



**FACILITIES, MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS
CAPITAL PROJECTS OFFICE**

DETERMINATION OF NON-SIGNIFICANCE

Renton School District, No. 403 – Six Year Capital Facilities Plan 2011-2017

Description of Current Proposal: A non-project action SEPA for the Renton School District No. 403, Six-Year Capital Facilities Plan 2011 – 2017.

Proponent on behalf of the Lead Agency:

Brad Medrud
AHBL, Inc.
2215 North 30th St., Suite 300
Tacoma, WA 98403

Lead Agency: Renton School District, No. 403

Knowles Education Center
300 SW 7th St.
Renton, WA 98507

School District Contact: Rick Stracke, Executive Director of Facilities and Operations,
(425) 204-4403

The Responsible Official of the Renton School District hereby makes the following Findings and Conclusions based upon review of the environmental checklist and attachments, other information on file with the Renton School District, and the policies, plans, and regulations designated by the Renton School District as a basis for the exercise of substantive authority under the Washington State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) pursuant to the Revised Code of Washington RCW 43.21C.060.

Findings of Fact:

1. The subject Six-Year Capital Facilities Plan will guide the development of school district facilities and is intended to be revised each year for the succeeding six years.
2. The plan was prepared utilizing information from the Renton School District as well as the City of Renton and King County community and land use plans.

Launching Learning to Last a Lifetime

RENTON



CONCLUSIONS OF THE RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL

The responsible official has determined that the proposal does not have a probable significant adverse impact on the environment. An environmental impact statement (EIS) is not required under RCW 43.21C.030(2)(c). This decision was made after review of a completed environmental checklist and other information on file with the Renton School District and existing regulations. This information is available to the public on request.

This Determination of Non-Significance (DNS) is issued under the *Washington Administrative Code* (WAC) 197-11-340(2); the lead agency will not act on this proposal for 14 days from the date of issuance. Only written comments will be accepted and must be submitted by 5:00 p.m. on March 3, 2011, to Mr. Rick Stracke, Executive Director, Facilities and Operations, Renton School District 7812 South 124th Street, Seattle, WA 98178-4830.

Unless modified by the Renton School District, this determination will become final following the above comment deadline. There is no agency appeal under Renton School District SEPA policies.

2/15/11
Date

Responsible Official:
Mr. Rick Stracke, Executive Director, Facilities and Operations

Lead Agency: Renton School District, No. 403
Knowles Education Center
300 SW 7th St.
Renton, WA 98507

Date of Issue: February 17, 2011
Comment Deadline: March 3, 2011, 5:00PM

NOTICE OF DETERMINATION OF NONSIGNIFICANCE

The Riverview School District No. 407 has issued a determination of nonsignificance under the State Environmental Policy Act Rules (Chapter 197-11 WAC) for the following nonproject action:

Adoption of the Riverview School District's 211 Capital Facilities Plan ("Capital Facilities Plan") for the purposes of planning for the District's facilities needs for the period 2011-2017. King County and the cities of Carnation and Duvall will incorporate the District's Capital Facilities Plan into their Comprehensive Plans.

After review of a completed environmental checklist and other information on file with the agency, the Riverview School District has determined this proposal will not have a probable significant adverse impact on the environment.

Copies of the determination of nonsignificance are available at no charge from Mr. William J. Adamo, Director of Business and Operations, Riverview School District No. 407, 32240 N.E. 50th Street, Carnation, WA 98014. The lead agency will not act on this proposal for 14 days from the date of issue. Comments may be submitted by 4:00 p.m., June 3, 2011, to: Conrad Robertson, Superintendent, at the above address.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "William J. Adamo". The signature is written in a cursive style with a long, sweeping tail on the final letter.

DETERMINATION OF NONSIGNIFICANCE (DNS)

Issued with a 14 day comment and appeals period

Description of Proposal:

This threshold determination analyzes the environmental impacts associated with the following action:

1. The adoption of the Lake Washington School District 2011-2016 Six Year Capital Facilities Plan by the Lake Washington School District for the purposes of planning for the facilities needs of the District.
2. The amendment of the King County Comprehensive Plan by King County to include the Lake Washington School District 2011-2016 Capital Facilities Plan as a part of the Capital Facilities Plan Element of the King County Comprehensive Plan.
3. The potential amendment of the Comprehensive Plans for the cities of Kirkland, Redmond, and Sammamish to include the Lake Washington School District 2011-2016 Capital Facilities Plan as a part of the Capital Facilities Plan element of each jurisdiction's Comprehensive Plan. The cities of Kirkland, Redmond, and Sammamish may also amend their Comprehensive Plans to include the Lake Washington School District's Capital Facilities Plan as part of the Capital Facilities Element of each jurisdiction's Comprehensive Plan.

Proponent: Lake Washington School District No. 414

Location of Proposal: The Lake Washington School District includes an area of approximately 75 square miles. The cities of Redmond, Kirkland and part of Sammamish fall within the District's boundaries, as do parts of unincorporated King County.

Lead Agency:

Lake Washington School District is the lead agency pursuant to WAC 197-11-926.

The lead agency for this proposal has determined that the proposal does not have a probable significant adverse environmental impact on the environment. An environmental impact statement (EIS) is not required under RCW 43.21C.030 (2) (c). This decision was made after a review of the completed environmental checklist and other information on file with the lead agency. This information is available to the public upon request.

This Determination of Non-significance (DNS) is issued under WAC 197-11-340(2). The lead agency will not act on this proposal for 14 days from the date of issue. Comments must be submitted by 5 p.m., May 16, 2011. The responsible official will reconsider the DNS based on timely comments and may retain, modify, or, if significant adverse impacts are likely, withdraw the DNS. If the DNS is retained, it will be final after the expiration of the comment deadline.

