



Chapter 1 - SUMMARY

CHAPTER 1

SUMMARY

1.1 Introduction

This chapter provides a summary of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIS) for the Yesler Terrace Redevelopment Proposal. It briefly describes the Proposed Actions and alternatives and contains an overview of significant environmental impacts identified for the Proposed Actions. Please see **Chapter 2** of this Draft EIS for a more detailed description of the Proposed Actions and alternatives and **Chapter 3** for a detailed presentation of the affected environment, significant impacts of the Proposed Actions, mitigation measures, and significant unavoidable adverse impacts.

The Seattle Housing Authority (SHA) is evaluating the potential redevelopment of Yesler Terrace, a public housing community located on the southern slope of First Hill in Seattle. The 36.6-acre Yesler Terrace site (including internal rights-of-way) currently contains 561 public housing units, a community center and various other buildings. Redevelopment is proposed in order to create a mixed income, mixed use community that is intended to better serve existing and future residents. The project would include a mix of low income and market rate housing, office uses, hotels, neighborhood commercial uses (neighborhood retail and small office uses), and neighborhood services uses, as well as parks and open space, and vehicular, pedestrian and bike improvements. In all alternatives, the existing City-owned Yesler Community Center would remain. It is anticipated that redevelopment of Yesler Terrace would take approximately 15-20 years to complete.

1.2 Proposed Actions

The Proposed Actions for the Yesler Terrace Redevelopment Proposal include:

- Decision by SHA on which alternative to implement;
- Possible City of Seattle Comprehensive Plan changes;
- Zoning changes that would be necessary in order to accommodate the mixed use redevelopment, including a Land Use Code text amendment and a change to the Official Land Use Map (legislative rezone);
- Planned Action Ordinance adoption by City of Seattle;
- Possible Development Agreement between the City of Seattle and SHA;
- Preliminary and Final Plat approvals by City of Seattle;
- Street Vacation and dedication approvals by City of Seattle;
- Future local, state and federal permits that would be required for construction and development of the Yesler Terrace community;
- Release of Funds by HUD; and,
- Construction and operation of buildings and facilities within the Yesler Terrace community.

1.3 Alternatives

For purposes of environmental review, five redevelopment alternatives (Alternatives 1, 1A, 2, 3 and 4) and a No Action Alternative are analyzed in this Draft EIS. The alternatives function to provide representative levels of development that could be achieved on the site.

Assumed redevelopment of Yesler Terrace would include replacement of all existing low income housing units, as well as upgrades to some of the supporting infrastructure. The redevelopment alternatives would replace some utility systems and several streets. The redevelopment alternatives would include: parks, open space, and an improved street network and walking environment that would enhance connections to the surrounding neighborhood. Market rate housing would also be added to the site, together with office, hotel, neighborhood commercial and neighborhood services under Alternatives 1-3. Under Alternative 4, no new non-residential uses are assumed. A brief description of each of the alternatives is provided below. The site has been divided into sectors and the sector boundaries are depicted on **Figure 2-4** in **Chapter 2**.

Alternative 1 – Lower Density

Alternative 1 represents the lower range of potential mixed use redevelopment of the site, with an assumed 3.65 million square feet (SF) of housing-based/mixed use redevelopment built over the assumed 20-year horizon. Land uses under Alternative 1 would include approximately:

- 3,000 dwelling units (2,747 dwelling units West of Boren and 253 units East of Boren);
- 800,000 SF of office (portion of this could be hotel);
- 40,000 SF of neighborhood commercial (including 10,000 SF of neighborhood retail/office in the East of Boren Sector);
- 50,000 SF of neighborhood services (including the Yesler Community Center);
- 6.0 acres of public open space (including the existing Yesler Community Center parcel, and a 1.7-acre Commons Park west of the existing Yesler Community Center) and 7.3 acres of semi-private open space; and,
- 3,900 parking spaces within/under buildings.

