vehicle racing events and motor vehicle testing and training from the County's noise regulations, but such noise is subject to permit-specific requirements. Current permits on the site prohibit two-stroke-engine vehicles, which are generally louder than four-stroke-engine vehicles. The proposed ordinance would allow for two-stroke-engine vehicles, which could result in greater noise than currently used vehicles, but these would be limited to one weekend per month during the racing season of May 1 to August 31.

The proposed ordinance does not alter requirements relating to noise and does not change the allowed days or times during which racing or testing can take place in the permit conditions for the site (until and unless a new development agreement is instituted or permit conditions are modified under subsequent permits). It would clarify that nonracing driving schools are allowed.

Any new uses not associated directly with motor vehicle racing events and motor vehicle testing and training would be subject to the County's standard noise regulations in K.C.C. 12.86.

Any development activity on the site would be subject to the construction noise regulations in King County Code. Material extraction would be limited to the minimum necessary for each project phase. Crushing of extracted materials is already allowed on the site under K.C.C. 21A.55.U.2.b. The proposed allowance for crushed materials to be moved off site could potentially result in greater volumes of material being crushed, and therefore longer periods of crushing-related noise, but these activities would remain subject to the noise regulations in K.C.C. 12.86 and therefore could not be louder than allowed under the current regulations or occur outside of times allowed by those regulations.

Noise is further discussed in part D of the checklist.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not have any direct noise impacts. The Pacific Raceways site would be subject to the same noise requirements that exist today. As noted above, this includes specific noise-related conditions imposed on the Pacific Raceways site through existing permits. Noise impacts would be evaluated as part of individual development proposals. Unless exempt under state and county requirements, development proposals would also be subject to SEPA review.

8. Land and shoreline use

[Find help answering land and shoreline use questions¹⁸](#)

- 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 site is currently used as a racetrack. This includes a 2.2-mile road track, a kart track, a drag strip, a dirt motocross track, paved and unpaved parking areas, and over 100,000 square feet of structures. An additional 120,000 square feet of warehousing structures has been built in 2022. The interim use permit allows up to 205,000 square feet of structures; the interim use permit may be modified to allow up to this square footage and such future construction would require separate SEPA review. Nearby land uses include residential to the north, east and south, and highway 18 to the west. Additionally, a church, a golf course, and manufacturing uses are located less than a half mile from the southern boundary of the site. Developments subject to the proposed ordinance are not expected to affect current land uses on nearby or adjacent properties.

- b. Has the project site been used as working farmlands or working forest lands? If so, describe. How much agricultural or forest land of long-term commercial significance will be converted to other uses because 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?**

There is no working farmland or forestland on the site. The site has been in racetrack use since 1959. Aerial photography from 1936 shows the property to be undeveloped, largely open grassland with scattered trees.¹⁹ It is unknown if forestry activities took place on the property prior to 1936, or if agriculture took place on the property between 1936 and 1959.

- 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 proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not directly affect or be affected by the normal business operations of working farmland or forestland.

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

The King County Assessor's database identifies nine buildings on site, including offices, a press building, restrooms, a snack bar, and garages/warehouses. There are also grandstands on site.

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

Although the proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not directly result in any demolition, existing structures could be demolished as part of a development project that would be subject to the proposed ordinance. The nature of and extent to which those structures could be demolished is unknown at this time and would be subject to all existing applicable regulations.

¹⁸ <https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/SEPA/Environmental-review/SEPA-guidance/SEPA-checklist-guidance/SEPA-Checklist-Section-B-Environmental-elements/Environmental-elements-8-Land-shoreline-use>

¹⁹ King County iMap accessed 7/18/23

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

The Pacific Raceways site is zoned industrial (I), with a property-specific development condition (SC-P02). SC-P02 limits the site to racetrack use, regional motor sports facility use, and uses consistent with the site's designation as a project of statewide significance. It also requires the recording of a conservation easement on the site, which occurred in 2021.

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

The Pacific Raceways site is designated rural area (ra).

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

Big Soos Creek, south of the property, is within the shoreline jurisdiction, with aquatic and conservancy designations. The shoreline jurisdiction does not extend onto the Pacific Raceways site.