Responsible Official:

Signature:



Address: Chip Kimball, Superintendent
Telephone: (425) 936-1200
16250 NE 74th Street
Redmond, WA 98052

You may appeal this determination in writing by 5 p.m., May 16, 2011 to Chip Kimball, Lake Washington School District – 16250 NE 74th Street, Redmond WA 98052

Date of Issue: April 29, 2011
Date Published: May 2, 2011

DETERMINATION OF NONSIGNIFICANCE

Issued with a 14-day comment and appeals period

Description of Proposal:

This threshold determination analyzes the environmental impacts associated with the following actions, which are so closely related to each other that they are in effect a single course of action:

1. The adoption of the Tahoma School District's 2011 Capital Facilities Plan by the Tahoma School District No. 409 for the purposes of planning for the facilities needs of the District;
2. The amendment of the King County Comprehensive Plan to include the Tahoma School District's 2011 Capital Facilities Plan as part of the Capital Facilities Element of the King County Comprehensive Plan; and
3. The potential amendment of the Comprehensive Plans of the cities of Covington and Maple Valley to include the Tahoma School District's 2011 Capital Facilities Plan as part of the Capital Facilities Element of each jurisdiction's Comprehensive Plan.

Proponent: Tahoma School District No. 409

Location of the Proposal:

The Tahoma School District includes an area of approximately 90 square miles. The City of Covington, the City of Maple Valley, and parts of unincorporated King County fall within the District's boundaries.

Lead Agency:

Tahoma School District No. 409

The lead agency for this proposal has determined that the proposal does not have a probable significant adverse environmental impact on the environment. An environmental impact statement (EIS) is not required under RCW 43.21C.030(2)(c). This decision was made after a review of the completed environmental checklist and other information on file with the lead agency. This information is available to the public upon request.

This Determination of Nonsignificance (DNS) is issued under WAC 197-11-340(2). The lead agency will not act on this proposal for 14 days from the date of issue. Comments must be submitted by 4:30 p.m., July 25, 2011. The responsible official will reconsider the DNS based on timely comments and may retain, modify, or, if significant adverse impacts are likely, withdraw the DNS. If the DNS is retained, it will be final after the expiration of the comment deadline.

Responsible Official: Lori Cloud
Director, Financial Services
Tahoma School District No. 409

Telephone: (425) 413-3400

Address: Tahoma School District
25720 Maple Valley-Black Diamond Road S.E.
Maple Valley, WA 98038-8412

You may appeal this determination in writing by 4:30 p.m., July 25, 2011, to Lori Cloud, Director, Financial Services, Tahoma School District No. 409, 25720 Maple Valley-Black Diamond Road S.E. Maple Valley, WA 98038-8412.

Date of Issue: July 5, 2011
Date Published: July 8, 2011 – Voice of the Valley
July 12, 2011 – Covington Reporter

**ISSAQUAH SCHOOL DISTRICT #411
DETERMINATION OF NONSIGNIFICANCE**

Issued with a 14-day comment and appeals period

Description of Proposal:

This threshold determination analyzes the environmental impacts associated with the following actions, which are so closely related to each other that they are in effect a single course of action:

1. The adoption of the Issaquah School District's Capital Facilities Plan 2011-2016 by the Issaquah School District No. 411 for the purposes of planning for the facilities needs of the District; and
2. The amendment of the Comprehensive Plans of King County, the City of Bellevue, City of Issaquah, City of Renton, City of Sammamish, and the City of Newcastle to include the Issaquah School District's Capital Facilities Plan 2011-2016 as part of the Capital Facilities Element of each jurisdiction's Comprehensive Plan.

Proponent: Issaquah School District No. 411

Location of the Proposal:

The Issaquah School District includes an area of approximately 110 square miles. The City of Issaquah, the City of Sammamish, parts of the cities of Bellevue, Newcastle, Renton, and parts of unincorporated King County fall within the District's boundaries.

Lead Agency:

Issaquah School District No. 411

The lead agency for this proposal has determined that the proposal does not have a probable significant adverse environmental impact on the environment. An environmental impact statement (EIS) is not required under RCW 43.21C.030(2)(c). This decision was made after a review of the completed environmental checklist and other information on file with the lead agency. This information is available to the public upon request.

This Determination of Nonsignificance (DNS) is issued under WAC 197-11-340(2). The lead agency will not act on this proposal for 14 days from the date of issue. Comments must be submitted by 4:30 p.m., May 24, 2011. The responsible official will reconsider the DNS based

on timely comments and may retain, modify, or, if significant adverse impacts are likely, withdraw the DNS. If the DNS is retained, it will be final after the expiration of the comment deadline.

Responsible Official: Jacob Kuper
Chief of Finance and Operations
Issaquah School District No. 411

Telephone: (425) 837-7024

Address: Issaquah School District
565 N.W. Holly Street
Issaquah, WA 98027-2899

You may appeal this determination in writing by 4:30 p.m., May 24, 2011 to Jacob Kuper Chief of Finance and Operations, Issaquah School District No. 411, 565 N.W. Holly Street, Issaquah, WA 98027-2899.

Date of Issue: May 9, 2011
Date Published: May 11, 2011

DETERMINATION OF NONSIGNIFICANCE

for

Kent School District No. 415
2011 Capital Facilities Plan

Issued with a 14-day comment and appeal period.

Description of Proposal:

This threshold determination analyzes the environmental impacts associated with the following actions, which are so closely related to each other that they are in effect a single action:

1. The adoption of the Kent School District 2011 Six-Year Capital Facilities Plan by the Kent School District for the purposes of planning for the facilities needs of the District.

2. The amendment of the King County Comprehensive Plan to include the Kent School District 2011 Capital Facilities Plan as a part of the Capital Facilities Plan Element of the King County Comprehensive Plan.

3. The amendment of the Comprehensive Plan of the City of Kent to include the Kent School District's 2011 Capital Facilities Plan as part of the Capital Facilities Plan Element of the Comprehensive Plans of the City of Kent.

4. The amendment of the Comprehensive Plan of the City of Covington to include the Kent School District's 2011 Capital Facilities Plan as part of the Capital Facilities Plan Element of the Comprehensive Plans of the City of Covington.