The intensity of development under this alternative would be highest in the NW Sector and lowest in the East of Boren Sector. It is assumed that two existing on-site buildings (the approximately 8,500 SF Steam Plant and the approximately 22,000 SF City-owned Yesler Community Center) would be retained. No street vacations are proposed under this alternative. Additional right-of-way on some streets (10th Avenue/10th Avenue S. and S. Washington Street) would be dedicated per zoning requirements; additional right-of-way would also be dedicated along Yesler Way. It is assumed that limited transportation and utility infrastructure improvements would be required to support proposed uses. This alternative would require a Land Use Code text amendment and rezone to allow mixed use redevelopment. It may also require a City of Seattle Comprehensive Plan amendment.

Alternative 1A – Lower Density with Less Office

Alternative 1A represents a variation of Alternative 1 wherein most proposed land uses would be similar to Alternative 1, except for office and parking development; approximately 400,000 SF of office would be provided under this alternative, as compared to approximately 800,000 SF under Alternative 1. Also, unlike Alternative 1, hotel uses would not be included in Alternative

1A. This alternative assumes the lowest range of mixed use redevelopment with an assumed 3.25 million SF of housing-based mixed use redevelopment over the assumed 20 year horizon. Land uses under Alternative 1A would include approximately:

- 3,000 dwelling units (2,747 dwelling units West of Boren and 253 units East of Boren);
- 400,000 SF of office;
- 40,000 SF of neighborhood commercial (including 10,000 SF of neighborhood retail/office in the East of Boren Sector);
- 50,000 SF of neighborhood services (including the Yesler Community Center);
- 6.0 acres of usable public open space (including the existing Yesler Community Center parcel and a 1.7 acre Commons Park to the west of the Community Center), and 7.8 acres of semi-private open space; and,
- 3,300 parking spaces within/under buildings.

The intensity of development under this alternative would be highest in the NW Sector and lowest in the East of Boren Sector. It is assumed that two existing on-site buildings (the approximately 8,500 SF Steam Plant, and the approximately 22,000 SF City-owned Yesler Community Center) would be retained. No street vacations are proposed under this alternative. Additional right-of-way on some streets would be dedicated, similar to Alternative 1. It is assumed that limited transportation and utility infrastructure improvements would be required to support proposed uses. This alternative would require a Land Use Code text amendment and rezone to allow mixed use redevelopment. It may also require a City of Seattle Comprehensive Plan amendment.

Alternative 2 – Medium Density

Alternative 2 represents the middle range of potential mixed use redevelopment of the site, with an assumed 4.75 million SF of housing-based/mixed use redevelopment over the assumed 20-year horizon. Land uses under Alternative 2 would include approximately:

- 4,000 dwelling units (3,747 dwelling units West of Boren and 253 units East of Boren);
- 1,000,000 SF of office (portion of this could be hotel);
- 60,000 SF of neighborhood commercial (including 10,000 SF of neighborhood retail/office in the East of Boren Sector);
- 50,000 SF of neighborhood services (including the Yesler Community Center);
- 6.5 acres of public open space (including the 1.4 acre Yesler Community Center parcel and a 1.9-acre Commons Park west of the existing Yesler Community Center) and 9.4 acres of semi-private open space; and,
- 5,100 parking spaces within/under buildings.

The intensity of development would be highest in the NW Sector and lowest in the East of Boren Sector. It is assumed that the only existing building to be retained would be the City-owned Yesler Community Center. Street vacations and new street dedications are proposed under this alternative to provide: a more connected grid network internally and to/from the surrounding community, complete streets, green streets, transit (including streetcar) and green stormwater infrastructure. It is assumed that substantial transportation and utility infrastructure improvements would be required to support proposed uses. This alternative would require a Land Use Code text amendment and rezone to allow mixed use redevelopment. It may also require a City of Seattle Comprehensive Plan amendment.

Alternative 3 – Higher Density

Alternative 3 represents the higher range of potential mixed use redevelopment of the site, with an assumed 5.84 million SF of housing-based/mixed use redevelopment over the assumed 20-year planning horizon.