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

County maps show erosion and landslide hazards along the western and southern portions of the site. Soosette creek, a Class F stream, is located on the western portion of the site. The streams and portions of the geological hazard areas are within the conservation easement recorded in 2021. Wetland areas have been identified in the southern portions of the racetrack areas.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not directly result in a completed project where people would reside or work. Development projects subject to the proposed regulations would not result in residences but could potentially result in more jobs at the site. This would be evaluated as part of individual development proposals.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action and would not directly result in any displacement, and as the Pacific Raceways site does not contain any residences, any development proposals subject to the proposed ordinance are not anticipated to displace anyone.

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

Because the proposal is not anticipated to affect the likelihood of displacement under K.C.C., no measures to avoid or reduce displacement impacts are proposed.

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

The proposed ordinance was drafted to be compatible with existing and projected land uses and plans. New uses allowed under this ordinance would be required to be compatible with the King County Comprehensive Plan and the P-suffix condition that applies to the property.

m. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts to agricultural and forest lands of long-term commercial significance, if any:

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action and would not directly impact agricultural and forest lands of long-term commercial significance; as such, no measures to reduce or control impacts to such lands are proposed.

9. Housing

[Find help answering housing questions²⁰](#)

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that will not have direct impacts to housing, and the site is zoned industrial, meaning no residential uses are allowed.

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

Neither the proposed ordinance itself nor the development allowed under the ordinance would result in elimination of housing, as no housing is present on-site.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action and would not directly impact housing; as such no measures to reduce or control housing impacts are proposed.

10. Aesthetics

[Find help answering aesthetics questions²¹](#)

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 ordinance is a nonproject action that does not directly involve the construction of any structures, and does not regulate or change the height requirements of any structures or principal exterior building materials. The height and any exterior building material of any development project subject to the proposed ordinance will be subject to existing regulations.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not have any direct impacts to views. Any development projects subject to the proposed ordinance would not result in the alteration or obstruction of any views to a greater degree than any other development allowed under existing regulations.

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

²⁰ <https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/SEPA/Environmental-review/SEPA-guidance/SEPA-checklist-guidance/SEPA-Checklist-Section-B-Environmental-elements/Environmental-elements-9-Housing>

²¹ <https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/SEPA/Environmental-review/SEPA-guidance/SEPA-checklist-guidance/SEPA-Checklist-Section-B-Environmental-elements/Environmental-elements-10-Aesthetics>

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not have any direct impacts to views or aesthetics, and as such, no measures are proposed to reduce or control aesthetic impacts.

11. Light and glare

[Find help answering light and glare questions²²](#)

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not directly cause any light or glare and any development allowed under the ordinance would not produce any light or glare beyond other development allowed under existing regulations.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not have any direct impacts. Development projects subject to the proposed ordinance would not result in a greater increase in light or glare than any other development allowed under existing regulations. Any development projects subject to the proposed ordinance would have to comply with existing development regulations, including any related to light and glare.

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

Various off-site sources of light or glare exist throughout unincorporated King County. It is unlikely that any development projects subject to the proposed ordinance would be impacted by any off-site sources.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not have any direct light and glare impacts. No additional measures to reduce or control light and glare impacts are proposed.

12. Recreation

[Find help answering recreation questions](#)

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

Pacific Raceways is a private recreational facility on the site, providing vehicle racing and spectating. The Soos Creek Park and Trail is located west and south of the site.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not directly displace any existing recreational uses. The ordinance would not result in a greater displacement of recreational uses than what may otherwise occur under current code.

²² <https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/SEPA/Environmental-review/SEPA-guidance/SEPA-checklist-guidance/SEPA-Checklist-Section-B-Environmental-elements/Environmental-elements-11-Light-glare>

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 ordinance is a nonproject action, and no measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation are proposed. The proposed ordinance would allow additional recreational uses associated with the Regional Motor Sports Facility, such as foot and bicycle races, in addition to supporting the existing racetrack use.

13. Historic and cultural preservation

[Find help answering historic and cultural preservation questions²³](#)

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? If so, specifically describe.**

There are buildings over 45 years old on the property. It is unknown whether they are eligible for listing on preservation registers. This would be determined and evaluated during review of individual development proposals.

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.**

None are known. The SEPA checklist for the interim use permit did not identify any. Projects subject to the proposed ordinance would continue to be required to comply with federal, state, and local rules related to historic and cultural resources.