5. The amendment of the Comprehensive Plan of the City of Auburn to include the Kent School District's 2011 Capital Facilities Plan as part of the Capital Facilities Plan Element of the Comprehensive Plans of the City of Auburn.

6. The amendment of the Comprehensive Plan of the City of Renton to include the Kent School District's 2011 Capital Facilities Plan as part of the Capital Facilities Plan Element of the Comprehensive Plans of the City of Renton.

7. This proposal may also involve amendment of Comprehensive Plans of the Cities of Maple Valley, Black Diamond, and/or SeaTac to incorporate the Kent School District 2011 Capital Facilities Plan into the Capital Facilities element of that jurisdiction's Comprehensive Plan.

Proponent: Kent School District No. 415

Location of the Proposal:

The Kent School District includes an area of approximately 72 square miles. The City of Covington and portions of the cities of Kent, Auburn, Renton, Black Diamond, Maple Valley, and SeaTac fall within the District's boundaries, as do parts of unincorporated King County.


Lead Agency:

Kent School District No. 415 is the lead agency pursuant to WAC 197-11-926.

The lead agency for this proposal has determined that the proposal does not pose a probable significant adverse impact to the environment. An environmental impact statement (EIS) is not required under RCW 43.21C.030 (2) (c). This decision was made after a review of the completed environmental checklist and other information on file with the lead agency. This information is available to the public upon request.

This Determination of Nonsignificance (DNS) is issued under WAC 197-11-340(2). The lead agency will not act on this proposal for 14 days from the date of issue. Comments must be submitted by 4:00 p.m., June 21, 2011. The responsible official will reconsider the DNS based on timely comments and may retain, modify, or, if significant adverse impacts are likely, withdraw the DNS. If the DNS is retained, it will be final after the expiration of the comment deadline.

Responsible Official:



Dr. Richard A. Stedry,
Chief Business Officer for
Kent School District No. 415

Telephone: (253) 373-7295

Address: 12033 SE 256th Street #A-600
Kent, Washington 98030-6643

Appeals of this determination are governed by Board Policy No. 9280 which can be obtained from Dr. Richard A. Stedry, Chief Business Officer, Kent School District No. 415, 12033 SE 256th Street #A-600, Kent, Washington 98030-6643 and pursuant to WAC 197-11-680 and RCW 43.21C.075.

Date of Issue: June 7, 2011

Date Published: June 8, 2011

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

WAC 197-11-960 Environmental Checklist.

Purpose of Checklist:

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

Instructions for Applicants:

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

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

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

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

Use of checklist for nonproject proposals:

Complete this checklist for nonproject proposals, even though questions may be answered "does not apply". In addition, complete the Supplemental Sheet for nonproject actions (part D).

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

A. BACKGROUND

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable:

The adoption of a six-year Capital Facilities Plan by the Kent School District. The Comprehensive Plans of King County, City of Kent, City of Covington, City of Renton, City of Auburn and possibly Cities of Maple Valley, Black Diamond and SeaTac have been and/or will be amended to include the Kent School District 2011 Capital Facilities Plan in the Capital Facilities Plan Element of each jurisdiction's Comprehensive Plan. A copy of the District's Plan is available for review in the District Finance & Planning Department.

2. Name of applicant:

Kent School District No. 415.

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

Kent School District No. 415
12033 SE 256th Street # A-600
Kent, WA 98030-6643

Contact Person: Dr. Richard A. Stedry, Chief Business Officer

Telephone: (253) 373-7295

4. Date checklist prepared: May 27, 2011

5. Agency requesting checklist:

Kent School District No. 415

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

The 2011 Kent School District Capital Facilities Plan is scheduled to be adopted in June, 2011 and forwarded to King County, Cities of Kent, Covington, Auburn, Renton, Maple Valley, Black Diamond, and SeaTac for possible inclusion in each jurisdiction's Comprehensive Plan. The Capital Facilities Plan will be updated annually. Site-specific projects have been or will be subject to project-specific environmental review.

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

The Capital Facilities Plan reviews classroom additions to one existing high school and proposes construction of a new elementary school and a replacement of Covington Elementary School.

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

The above-referenced projects will undergo environmental review at the time of formal proposal.

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.

No.

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

King County and Cities of Kent, Covington and Auburn will review and approve the Capital Facilities Plan for the purposes of impact fee ordinances and will need to adopt the Plan as an amendment to the Capital Facilities Plan element of the Comprehensive Plans of King County and Cities of Kent, Covington, Renton and Auburn. Cities of Maple Valley, Black Diamond, and SeaTac may also review and approve the Plan for the purposes of any school impact fee ordinances and may adopt the Plan as an amendment to the Capital Facilities element of their Comprehensive Plans.

11. Give a brief, complete description of your proposal, including the proposed uses and the size of the project and site. There are several questions later in this checklist that ask you to describe certain aspects of your proposal. You do not need to repeat those answers on this page. (Lead agencies may modify this form to include additional specific information on project description.)

This is a non-project action. This proposal involves the adoption of the Kent School District 2011 Capital Facilities Plan for the purpose of planning the facilities needs of the District and for inclusion in the Capital Facilities Plan element and possible amendment of the Comprehensive Plans for King County, City of Covington, City of Kent, City of Renton, City of Auburn, City of SeaTac, City of Maple Valley and City of Black Diamond. A copy of the Capital Facilities Plan may be viewed at the Kent School District Business Services Department office.

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 2011 Capital Facilities Plan will affect the Kent School District. The District includes an area of approximately 70 square miles. The City of Covington, and portions of the Cities of Kent, Auburn, Renton, Black Diamond, Maple Valley, SeaTac and parts of unincorporated King County fall within the District's boundaries.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS

1. Earth

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

The Kent School District is comprised of a variety of topographic land forms and gradients, including all of those listed. Specific topographic characteristics will be identified during the planning and permit process for each capital project.

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

Specific slope characteristics will be identified during the planning and permit process for each capital project.