Land uses under Alternative 3 would include approximately:

- 5,000 dwelling units (4,697 units West of Boren and 303 units East of Boren);
- 1,200,000 SF of office (portion of which could be hotel);
- 88,000 SF of neighborhood commercial (including 18,000 SF of neighborhood retail/office in the East of Boren Sector);
- 50,000 SF of neighborhood services (including the Yesler Community Center);
- 6.9 acres of public open space, (including the 1.4 acre Yesler Community Center parcel and a 1.9-acre Commons Park west of the existing Yesler Community Center), and 9.2 acres of semi-private open space; and,
- 6,300 parking spaces within/under buildings.

The intensity of development would be highest in the NW Sector and lowest in the East of Boren Sector. It is assumed that the only existing building to be retained would be the City-owned Yesler Community Center. Street vacations and new street dedications are also proposed under this alternative to provide: a more connected grid network internally and to/from the surrounding community, complete streets, green streets, transit (including streetcar) and green stormwater infrastructure. It is assumed that substantial transportation and utility infrastructure improvements would be required to support proposed uses. This alternative would require a Land Use Code text amendment and rezone to allow mixed use redevelopment. It may also require a City of Seattle Comprehensive amendment.

Alternative 4 – Existing Zoning

Alternative 4 represents the lowest amount of residential development among the redevelopment alternatives, assuming a total of 1.5 million SF of residential development. The existing Lowrise-3 (L3) zoning designation would govern future redevelopment of West of Boren Sectors.¹ Redevelopment in the East of Boren Sector would occur under existing zoning (Midrise (MR) and Neighborhood Commercial 3 - 65 feet (NC3)), similar to Alternatives 1-3. It is assumed that three existing on-site buildings (the Jesse Epstein building, the Steam Plant, and the City-owned Yesler Community Center) would be retained. It is also assumed that all new construction would conform to the proposed new multi-family (L3) zoning code changes being considered by the City. Redevelopment under this alternative would include approximately:

- 1,523 dwelling units (1,219 units West of Boren and 304 units East of Boren);
- 20,000 SF of office uses would remain;
- 10,000 SF of neighborhood commercial in the East of Boren Sector
- 50,000 SF of neighborhood services uses would remain;

¹ Alternative 4 is referred to as Existing Zoning because development is proposed based on existing zoning designations. The West of Boren Sectors are currently zoned L3. The City of Seattle has been considering amendments to the Lowrise zone portion of the Land Use Code for over a year. However, adoption of changes to the Lowrise zones is not expected until after publication of this Draft EIS. For purposes of this Draft EIS, draft code revisions for the L3 zone dated May 18, 2009 were used to project proposed development for the West of Boren Sectors in Alternative 4.

- 5.2 acres of public open space (including the 1.4 acre Yesler Community Center parcel and a 1.7 acres Commons Park west of the existing Yesler Community Center), and 7.9 acres of semi-private open space; and,
- 1,840 parking spaces within/under buildings and surface parking stalls (approximately 50 percent of each type).

The intensity of development would be highest in the East of Boren Sector and lowest in the SW Sector. No street vacations are proposed under this alternative. Street frontage (sidewalk/landscaping) and limited utility improvements would be required to support proposed uses. Additional right-of-way on some streets (10th Avenue/10th Avenue S and S Washington Street) may be dedicated per zoning requirements.

No Action Alternative

This alternative represents a continuation of the site in its present condition, including the East of Boren Sector. As under Alternative 4, the existing City of Seattle Lowrise-3 zoning designation would govern potential replacement of existing buildings in the West of Boren Sectors and the MR and NC3 zoning designations would govern replacement of existing buildings in the East of Boren Sector. However, buildings would be replaced as necessary in the same location and configuration as the existing buildings, and therefore the site would not reach the zoning potential of those designations.

The 561 extremely low income public housing units would be repaired or replaced as necessary, or on a programmed schedule by SHA. No additional housing units would be provided for very low, or low income households, nor would market-rate housing be added. The existing on-site non-residential buildings and the neighborhood service uses within them would remain: the old community center and gym, the adjacent storage building and Head Start building, the Jesse Epstein building, the Steam Plant and the Yesler Community Center. The existing baseball field and the private and semi-private open space near the existing housing units would also remain.