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.**

According to the SEPA checklist for the interim use permit, the applicant consulted with and received input from the Muckleshoot tribe at that time, and concerns raised were focused on preservation of the area surrounding Soos and Soosette Creeks. Those areas are now protected by a permanent conservation easement. Any future development would be subject to existing requirements related to cultural and historic resources.

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.**

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that will not have any direct impacts to cultural or historic resources. However, King County's existing regulations related to avoidance, minimization of, or compensation for loss, changes to, and disturbances to cultural and historic resources would apply to any individual development proposals subject to the proposed ordinance.

²³ <https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/SEPA/Environmental-review/SEPA-guidance/SEPA-checklist-guidance/SEPA-Checklist-Section-B-Environmental-elements/Environmental-elements-13-Historic-cultural-p>

14. Transportation

[Find help with answering transportation questions²⁴](#)

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

Access to the site is currently from Highway 18 via SE 304th Street. SE 304th Street is identified as a collector arterial from Highway 18 up to the point that it intersects the access point to Pacific Raceways' site, after which it is identified as a local street.

- b. Is the site or affected geographic area currently served by public transit? If so, generally describe. If not, what is the approximate distance to the nearest transit stop?**

The site is not served by transit. The nearest transit stop is to the southwest, across highway 18. Two routes, Metro routes 165 and the 181, serve the Green River College. The College is over half a mile away from the property.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action and would not directly add or eliminate parking spaces. It would not allow for more parking than is allowed under the current code. Impervious surface on the site, including parking, is limited to 33.33% of the total site under the interim use permit. Any impervious surface beyond that amount would be required to go through the full master planning demonstration project process currently in code. The exact number of spaces added or eliminated would be evaluated as part of individual development proposals.

- 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).**

Although the proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not directly involve any roadway, bicycle, or pedestrian improvements, improvements to existing roads, streets, or pedestrian or bicycle transportation may be associated with individual development under the proposed ordinance. Improvements may also be required as mitigation for a new structure, or as a condition on an interim use permit, development agreement, or future development.

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

The Pacific Raceways site is not in the immediate vicinity of water, rail, or air transportation and is not expected to make use of such modes.

²⁴ <https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/SEPA/Environmental-review/SEPA-guidance/SEPA-checklist-guidance/SEPA-Checklist-Section-B-Environmental-elements/Environmental-elements-14-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 proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not directly generate any vehicular trips. However, uses allowed under the proposed ordinance, such as mass production manufacturing, would generate vehicular trips in the same way as existing facilities of these types do.

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.**

Although the proposed ordinance would not have any direct impact on the movement of agricultural and forest products on roads or streets on the area, individual development projects allowed under the ordinance could generate some additional traffic that could interfere with, affect, or be affected by the movement of agricultural and forest products. This would be evaluated as part of individual development projects.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not have any direct impacts to transportation volumes. No additional measures to reduce or control transportation impacts are proposed. Development projects subject to the proposed ordinance will be subject to existing zoning and development regulations, including, to the extent required, transportation analysis and mitigation.

15. Public services

[Find help answering public service questions²⁵](#)

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

It is not known whether development proposals under this proposed ordinance would increase the need for public services. .

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not have any direct impacts to public services, so no additional measures to reduce or control impacts on public services are proposed.

16. Utilities [Find help answering utilities questions²⁶](#)

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

²⁵ <https://ecology.wa.gov/regulations-permits/sepa/environmental-review/sepa-guidance/sepa-checklist-guidance/sepa-checklist-section-b-environmental-elements/environmental-elements-15-public-services>

²⁶ <https://ecology.wa.gov/regulations-permits/sepa/environmental-review/sepa-guidance/sepa-checklist-guidance/sepa-checklist-section-b-environmental-elements/environmental-elements-16-utilities>

The Pacific Raceways site is served by Puget Sound Energy for electric service and Covington Water District for water. The site uses an on-site septic for wastewater.

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 ordinance is a nonproject action that would not have any direct connection to utilities. There is nothing within the proposed ordinance that would change the provision of utility services. All development on the site must comply with K.C.C. Title 13.

Development projects related to the proposed ordinance, such as mass production manufacturing, might generate higher electricity demand than exists on the site currently. This would be evaluated through the development agreement and/or individual project applications.

C.Signature

Find help about who should sign²⁷

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.