- c. What general types of soils are found on the site (for example, clay, sand, gravel, peat, muck)? If you know the classification of agricultural soils, specify them and note any prime farmland.

Specific soil types will be identified during the planning and permit process for each capital project.

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

Unstable soils may exist within the Kent School District. Specific soil limitations on individual project sites will be identified at the time of environmental review.

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

Individual projects included in the Capital Facilities Plan will be subject to project-specific environmental review and local approval at the time of proposal. Proposed grading projects, as well as the purpose, type, quantity, and source of fill materials will be identified as appropriate to each project.

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

It is possible that erosion could occur as a result of construction projects currently proposed in the Capital Facilities Plan. Individual projects and their erosion impacts will be evaluated on a site-specific basis. Individual projects will be subject to environmental review and local approval on the time of proposal.

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

Percentage of impervious cover will vary with each capital facilities project and will be addressed during project-specific environmental review.

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

Erosion potential on individual project sites will be addressed during project-specific environmental review. Relevant erosion reduction and control requirements will be met.

2. Air

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

Various emissions, many construction-related, may result from individual projects. Air-quality impacts will be evaluated during project-specific environmental review. Please see the Supplemental Sheet for Nonproject Actions.

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

Off-site sources and necessary mitigation will be addressed during project-specific environmental review.

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

Plans for individual projects included in the Capital Facilities Plan have been or will be subject to environmental review and relevant local approval processes, including obtaining of any necessary air quality permits, at the time individual projects are formally proposed. Please see the Supplemental Sheet for Nonproject Actions.

3. Water

- a. Surface:

- 1) Is there any surface water body on or in the immediate vicinity of the site (including year-round and seasonal streams, saltwater, lakes, ponds, wetlands)? If yes, describe type and provide names. If appropriate, state what stream or river it flows into.

There is a network of surface water bodies within the Kent School District. The surface water regimes and flow patterns have been or will be researched and incorporated in the design of each individual project.

- 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.

Some projects may require work near these described waters. Individual projects in the Capital Facilities Plan will be subject to environmental review and local approval requirements at the time the project is formally proposed.

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.

Information with respect to placement or removal of fill or dredge material will be addressed at the time of project-specific environmental review. Applicable local regulations have been or will be satisfied.

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

Any surface water withdrawals or diversions have been or will be addressed during project-specific environmental review.

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

Each capital facilities project, if located in a floodplain area, will be required to meet applicable local regulations for flood areas.

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.

Specific information regarding discharges of waste materials, if any, will be addressed during project-specific environmental review. Please see the Supplemental Sheet for Nonproject Actions.

b. Ground:

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

Individual projects included in the Capital Facilities Plan may impact ground water resources. Each project will be evaluated during project-specific environmental review. Applicable local regulations have been or will be satisfied. Please see the Supplemental Sheet for Nonproject Actions.

2) Describe waste material that will be discharged into the ground from septic tanks or other sources, if any (for example: Domestic sewage; industrial, containing the following chemicals . . .; agricultural; etc.). Describe the general size of the system, the number of such systems, the number of houses to be served (if applicable), or the number of animals or humans the system(s) are expected to serve.

Impacts of discharged waste material, if any, have been or will be addressed during site-specific, project-level environmental review.

c. Water Runoff (including storm water):

1) Describe the source of runoff (including storm water) and method of collection and disposal, if any (include quantities, if known). Where will this water flow? Will this water flow into other waters? If so, describe.

Individual projects included in the Capital Facilities Plan may have varying storm water runoff consequences. Each project will be subject to environmental review and applicable local regulations.

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

Individual projects included in the Capital Facilities Plan will have varying environmental impacts and will be subject to appropriate review and local regulations prior to construction. Information regarding waste materials will be presented at the time of such review. Please see the Supplemental Sheet for Nonproject Actions.

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

Specific measures to reduce or control runoff impacts have been or will be developed on a project-specific basis in cooperation with the appropriate jurisdiction.

4. Plants:

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

- deciduous tree: alder, maple, aspen, other
- evergreen tree: fir, cedar, pine, other
- shrubs
- grass
- pasture
- crop or grain
- wet soil plants: cattail, buttercup, bulrush, skunk cabbage, other
- water plants: water lily, eelgrass, milfoil, other
- other types of vegetation

There are various vegetative zones within the Kent School District. An inventory of species has been or will be produced as part of project-specific environmental review.

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

Impacts on vegetation will be determined at the time of project-specific environmental review at the time the project is formally proposed. Please see the Supplemental Sheet for Nonproject Actions.

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

Specific impacts to these species from individual projects has been or will be determined at the time of project proposal and will be addressed during site-specific, project-level environmental review.

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

Individual projects included in the Capital Facilities Plan will be subject to environmental review and local approval at the time of project proposal.

5. Animals:

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

birds: hawk, heron, eagle, songbirds, other:

mammals: deer, bear, elk, beaver, other:

fish: bass, salmon, trout, herring, shellfish, other:

An inventory of species observed on or near sites has been or will be developed during project-specific environmental review.

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

Specific impacts to these species from individual projects will be determined at the time of project proposal and will be reviewed in cooperation with the affected jurisdictions.

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

Impacts on migration routes, if any, will be addressed during site-specific, project-level environmental review.

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

Appropriate measures to preserve or enhance wildlife have been or will be determined at the time of site-specific, project-level environmental review.

6. Energy and Natural Resources:

a. What kinds of energy (electric, natural gas, oil, wood stove, solar) will be used to meet the completed project's energy needs? Describe whether it will be used for heating, manufacturing, etc.

The State Board of Education requires a life-cycle cost analysis of all heating, lighting, and insulating systems prior to allowing specific projects to proceed. Energy needs will be decided at the time of specific engineering and site design planning. Please see the Supplemental Sheet for Nonproject Actions.

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

Individual projects of this Capital Facilities Plan will be evaluated as to their impact on the solar potential of adjacent projects during environmental review.

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:

Energy conservation measures will be considered at the project-specific design phase and environmental review.