Existing streets, utilities and other infrastructure would be repaired as necessary over time and would be built consistent with City of Seattle Code requirements. No stormwater improvements are assumed. Under the No Action Alternative, it is assumed that some of the water service lines onsite would be replaced and fire sprinkler services would be provided for existing buildings. Under the No Action Alternative, the private trunk sewer lines would need to be replaced at some point in the future.

1.4 Impacts

The following table highlights the impacts that would potentially result from the alternatives analyzed in this Draft EIS. This summary table is not intended to be a substitute for the complete discussion of each element that is contained in **Chapter 3**.

Table1-1
IMPACTS

		Alternative 1 - Lower Density	Alternative 1A - Lower Density with Less Office	Alternative 2 - Medium Density	Alternative 3 - Higher Density	Alternative 4 - Existing Zoning	No Action Alternative
3.1 Earth							
	<i>Construction</i>						
	Grading	Based on the preliminary grading concept, the following site grading quantities could be required for proposed redevelopment - Cut - 465,000 cubic yards - Fill - 57,000 cubic yards	Based on the preliminary grading concept, the following site grading quantities could be required for proposed redevelopment - Cut - 465,000 cubic yards - Fill - 57,000 cubic yards	Based on the preliminary grading concept, the following site grading quantities could be required for proposed redevelopment - Cut - 745,000 cubic yards - Fill - 108,000 cubic yards	Based on the preliminary grading concept, the following site grading quantities could be required for proposed redevelopment - Cut - 730,000 cubic yards - Fill - 88,000 cubic yards	Based on the preliminary grading concept, the following site grading quantities could be required for proposed redevelopment - Cut - 158,000 cubic yards - Fill - 84,000 cubic yards	Minimal site grading activities would be anticipated as part of remodeling and replacing existing buildings, utilities and roadways as necessary, or on a programmed schedule; no significant impacts would be anticipated.
	Steep Slopes/Landslide Hazards	The steep slope/slide prone area along the southern portion of the site would remain and would not be redeveloped with new uses.	Same as Alternative 1.	The steep slope/slide prone area along the southern portion of the site would be graded and redeveloped with new building construction. Substantial slope and stabilization design and other construction measures would be implemented to address potential impacts associated with grading this area.	Same as Alternative 2.	Same as Alternative 1.	Remodeling and replacing existing buildings, utilities and roadways as necessary, or on a programmed schedule would not result in impacts to the steep slope/slide prone area along the southern portion of the site.
	Temporary Excavations	Temporary excavations would be required for the installation of structures and infrastructure. Without mitigation, these excavations could have a potentially adverse effect on immediately adjacent existing and future structures, utilities and other improvements.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1, except that construction activity would occur at a lower level of intensity than Alternative 1.	Minimal temporary excavation would be anticipated as part of remodeling and replacing existing buildings, utilities and roadways as necessary, or on a programmed schedule; no significant impacts would be anticipated.
	Construction Dewatering	Dewatering may be required during construction to control groundwater flow into certain excavations, particularly during spring and winter months, which could cause some ground settlement and potentially damage nearby structures. Site-specific analyses would be required during design to determine the appropriate measures to control the potential impacts of dewatering.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1, except that construction activity would occur at a lower level of intensity than Alternative 1.	Minimal site grading and dewatering activities would be anticipated as part of remodeling and replacing existing buildings, utilities and roadways as necessary, or on a programmed schedule; no significant impacts would be anticipated.
	Foundations	Foundation support for most structures would likely be provided by conventional spread	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1, except that no high-rise buildings would be built under this alternative.	Same as Alternative 1.