1/15/2026

 Jake Tracy

Signed by: Tracy, Jake

Type name of signee: Jake Tracy

Position and agency/organization: Senior Principal Legislative Analyst, King County Council

Date submitted: January 15, 2026

²⁷ <https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/SEPA/Environmental-review/SEPA-guidance/SEPA-checklist-guidance/SEPA-Checklist-Section-C-Signature>

D.D. Supplemental sheet for nonproject actions [\[HELP\]](#)

[Find help for the nonproject actions worksheet²⁸](#)

Do not use this section 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 ordinance would broaden the range of uses permitted at Pacific Raceways as part of the regional motor sports facility demonstration project. This includes:

- Expanding the definition of accessory uses to allow recreational cycling and running events; and
- When consistent with the project of statewide significance designation, consistent with changes made as part of the 2020 Comprehensive Plan, allowing:
 - Expanded research and manufacturing activities, including assembly line and mass production related to research, development, testing, manufacturing, and distribution of new technology in the transportation industry; and
 - Permanent lodging facilities.

The expansion of uses would allow for ones that are similar in character to existing uses – events, overnight accommodations, and vehicle-related manufacturing. Though the exact nature or intensity of the uses may be different than those currently allowed, they are unlikely to result in significant impacts, primarily due to 1) existing regulations around stormwater, critical areas, hazardous substances, and noise; 2) the Growth Management Act and Comprehensive Plan prohibition on extending sewer service to this rural area site, combined with K.C.C. 21A.28.035 and Board of Health (BOH) code 13.08.220, which limit the size of septic systems on the site to design flows, at any common point, of no more than 3,500 gallons a day. These sewage disposal restrictions act as a natural check on the size or intensity of operations.

Potential impacts to air emissions, discharges to water, and the release of toxic or hazardous substances from these new uses and other proposed changes to regulations are discussed below.

Discharges to Water

The proposed ordinance is not expected to result in development that would cause discharges to water. Conservation easements protect areas of the site that are near waterbodies. The ordinance would remove certain stormwater provisions that were previously applied specifically to the Pacific Raceways demonstration project. Specifically, K.C.C. 21A.55.105.H. would remove: a requirement to use enhanced basic water quality measures to treat stormwater and use stormwater infiltration facilities to manage stormwater to protect aquatic life in Big Soos and Soosette creeks and operation of the Soos Creek Hatchery, while protecting groundwater quality; direction that the County consider the proposed use in

²⁸ <https://ecology.wa.gov/regulations-permits/sepa/environmental-review/sepa-guidance/sepa-checklist-guidance/sepa-checklist-section-d-non-project-actions>

determining whether spill control or special oil control measures in excess of the King County surface water design manual requirements are necessary to achieve the required environmental protections; a requirement to use best management practices to ensure that auto-related fluids, brake dust, and other products are properly managed and disposed of to avoid contamination of soils, surface water, and groundwater; and the requirement for an adaptive management program to correct any flow, surface or ground water quality, or biotic problem in Big Soos or Soosette creeks caused by the development. A requirement to develop and implement a water quality monitoring plan for the points of discharge for on-site surface water drainage to determine that copper, other metals, hydrocarbons, and other contaminants are not elevated in down gradient ground water on-site and in Big Soos and Soosette creeks would be retained and expanded to include points of groundwater discharge and infiltration points. The site would also be required to meet all state and local requirements for on-site wastewater disposal. In practice, this means stormwater and wastewater from new development would be managed under the same standards as any other project in unincorporated King County, and the ongoing monitoring would provide an additional safety net to identify and address any unexpected water quality issues at points of discharge before they reach the creeks.

As the site is entirely located within a mapped Category II critical aquifer recharge area, any development would also be subject to the use restrictions of K.C.C. 21A.24.316.B., unless a critical area report demonstrates that the site is not in a critical aquifer recharge area and there would be no significant environmental impact from a given development proposal.

Air Emissions

If construction of additional buildings or facilities to house new or expanded uses occurs on this property, emissions are likely to occur during the construction process due to use of fossil fuel-powered machinery, manufacture or construction of materials, and use of hot-mix asphalt for paving.

Custom fabrication of racing motor vehicles, or vehicle parts to be incorporated into those vehicles, is already allowed on the site. Such activities may involve air emissions, such as volatile organic compounds, particulates from machining, or combustion exhaust. The proposed ordinance, in expanding the allowance to uses that research, develop, test, manufacture, and distribute new technology in the transportation industry broadly, including assembly line and mass production of vehicles and parts, may increase the quantity of emissions, but would not necessarily introduce new types of emissions beyond what could occur currently. Any emissions would continue to be subject to federal, state, and local laws and regulations, including any applicable permits from the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency. As discussed above, the prohibition on sewer connection to this property and prohibition on large on-site sewage systems would likely preclude any large-scale development, keeping even noncustom vehicle part manufacturing at a smaller scale.