7. Environmental Health:

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

Please see the Supplemental Sheet for Nonproject Actions.

1) Describe special emergency services that might be required.

Please see the Supplemental Sheet for Nonproject Actions.

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

Proposed projects will comply with all current codes, standards, and rules and regulations. Individual projects have been or will be subject to environmental review and local approval at the time of formal submittal.

b. Noise:

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

A variety of noises exist within the Kent School District. Specific noise sources have been or will be identified during project-specific environmental review.

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.

Normal construction noises would exist on a short-term basis during school construction. There could be an increase in traffic or operations-related noise which would be addressed during project specific environmental review. Please see the Supplemental Sheet for Nonproject Actions.

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

Project noise impacts have been or will be evaluated and mitigated during the project-specific environmental review. Each project is or will be subject to applicable local regulations.

8. Land and Shoreline Use:

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

There are a variety of land uses within the Kent School District, including residential, commercial, industrial, institutional, utility, agricultural, forestry, open space, recreational, etc.

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

This question will be addressed during site-specific, project-level environmental review.

c. Describe any structures on the site.

Structures located on proposed sites have been or will be identified and described during project-specific environmental review when appropriate.

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

Structures to be demolished, if any, will be identified as part of the project-specific environmental review process.

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

There are a variety of zoning classifications within the Kent School District. Site specific zoning information has been or will be identified during project-specific environmental review.

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

An inventory of comprehensive plan designations has been or will be completed during project-specific environmental review.

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

Any shoreline master program designations have been or will be identified during project-specific environmental review.

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

Environmentally sensitive areas, if any, will be identified during project-specific environmental review.

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

This information has been or will be provided at the time of project-specific environmental review.

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

It is not anticipated that proposed projects will displace any people. Displacement of people, if any, will be evaluated during project-specific environmental review.

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

Individual projects included in the Capital Facilities Plan will be subject to project-specific environmental review and local approval at the time the project is formally proposed.

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

Compatibility of the proposal and specific projects with existing uses and plans have been or will be assessed as part of the comprehensive planning process and during project-specific environmental review.

9. Housing:

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

No housing units would be provided.

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

Any impact of project proposals on existing housing has been or would be evaluated during project-specific environmental review procedures.

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

Measures to reduce or control any housing impacts have been or will be addressed during site-specific, project-level environmental review.

10. Aesthetics:

- a. What is the tallest height of any proposed structure(s), not including antennas; what is the principal exterior building material(s) proposed?

Aesthetic impacts have been or will be determined at the time of site-specific, project-level environmental review.

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

Aesthetic impacts have been or will be determined at the time of site-specific, project-level environmental review.

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

Appropriate measures to reduce or control aesthetic impacts have been or will be determined at the time of project-specific environmental review.

11. Light and Glare:

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

Light or glare impacts have been or will be determined at the time of project-specific environmental review.

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

Light or glare impacts have been or will be determined at the time of project-specific environmental review.

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

Off-site sources of light or glare have been or will be evaluated at the time of project specific environmental review.

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

Mitigation of light and glare impact has been or will be addressed during project-specific environmental review.

12. Recreation:

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

There are a variety of formal and informal recreational facilities within the Kent School District.

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

Recreational impacts have been or will be addressed during project specific environmental review. Projects in the Capital Facilities Plan may enhance recreational opportunities and uses.

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

Any adverse effects on recreation stemming from individual project proposals have been or will be subject to mitigation during the environmental review procedure. A school site usually provides recreational facilities to the community in the form of additional play fields and gymnasiums.

13. Historic and Cultural Preservation:

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

The existence of historic and cultural resources will be determined at the time of project-specific environmental review.

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

An inventory of historical sites has been or will be conducted as part of project specific environmental review.

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

Appropriate measures have been or will be proposed on a project-specific basis.

14. Transportation:

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

Impact on public streets and highways has been or will be assessed during project-specific environmental review.

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

The relationship between specific projects and public transit has been or will be assessed during project-specific environmental review.

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

An inventory of parking spaces and the impacts of specific projects on parking spaces has been or will be conducted during project-specific environmental review.

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

The development of new schools may require new access roads or streets. This issue will be fully addressed during project-specific environmental review.

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

Use of water, rail or air transportation has been or will be addressed during site-specific, project-level environmental review.

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

Each project proposal has been or will be separately evaluated as to traffic impacts.

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

Mitigation of impacts on transportation has been or will be addressed during project-specific environmental review.

15. Public Services:

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

The District does not anticipate that the projects identified in the Capital Facilities Plan will substantially increase the need for other public services. Impacts have been or will be evaluated on a project-specific basis.

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

Schools are built with automatic security systems, fire alarms, smoke alarms, heat sensors and sprinkler systems.

16. Utilities:

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

Utilities available at project sites have been or will be identified during project specific environmental review.


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.

Utility revisions and construction needs will be identified during project-specific environmental review.

C. SIGNATURE

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

Signature: _____



Dr. Richard A. Stedry, Chief Business Officer

Date Submitted: June 7, 2011

D. SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS

(do not use this sheet for project actions)

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

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

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

To the extent this Plan makes it more likely that school facilities will be constructed, and/or renovated or remodeled, some of these environmental impacts will be more likely. Additional impermeable surfaces, such as roofs, parking lots, sidewalks, access roads and playgrounds will increase storm water runoff, which could enter surface or ground water. Emissions to air could result from heating systems, emergency generators and other equipment, and from additional car and bus trips to and from the school for students and faculty. Any emissions resulting from this Plan should not require the production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances, with the possible exception of storage of diesel fuel or gasoline for emergency generating equipment. Noise may result from additional traffic and from concentrating several hundred children at a new facility, especially before and after school and during recesses.

To the extent this proposal allows additional residential development to occur, these impacts would also increase somewhat, but it is not possible to quantify those impacts at this time. The impacts would depend on the type, location and distribution of housing, for example, whether single or multiple family and the location of the school.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are:

Facilities implementing the Plan have been or will be evaluated at the project specific level and impacts will be mitigated accordingly. Storm water detention and runoff will meet applicable County and/or City requirements and, depending on the date of actual construction, may be subject to a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System ("NPDES") permitting requirements. Discharges to air will be minimal, and will meet any applicable requirements of the Puget Sound Air Pollution Control Authority. Fuel oil will be stored according to local and state requirements.