		Alternative 1 - Lower Density	Alternative 1A - Lower Density with Less Office	Alternative 2 - Medium Density	Alternative 3 - Higher Density	Alternative 4 - Existing Zoning	No Action Alternative
		footings and mat foundations, although drilled shaft foundations could be used for some high-rise buildings.					
	Seismic Hazards	The entire Puget Sound region, including the Yesler Terrace site, is located within a seismically active area. With incorporation of appropriate building design and other geotechnical measures, no significant impacts to building/site stability and safety would be expected.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	As existing buildings, utilities and roadways are remodeled and replaced as necessary, or on a programmed schedule, structures would be brought into compliance with current seismic building code requirements.
	Erosion Hazards	Site grading and construction associated with redevelopment could cause erosion of exposed soils which could potentially result in on and off-site transport of sediment. Proper use of temporary erosion and sedimentation control measures and BMPs would be implemented to reduce the potential for impacts.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1, except that construction activity would occur at a lower level of intensity than Alternative 1.	Minimal erosion hazards would be anticipated as part of remodeling and replacing existing buildings, utilities and roadways as necessary, or on a programmed schedule; no significant impacts would be anticipated.
	<i>Operation</i>						
		No significant earth-related impacts (i.e. landslide and erosion impacts) would be anticipated.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
	<i>Cumulative Impacts</i>						
		No significant cumulative impacts would be anticipated.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
3.2 Air Quality							
	<i>Construction</i>						
	Dust	Site preparation and construction could generate dust from: grading; excavation; building and infrastructure demolition; and, construction of new buildings and infrastructure. Such activities would contribute to temporary localized increases in ambient concentrations of suspended particulate matter. Measures to provide reasonable controls of emissions of dust would be implemented, and construction activities would not be expected to significantly impact air quality.	Similar to Alternative 1.	Similar to Alternative 1.	Similar to Alternative 1.	Similar to Alternative 1, except that construction activity would occur at a lower level of intensity than Alternative 1.	It is assumed that remodeling and replacement of existing buildings would take place as necessary, or on a programmed schedule. Existing streets, utilities and other infrastructure would be repaired/replaced, as necessary, over time. Construction activities would be required to comply with all relevant federal, state and local air quality rules, and no significant impacts would be anticipated.

	Alternative 1 - Lower Density	Alternative 1A - Lower Density with Less Office	Alternative 2 - Medium Density	Alternative 3 - Higher Density	Alternative 4 - Existing Zoning	No Action Alternative
Hazardous Materials Disposal	Demolition of existing buildings would require the removal and disposal of building materials that could contain asbestos and lead based paint. Demolition contractors would be required to comply with EPA and PSCAA regulations related to the safe removal and disposal of such materials and no significant air quality impacts would be expected.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
Construction Equipment and Vehicle Emissions	Construction equipment and vehicles would emit air pollutants that would slightly and temporarily degrade local air quality, especially during earthwork activity. Standard construction measures would be implemented and no significant impacts would be expected.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1, except that construction activity would occur at a lower level of intensity than Alternative 1.	Minimal construction emissions would be anticipated as part of remodeling and replacing existing buildings, utilities and roadways as necessary, or on a programmed schedule; no significant impacts would be anticipated.
Construction Odors	Some construction activities would temporarily cause odors, particularly during paving operations using tar and asphalt. Measures to provide reasonable controls of emissions of construction odors would be implemented and, construction activities would not be expected to significantly impact air quality.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1, except that construction activity would occur at a lower level of intensity than Alternative 1.	Minimal construction odors would be anticipated as part of remodeling and replacing existing buildings, utilities and roadways as necessary, or on a programmed schedule; no significant impacts would be anticipated.
<i>Operation</i>						
Traffic	Similar to or less than Alternative 3.	Similar to or less than Alternative 3.	Similar to or less than Alternative 3.	The primary emissions generating activity associated with redevelopment would be increased traffic traveling to and from the site. Increased traffic would not be expected to result in any significant air quality impacts.	Similar to or less than Alternative 3.	Off-site traffic conditions would remain similar to existing conditions, and no operational-related air quality impacts would be expected.
Site Suitability	Same as Alternative 3.	Same as Alternative 3.	Same as Alternative 3.	Modeling indicates that concentrations of most selected toxic air pollutants (TAPSs) probably currently exceed the acceptable source impact level health-risk guidelines. Existing levels of most TAPS considered and especially diesel particulate matter (DPM) exceed the risk	Same as Alternative 3.	Same as Alternative 3.