The proposed ordinance would also explicitly allow two-stroke-engine vehicles, which are not prohibited by current development regulations but are prohibited by currently approved permits. Two-stroke-engine vehicles are less efficient than the four-stroke variety and therefore create higher levels of air emissions. Use of these vehicles would be limited to one weekend per month during the racing season of May 1 – August 31.

While the proposed ordinance could potentially result in a modest increase to emissions from the site, the proposed ordinance also specifically calls out transportation technology with an emphasis on projects and innovative technology development, testing, and production that reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in the automotive and combustion engine sectors as an example of what this expanded use might involve. The development and manufacturing of low-GHG technologies for the racing industry may result in a net reduction to on-site emissions in the long term, if such technologies are adopted by vehicles racing on the site. Low-GHG technologies developed for the transportation industry more generally could also contribute to reduced emissions at a broader geographic scale.

Toxic or Hazardous Substances

Development resulting from the proposal is not expected to increase the production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances beyond what might occur under current regulations. The expanded use allowances under the regional motor sports facility definition are not likely to introduce new types of toxic or hazardous substances to the site that would not be allowed under the current allowances for custom vehicle and parts fabrication; motor vehicle fuel sales; vehicle repair, modification, and storage; and racing events. Any hazardous waste generated by future development would need to be collected, stored, removed and transported to appropriate facilities as required by law.

Noise

Pacific Raceways is an established source of noise in the area due to racing engines and spectator events. Sounds created by motor vehicle racing events, as well as motor vehicle testing and training, are exempt from King County's noise regulations under K.C.C. 12.86.500.P., when governed by and conducted in accordance with permit conditions (as Pacific Raceways is and would be for any new permits).

Pacific Raceways' existing permits include quiet times during which events cannot take place. According to the Permitting Division, the current hours for racing events and testing are:

- **May through August**
 - Sun: 9am - 5:30pm
 - Mon & Tues - Closed (except if a weekend day is traded or canceled)
 - Wed - 9am – 10pm
 - Thurs - 9am – 5:30pm
 - Fri & Sat - 9am – 11pm
 - One quiet weekend day per month
- **September through April**
 - Mon & Tues - Closed
 - Wed – Sun - 9am – 5:30pm

The ordinance does not relax or modify any existing noise regulations, and would not change the allowed days or times for racing activities or vehicle testing at the track (though these could be modified in the future through the demonstration project's development agreement or subsequent permit conditions). The current rules include "quiet days" and hour limits set by the site's existing permits, and those would remain in effect. The only change regarding activity timing is to clarify that non-racing driving school programs can occur on Mondays and Tuesdays, which are non-race days. These driving classes are low-intensity and generate noise similar to general vehicle traffic noise rather than racecar-related noise.

Current permits on the site prohibit two-stroke-engine vehicles, which are generally louder than four-stroke-engine vehicles. The proposed ordinance would allow for two-stroke-engine vehicles, which could result in greater noise than currently used vehicles. Use of these vehicles would be limited to one weekend per month during the racing season of May 1 – August 31.

Any activities not exempt under K.C.C. 21.86.500 are subject to the noise regulations in K.C.C. 12.86. Crushing of extracted materials is already allowed on the site under K.C.C. 21A.55.U.2.b. The proposed allowance for crushed materials to be moved off site could potentially result in greater volumes of material being crushed, and therefore longer periods of crushing-related noise, but these activities would remain subject to the requirements in K.C.C. 12.86 and therefore could not be louder than allowed under the current regulations. Material extraction would be limited to the minimum necessary for the project phase.

- **Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are:**

Existing regulations that aim to avoid or reduce increased discharges to water, emissions to air and the production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances, and to limit noise would apply to development projects subject to the proposed ordinance and are not changed by the proposed ordinance. Compliance with these standards is expected to prevent increased impacts. The proposed ordinance maintains a requirement for a water quality monitoring plan for the points of discharge for on-site surface water drainage to determine that copper, other metals, hydrocarbons, and other contaminants are not elevated in down gradient ground water on- site and in Big Soos and Soosette creeks, and expands it to apply to groundwater discharges and infiltration points. This monitoring is expected to help detect any contamination in nearby creeks and groundwater early, so that corrective actions can be taken if necessary.