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

The Plan itself will have no impact on these elements of the environment. Depending on the particular site, construction of facilities may require clearing sites of plants and loss of animal habitat. To the extent residential development is allowed, additional area may be cleared and eliminated as habitat for animals. There are not likely to be any impacts on fish or marine life, although some water quality degradation in streams and rivers could occur due to increased residential development. These impacts have been or will be addressed in more detail during project-specific environmental review when appropriate.

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

Individual projects will be evaluated and mitigated appropriately on a project-specific basis, but specific mitigation proposals cannot be identified at this time.

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

Any actual projects resulting from this Plan would consume heating fuel and electrical energy. Increased traffic resulting from the construction of additional facilities would consume petroleum based fuels. Reduced traffic resulting from construction of another neighborhood school may also reduce amounts of fuel consumed, but it is not possible to quantify such reduction in consumption at this time. These impacts have been or will be addressed in more detail during project-specific environmental review when appropriate.

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

Facilities would be constructed in accordance with applicable energy efficiency standards.

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 Plan and facilities constructed pursuant to the Plan should have no impact on these resources. It is not possible to predict whether other development made possible by this Plan would affect sensitive areas.

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

No specific measures are being proposed at this time. Appropriate measures have been or will be proposed during project-specific review. Annual updates of this Plan will be coordinated with King County, Cities of Kent, Covington, Auburn, Renton, SeaTac, Maple Valley and Black Diamond as part of the Growth Management Act process, one of the purposes of which is to protect environmentally sensitive areas. To the extent the School District's facilities planning process is part of the overall growth management planning process, these resources are more likely to be protected.

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

The Plan will not have any impact on land or shoreline use that is incompatible with existing comprehensive plans, land use codes, or shoreline management plans.

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

None are proposed at this time. Actual facilities constructed to implement the Plan will be sited and constructed to avoid or reduce land use impacts.

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

This proposal should not create substantial new demands for transportation. The projects included in the Capital Facilities Plan may create an increase in traffic near new District facilities but also reduce traffic by creating the opportunity for more students to walk to a closer school. The construction of the facilities included in the Capital Facilities Plan may result in minor increases in the demand for public services and utilities, such as fire and police protection, and water, sewer, and electric utilities. None of these impacts are likely to be significant. The impacts on transportation and public services and utilities of the projects included in the Capital Facilities Plan will be addressed during project-level review when appropriate.

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

No measures to reduce or respond to such demands are proposed at this time.

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

The Kent School District Capital Facilities Plan will not conflict with any laws or requirements for the protection of the environment.

DETERMINATION OF NONSIGNIFICANCE
Issued with a 14 Day comment and appeals period

Description of Proposal:

This threshold determination analyzes the environmental impacts associated with the following actions, which are so closely related to each other that they are in effect a single action:

1. The adoption of the Federal Way Public Schools' 2012 Six Year Capital Facilities Plan by the Federal Way Public Schools for the purposes of planning for the facilities needs of the District.
2. The amendment of the King County Comprehensive Plan by King County to include the Federal Way Public Schools' 2012 Capital Facilities Plan as part of the Capital Facilities Plan Element of the King County Comprehensive Plan.
3. The amendment of the Comprehensive Plans of the City of Federal Way, City of Kent and the City of Auburn to include the Federal Way Public Schools' 2012 Capital Facilities Plan as part of the Capital Facilities Plan Element of the City of Federal Way's, City of Kent's and the City of Auburn's Comprehensive Plan.

This proposal may also involve the amendment of the Comprehensive Plans of the City of Des Moines to incorporate the Federal Way Public Schools' 2012 Capital Facilities Plan into the Capital Facilities Element of the City of Des Moines' Comprehensive Plan.

Proponent: Federal Way Public Schools

Location of the Proposal:

The Federal Way Public Schools District includes an area of approximately 35 square miles. Areas of the cities of Federal Way, Kent, Des Moines and Auburn fall within the District's boundaries, as do parts of unincorporated King County.

Lead Agency:

Federal Way Public Schools is the lead agency pursuant to WAC 197-11-926.

The lead agency for this proposal has determined that the proposal does not have a probable significant adverse environmental impact on the environment. An environmental impact statement (EIS) is not required under RCW 43.21C.030(2)(c). This decision was made after a review of the completed environmental checklist and other information on file with the lead agency. This information is available to the public upon request.

This Determination of Nonsignificance (DNS) is issued under WAC 197-11-340(2). The lead agency will not act on this proposal for 14 days from the date of issue. Comments must be submitted by 5:00 p.m., May 7, 2011. The responsible official will reconsider the DNS based on timely comments and may retain, modify, or, if significant adverse impacts are likely, withdraw the DNS. If the DNS is retained, it will be final after the expiration of the comment deadline.

Responsible Official: Ms. Tanya Nascimenot
Enrollment and Demographics
Federal Way Public Schools
Telephone: (253) 945-2071
Address: 31405 18th Avenue South
Federal Way WA 98003

You may appeal this determination in writing by 5:00 p.m., May 7, 2011 to Tanya Nascimento, Federal Way Public Schools, 31405 18th Avenue South, Federal Way, WA 98003.

Date of Issue: April 23, 2011
Date Published: April 23, 2011

DETERMINATION OF NONSIGNIFICANCE
Issued with a 14 Day comment and appeals period

Description of Proposal:

This threshold determination analyzes the environmental impacts associated with the following actions, which are so closely related to each other that they are in effect a single action:

1. The adoption of the Snoqualmie Valley School District's 2011 Six Year Capital Facilities Plan by the Snoqualmie Valley School District for the purposes of planning for the facilities needs of the District.
2. The amendment of the King County Comprehensive Plan by King County to include the Snoqualmie Valley School District's 2011 Capital Facilities Plan as part of the Capital Facilities Plan Element of the King County Comprehensive Plan.
3. The amendment of the Comprehensive Plans of the cities of Sammamish, Snoqualmie and North Bend to incorporate the Snoqualmie Valley School District's 2011 Capital Facilities Plan into the Capital Facilities Element of each jurisdiction's Comprehensive Plan.