		Alternative 1 - Lower Density	Alternative 1A - Lower Density with Less Office	Alternative 2 - Medium Density	Alternative 3 - Higher Density	Alternative 4 - Existing Zoning	No Action Alternative
					guideline many times over, because these guidelines are quite low. Modeling of future conditions suggests concentrations of traffic-related TAPs would be lower, but would still exceed most of the risk guideline levels considered. These findings suggest there is a potential increased health risk due to long-term exposure to TAPs from transportation sources near the project site – and on any similarly exposed areas near major roadways.		
3.3 Water Resources							
	<i>Construction</i>						
	Onsite Water Resources	Redevelopment activities would not occur in SW Sector where the seep and two potential wetlands are located; therefore, no significant impacts would be anticipated.	Same as Alternative 1	A seep and two potential wetlands are located in the southern portion of the SW Sector. If it is determined that wetlands are located onsite, the project would comply with applicable requirements (i.e. the City of Seattle critical areas ordinance) and Section 404 of the Clean Water Act if the wetlands are determined by the Corps of Engineers not to be isolated).	Same as Alternative 2	Same as Alternative 1, except that construction activity would occur at a lower level of intensity than Alternative 1.	No impacts to the seep and two potential wetlands in the SW Sector would be anticipated as part of remodeling and replacing existing buildings, utilities and roadways as necessary, or on a programmed schedule.
	Temporary Stormwater Quality and Flow Controls	During construction, potential short-term impacts to water resources could occur due to the release of sediment from grading activities and pollutants from construction equipment. With implementation of required temporary erosion, sediment control, spill prevention, flow control measures, and best management practices, no significant impacts would be anticipated.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1, except that construction activity would occur at a lower level of intensity than Alternative 1.	Minimal site grading activities and therefore temporary stormwater control measures would be anticipated as part of remodeling and replacing existing buildings, utilities and roadways as necessary. With implementation of required temporary erosion, sediment control, spill prevention, flow control measures, and best management practices, no significant impacts would be anticipated.
	<i>Operation</i>						
	Permanent Stormwater Control System	Following development, impervious surface area onsite would increase relative to existing conditions. A permanent stormwater control system would be installed per applicable	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Buildings, utilities and roadways would be repaired or replaced as necessary, or on a programmed schedule. Based on assumed levels of sidewalk replacement, most areas would trigger a

	Alternative 1 - Lower Density	Alternative 1A - Lower Density with Less Office	Alternative 2 - Medium Density	Alternative 3 - Higher Density	Alternative 4 - Existing Zoning	No Action Alternative
	regulations.					requirement for new flow control facilities. Impacts would be as described under Alternative 1 but at a lower level of intensity and over a longer period of time.
Right-of-Way Improvements	Where full street improvements occur as part of redevelopment, separate stormwater drainage and sanitary sewer conveyance systems would be provided, as required by the City of Seattle.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	No significant right-of-way improvements would be anticipated. Roadways would be repaired or replaced in-kind as necessary.
<i>Cumulative Impacts</i>						
	Increased demand on combined sewer systems from other development in the site's vicinity could require improvements, extensions or connections to the existing infrastructure (including flow control measures) to accommodate growth.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
	The proposed First Hill Streetcar alignment could affect the horizontal layout, location and connections to facilities.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Existing buildings, utilities and roadways would be replaced in-kind as necessary and would not be affected by the new First Hill Streetcar alignment.
3.4 Plants and Animals						
<i>Construction</i>						
Plants - Built and Vegetated Area	Overall, the amount of built area would increase to 73 percent (as compared to 58 percent under existing conditions and the amount of vegetated area would decrease to 27 percent (as compared to 42 percent under existing conditions.	Same as Alternative 1	Same as Alternative 1	Same as Alternative 1	Overall, the amount of built area would increase to 74 percent (as compared to 58 percent under existing conditions and the amount of vegetated area would decrease to 26 percent (as compared to 42 percent under existing conditions.	The amount of built area (58 percent) and vegetated area (42 percent) would remain as under existing conditions.
Plants - Exceptional Trees	Of the 22 existing "exceptional trees" as defined by the City, approximately 15 would be retained and 7 would be removed.	Same as Alternative 1	Of the 22 existing "exceptional trees" as defined by the City, approximately 12 would be retained and 10 would be removed.	Of the 22 existing "exceptional trees" as defined by the City, approximately 10 would be retained and 12 would be removed.	Of the 22 existing "exceptional trees" as defined by the City, approximately 12 would be retained and 10 would be removed.	As part of remodeling and replacing existing buildings, utilities and roadways as necessary; no exceptional trees would be anticipated to be removed.
Plants - Tree Canopy	The amount of tree canopy would be reduced to 5.1 percent due to tree removal to accommodate redevelopment and removal of a significant number of unhealthy or hazardous trees.	Same as Alternative 1	The amount of tree canopy would be reduced to 4.8 percent due to tree removal to accommodate redevelopment and removal of a significant number of unhealthy or hazardous trees.	The amount of tree canopy would be reduced to 4.3 percent due to tree removal to accommodate redevelopment and removal of a significant number of unhealthy or hazardous trees.	The amount of tree canopy would be reduced to 5.7 percent due to tree removal to accommodate redevelopment and removal of a significant number of unhealthy or hazardous trees.	The amount of tree canopy would remain at 22.2 percent initially, but a significant number of unhealthy or hazardous trees would likely be removed over time.