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

The proposed ordinance is unlikely to result in activities that would cause a greater impact to plants, animals, fish, or marine life than might otherwise occur under the current code. Soosette Creek, on the western portion of the site, and Big Soos Creek, south of the site, are identified as habitat for anadromous fish. Though the proposed ordinance would allow additional alteration types and locations beyond the current code (for spectator seating outside of the racetrack interior, for instance), such alterations would not be allowed in critical areas that are salmonid spawning areas or category I and II wetlands, and would continue to require least-possible impact to the critical area.

Additionally, the existing conservation easement on the site, recorded in 2021, permanently protected Soosette Creek and its buffer, which means that any alterations made as a result of this proposed ordinance would not be allowed to occur in those areas.

All other critical area regulations in K.C.C. chapter 21A.24 would continue to apply.

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

Existing regulations that protect and conserve plants, animals, fish, and marine life would apply to development projects subject to the proposed ordinance. Other than the conservation easement that covers the western and southern portions of the site, no additional measures to avoid or reduce such impacts are proposed.

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

The proposed ordinance is unlikely to result in activities that would cause a significantly greater impact to these resources than might otherwise occur under the existing code. While expanded manufacturing and event uses are possible under the proposed ordinance, and energy and resource demand on this particular site may increase to some extent, such expansions will not lead to activities with greater energy or natural resource demands than those already possible under existing zoning and regulations elsewhere in unincorporated King County.

Due to its rural location, sewer connection is prohibited on this site, and the a large on-site sewage system is not allowed under the King County Code and BOH code. Uses requiring large volumes of water, such as large-scale lodging facilities and water-intensive manufacturing, would therefore not be feasible given this constraint.

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

Existing regulations that protect and conserve energy and natural resources would apply to development projects subject to the proposed ordinance. No additional measures to avoid or reduce such impacts are proposed.

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 ordinance is unlikely to result in activities that would cause a greater impact to environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated as eligible or under study for governmental protection than might otherwise occur under the underlying code.

Though the proposed ordinance would allow additional alteration types and locations beyond the current code (for spectator seating outside of the racetrack interior, for instance), such alterations would not be allowed in critical areas that are salmonid spawning areas or category I and II wetlands, and would continue to require least-possible impact to the critical area. Any alterations to wetlands, aquatic areas, wetland buffers, and riparian areas would need to be shown to be the minimum necessary to accommodate the development proposal and to have the least possible adverse impact on the critical area and critical area buffer. Any alterations in steep slope or landslide hazard areas would require the use of structural mitigations identified through a geotechnical analysis by a licensed and qualified geotechnical professional.

Additionally, the existing conservation easement on the site, recorded in 2021, permanently protected Soosette Creek and its buffer and the southern portion of the site which includes portions of the buffer for Big Soos Creek, which means that any alterations made as a result of this proposed ordinance would not be allowed to occur in those areas.

The proposed ordinance also maintains a requirement for a water quality monitoring plan to ensure contaminants in runoff (like metals or oil) do not reach Soosette or Big Soos Creeks, giving these streams a higher level of protection than afforded to other properties throughout unincorporated King County.

The project site is located within a mapped Category II critical aquifer recharge area and is subject to the restrictions of K.C.C. 21A.24.316.B., unless the a critical area report demonstrates that the site is not in a critical aquifer recharge area and there would be no significant environmental impact from a given development proposal.

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

Existing federal and state laws and critical area codes in K.C.C. 21A.24, combined with the critical area regulations specific to this site that are proposed remain in code, are expected to afford the critical areas on or near this site with a higher level of protection than other properties in unincorporated King County. No additional measures are proposed to protect environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated as eligible or under study for governmental protection.

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?

Pacific Raceways is zoned Industrial with a P-suffix tying uses to the racetrack and the site's designation as a project statewide significance. The proposal would allow additional land uses on the site, but is not expected to affect land use in the surrounding area, and is not expected to have an impact on shoreline use.