Proponent: Snoqualmie Valley School District No. 410

Location of the Proposal:

The Snoqualmie Valley School District includes an area of approximately 400 square miles. The cities of Sammamish, Snoqualmie and North Bend fall within the District's boundaries, as do parts of unincorporated King County.

Lead Agency: Snoqualmie Valley School District is the lead agency pursuant to WAC 197-11-926.


The lead agency for this proposal has determined that the proposal does not have a probable significant adverse environmental impact on the environment. An environmental impact statement (EIS) is not required under RCW 43.21C.030(2)(c). This decision was made after a review of the completed environmental checklist and other information on file with the lead agency. This information is available to the public upon request.

This Determination of Nonsignificance (DNS) is issued under WAC 197-11-340(2). The lead agency will not act on this proposal for 14 days from the date of issue. Comments must be submitted by 4:00 p.m., June 23, 2011. The responsible official will reconsider the DNS based on timely comments and may retain, modify, or, if significant adverse impacts are likely, withdraw the DNS. If the DNS is retained, it will be final after the expiration of the comment deadline.

Responsible Official: Mr. G. Joel Aune, Superintendent
Snoqualmie Valley School District #410
Telephone: (425)-831-8000
Address: 8001 Silva Ave SE, P.O. Box 400
Snoqualmie, WA. 98065

Date: June 9, 2011

Signature: _____



You may appeal this determination in writing by 4:00 p.m., June 23, 2011, to Mr. G. Joel Aune, Superintendent, Snoqualmie Valley School District, P.O. Box 400, Snoqualmie, WA. 98065.

Date of Issue: June 9, 2011

Date Published: June 9, 2011

DETERMINATION OF NONSIGNIFICANCE
Adoption of the Northshore School District 2011 Six Year Capital Facilities Plan

Description of Proposal:

This threshold determination analyzes the environmental impacts associated with the following actions, which are so closely related to each other that they are, in effect, a single action:

1. The adoption of the Northshore School District's 2011 Six Year Capital Facilities Plan by the Northshore School District for the purposes of planning for the facilities needs of the District.

2. The amendment of the King County Comprehensive Plan by King County to include the Northshore School District's 2011 Capital Facilities Plan as part of the Capital Facilities Plan Element of the King County Comprehensive Plan.

3. This proposal may also involve the amendment of the Comprehensive Plans of Snohomish County and the cities of Bothell, Woodinville, and Kenmore to incorporate the Northshore School District's 2011 Capital Facilities Plan into the Capital Facilities Element of each jurisdiction's Comprehensive Plan.

Proponent: Northshore School District No. 417

Location of the Proposal:

The Northshore School District includes an area of approximately 60 square miles. The cities of Bothell, Woodinville, and Kenmore fall within the District's boundaries, as do parts of unincorporated King and Snohomish Counties.

Lead Agency: Northshore School District No. 417

Note: Issuance of this threshold determination does not constitute approval of any permits.


The lead agency for this proposal has determined that it does not have a probable significant adverse impact on the environment if the following conditions are implemented. An environmental impact statement (EIS) is not required under RCW 43.21C.030(2)(c). This decision was made after review of a completed environmental checklist and other information on file with the lead agency. This information is available to the public upon request.

It is the policy of the District that, when undertaking an action involving the exercise of substantive SEPA authority, the District shall consider, as appropriate under the circumstances,

the ramifications of such action as to one or more of the factors listed in Northshore School District Policy 9280, Substantive Authority (A-I).

This Determination of Nonsignificance (DNS) is issued under WAC 197-11-340(2). The lead agency will not act on this proposal for 14 days from the date of issue. Comments must be submitted by 5:00 p.m., May 2, 2011. The responsible official will reconsider the DNS based on timely comments and may retain, modify, or, if significant adverse impacts are likely, withdraw the DNS. If the DNS is retained, it will be final after the expiration of the comment deadline.

Responsible Official: Evan Ujjiye
Director, Capital Projects
Northshore School District No. 417
Telephone: (425) 408-7850
Address: 22105 23rd Drive S.E.
Bothell, Washington 98021-4409

Signature  _____

You may appeal this determination in writing by 5:00 p.m., May 2, 2011 to Evan Ujjiye, Northshore School District No. 417, 22105 23rd Drive S.E., Bothell, WA 98021-4409.

This determination may be appealed to the Superintendent pursuant to the requirements of Northshore School District Board Policy No. 9280, within fourteen (14) days of the date the challenged environmental document or determination is issued. An appeal must be addressed to the Superintendent.

Form of Appeal: For an appeal to be accepted, the letter must specify: (a) the determination being appealed; (b) the errors complained of; (c) the corrective action being sought; (d) the reasons why the determination should be changed; and (e) whether further oral or written comment or a hearing is being requested. Supporting documents may be submitted with the letter of appeal.

Date of Issue: April 18, 2011
Date Published: April 18, 2011

DETERMINATION OF NONSIGNIFICANCE

Issued with a 14-day comment period

Description of Proposal:

This threshold determination analyzes the environmental impacts associated with the following actions, which are so closely related to each other that they are in effect a single course of action:

1. The adoption of the Enumclaw School District's 2011-2016 Capital Facilities Plan by the Enumclaw School District No. 216 for the purposes of planning for the facilities needs of the District; and
2. The amendment of the Comprehensive Plans of King County to include the Enumclaw School District's 2011-2016 Capital Facilities Plan as part of the Capital Facilities Element of the County's Comprehensive Plan. The cities of Black Diamond and Enumclaw may also amend their Comprehensive Plans to include the Enumclaw School District's Capital Facilities Plan as part of the Capital Facilities Element of each jurisdiction's Comprehensive Plan.

Proponent: Enumclaw School District No. 216

Location of the Proposal:

The Enumclaw School District includes an area of approximately 444 square miles. The Cities of Black Diamond and Enumclaw, and parts of unincorporated King County fall within the District's boundaries.

Lead Agency:

Enumclaw School District No. 216

The lead agency for this proposal has determined that the proposal does not have a probable significant adverse environmental impact on the environment. An environmental impact statement (EIS) is not required under RCW 43.21C.030(2)(c). This decision was made after a review of the completed environmental checklist and other information on file with the lead agency. This information is available to the public upon request.

This Determination of Nonsignificance (DNS) is issued under WAC 197-11-340(2). The lead agency will not act on this proposal for 14 days from the date of issue. Comments must be submitted by 4:00 p.m., July 11, 2011. The responsible official will reconsider the DNS based on timely comments and may retain, modify, or, if significant adverse impacts are likely, withdraw the DNS. If the DNS is retained, it will be final after the expiration of the comment deadline.

Responsible Official: Mike Nelson
Superintendent
Enumclaw School District No. 216

Telephone: (360) 802-7100

Address: Enumclaw School District
2929 McDougall Avenue
Enumclaw, WA 98022

You may provide comments regarding this determination in writing by 4:00 p.m., July 11, 2011, to Tim Madden, Director, Business & Operations, Enumclaw School District No. 216, 2929 McDougall Avenue, Enumclaw, WA 98022.

Date of Issue: June 14, 2011

Date Published: June 15, 2011

DETERMINATION OF NONSIGNIFICANCE

Description of Proposal:

This threshold determination analyzes the environmental impacts associated with the following actions, which are so closely related to each other that they are in effect a single course of action:

1. The adoption of the Fife School District's Capital Facilities Plan 2011-2017, by the Fife School District No. 417 for the purposes of planning for the facilities needs of the District;

and

2. The amendment of the Comprehensive Plans of the City of Fife, the City of Milton, the City of Edgewood, Pierce County, and King County to include the Fife School District's Capital Facilities Plan 2011-2017 as part of the Capital Facilities Element of these jurisdictions' Comprehensive Plans.

Proponent Fife School District No. 417

Location of Proposal:

Fife School District includes an area of approximately 10 square miles. The City of Fife, the City of Milton, the City of Edgewood and portions of unincorporated Pierce and King Counties fall within the District's boundaries.

Lead Agency:

Fife School District No. 417

The lead agency for this proposal has determined that the proposal does not have a probable significant adverse impact on the environment. An environmental impact statement (EIS) is not required under RCW43.21C.030(2)(c.). This decision was made after a review of the completed environmental checklist and other information on file with the lead agency. This information is available to the public on request.

This Determination of Nonsignificance (DNS) is issued under WAC 197-11-340(2). The lead agency will not act on this proposal for 14 days from the date of issue. Comments must be submitted by 4 p.m., June 20, 2011. The responsible official will reconsider the DNS based on timely comments and may retain, modify, or, if significant adverse impacts are likely, withdraw the DNS. If the DNS is retained, it will be final after the expiration of the comment deadline.

Responsible Official:
Stephen D. McCammon, Ed.D.
Superintendent
(253) 517.1000
5802 20th Street East
Tacoma, WA 98424
June 13, 2011

You may appeal this determination in writing by 4 p.m., June 27, 2011, to Kari Harris, Director of Business Services, Fife School District No. 417, 5802 20th St. E., Tacoma, WA 98424

Date of Issue: June 13, 2011
Date of Publication: June 13, 2011

DETERMINATION OF NONSIGNIFICANCE

Issued with a 14-day comment and appeals period

Description of Proposal:

This threshold determination analyzes the environmental impacts associated with the following actions, which are so closely related to each other that they are in effect a single course of action:

1. The adoption of the Auburn School District's 2011-2017 Capital Facilities Plan by the Auburn School District No. 408 for the purposes of planning for the facilities needs of the District; and

2. The amendment of the Comprehensive Plans of King County and the cities of Auburn and Kent to include the Auburn School District's 2011-2017 Capital Facilities Plan as part of the Capital Facilities Element of each jurisdiction's Comprehensive Plan. The cities of Algona, Pacific, and Black Diamond may also amend their Comprehensive Plans to include the Auburn School District's Capital Facilities Plan as part of the Capital Facilities Element of each jurisdiction's Comprehensive Plan.

Proponent: Auburn School District No. 408

Location of the Proposal:

The Auburn School District includes an area of approximately 57 square miles. The Cities of Auburn, Algona, Black Diamond, Kent, and Pacific and parts of unincorporated King and Pierce Counties fall within the District's boundaries.

Lead Agency:

Auburn School District No. 408

The lead agency for this proposal has determined that the proposal does not have a probable significant adverse environmental impact on the environment. An environmental impact statement (EIS) is not required under RCW 43.21C.030(2)(c). This decision was made after a review of the completed environmental checklist and other information on file with the lead agency. This information is available to the public upon request.

This Determination of Nonsignificance (DNS) is issued under WAC 197-11-340(2). The lead agency will not act on this proposal for 14 days from the date of issue. Comments must be submitted by 4:00 p.m., May 9, 2011. The responsible official will reconsider the DNS based on timely comments and may retain, modify, or, if significant adverse impacts are likely, withdraw the DNS. If the DNS is retained, it will be final after the expiration of the comment deadline.

Responsible Official: Mike Newman
Deputy Superintendent, Business and Operations
Auburn School District No. 408

Telephone: (253) 931-4900

Address: Auburn School District
915 4th Street N.E.
Auburn, WA 98002

You may appeal this determination in writing by 4:00 p.m., May 9, 2011, to Mike Newman, Deputy Superintendent, Auburn School District No. 408, 915 4th Street N.E., Auburn, WA 98002.

Date of Issue: April 22, 2011
Date Published: April 22, 2011