The proposed ordinance is consistent with existing land use plans. The existing P-suffix condition allows for the following uses:

A. *The site is limited to racetrack uses only; no other industrial uses are allowed which are not permitted by the SIR Special Use Permit except as noted in this P-suffix condition. The following additional uses may be permitted under King County Permitting Division File No. LUT417-0003 if the area for these uses is equal to or below the square footage limitations in the permit: regional motor sports facility; uses consistent with the project of statewide significance designation on the property and that are related to racetrack uses; uses that research, develop, test, manufacture and distribute new technology in the transportation industry, such as those with an emphasis on projects and innovative technology development, testing and production that reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the automotive and combustion engine sectors; automotive educational institutions; and uses that could benefit from colocation with the existing racetrack for testing of such technologies. These additional uses may be allowed in areas over the square footage limitations in LUT417-0003 if approved via the permit process and environmental review required by K.C.C. 21A.55.105. The Rural land use designation will remain; should the racetrack use be abandoned, the Executive shall transmit legislation to the Council as part of the next Comprehensive Plan update to maintain the Rural Area land use designation and revert the zoning classification to RA-5. After such reversion, the non-racetrack uses shall only be allowed to remain for up to eight years after the abandonment of the racetrack use.*

When this P-suffix condition was modified in 2020, the language in the demonstration project section of code (K.C.C. 21A.55.105) was not updated to match. The proposed changes to code around research, development, testing, and manufacturing align the code with the P-suffix language. All newly proposed uses would be allowed as part of a regional motor sports facility and are consistent with the P-suffix language.

The proposal is consistent with the following applicable King County Comprehensive Plan policies:

R-323 *Nonresidential uses in the Rural Area shall be consistent with the other applicable policies in this chapter and limited to those that:*

- a. Provide convenient local products and services for nearby residents;*
- b. Require location in a Rural Area;*
- c. Support the economic vitality of natural resource-based industries;*
- d. Provide adaptive reuse of significant historic resources;*
- e. Provide recreational or tourism opportunities that are compatible with the surrounding Rural Area;*
- f. Provide or support infrastructure for nearby residents; or*
- g. In Rural Towns and on industrial-zoned properties, involve commercial or manufacturing-related development.*

R-324 *Nonresidential uses in the Rural Area shall be sited, sized, and landscaped to complement rural character, prevent impacts to the environment, and function with rural services, including on-site wastewater disposal.*

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

No land use or shoreline impacts are anticipated beyond the additional land uses allowed on the site, and so no measures are proposed. Existing land use regulations around height, setbacks, impervious surface, parking, etc. will continue to apply.

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

The proposal would allow for additional uses as part of the regional motor sports facility that are similar in character to those that are already present on the site. While increased event frequency is possible, traffic impacts for given events is likely to be similar in character and scale to existing racetrack events.

If permanent lodging facilities for event attendees are constructed under the allowances in the proposed ordinance, as opposed to temporary accommodations as is the case now, this likely would not increase overall traffic to and from the site, but could serve to lessen acute traffic impacts just before and after events, and might spread out traffic impacts to additional times/days if spectators are arriving or departing on days surrounding the events.

If the allowances for assembly line and mass production manufacturing in the proposed ordinance result in larger-scale facilities than are currently on the site, this could increase traffic impacts from employees commuting to and from the site. However, as has been noted, the prohibition on sewer connections and large on-site sewage systems on this property will limit the size of any such facilities to a smaller scale.

If the allowance for recreational cycling and running events were to result in an increase in the number of events could potentially increase the frequency of need for public services such as fire, traffic control, and law enforcement. However, the ordinance does not increase the number of allowed spectator events beyond what is allowed by the current code.

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

The proposed ordinance is not expected to result in significant impacts to demand for transportation, public services, or utilities. The newly allowed uses would be similar in character to those allowed today. Any impacts to traffic, parking, or public services due to specific permit proposals would be evaluated and mitigated through the project-specific SEPA process or through the required operating agreement.

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 ordinance is consistent with local, state, and federal law requirements for the protection of the environment. Existing regulations related to the protection of the environment, including the County's Critical Areas Code, Shoreline Master Program, King County Code (particularly development regulations such as Title 9 Surface Water Management, Title 10 Solid Waste, Title 13 Water and Sewer Systems, Title 21A Zoning, and Title 23 Code Compliance), the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, and others, are not amended by the proposed ordinance, with the exception of the portions of Title 21A dealing specifically with the regional motor sports facility demonstration project. These regulations would still apply to development projects subject to the proposed ordinance in unincorporated King County.