	Alternative 1 - Lower Density	Alternative 1A - Lower Density with Less Office	Alternative 2 - Medium Density	Alternative 3 - Higher Density	Alternative 4 - Existing Zoning	No Action Alternative
Wildlife	Existing wildlife species that currently use the site are adapted to urban environments, could be disturbed/displaced due to construction activities (i.e. from habitat removal and noise). Impacts would not be anticipated to be significant.	Same as Alternative 1	Same as Alternative 1	Same as Alternative 1	Same as Alternative 1	Buildings, utilities and roadways would be repaired or replaced as necessary, or on a programmed schedule displacing the existing urban wildlife. Impacts would be as described under Alternative 1 but at a lower level of intensity and over a longer period of time.
Wildlife- Migratory Birds	Potential nesting sites in existing buildings would be removed to accommodate redevelopment. Nests would be removed after birds have fledged; therefore, no significant impacts would be anticipated.	Same as Alternative 1	Same as Alternative 1	Same as Alternative 1	Same as Alternative 1	As buildings are remodeled or replaced necessary, or on a programmed schedule, existing nesting sites in buildings would be removed. Nests would be removed after birds have fledged; therefore, no significant impacts would be anticipated.
<i>Operation</i>						
Wildlife	The reduction in vegetated area would result in a small reduction in habitat and fewer animals at the site; however, due to the small reduction and the adaptive ability of the onsite urban wildlife; impacts would not be considered significant.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	As buildings, utilities and roadways are repaired or replaced as necessary, or on a programmed schedule, these structures would be replaced in kind; therefore, no change in the amount of existing habitat area would be anticipated.
<i>Cumulative Impacts</i>						
	Impacts to plants and animals associated with proposed offsite development in the site vicinity would result in the removal of trees, wildlife and habitat, but due to the highly urbanized nature of these sites, no significant impacts would be anticipated.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
	The First Hill Streetcar right-of-way would run through the Yesler Terrace site and could require the removal of 2 onsite exceptional trees. Removal of these trees would be a cumulative impact with the Yesler Terrace Redevelopment. These potential impacts would not be significant, because the site is already highly urbanized and animals in the site vicinity are adapted to the urban environment.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.

	Alternative 1 - Lower Density	Alternative 1A - Lower Density with Less Office	Alternative 2 - Medium Density	Alternative 3 - Higher Density	Alternative 4 - Existing Zoning	No Action Alternative
3.5 Energy - Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Emissions						
<i>Construction, Operation and Cumulative Impacts</i>						
Climate Change	No disproportionate impacts from global climate change to the Yesler Terrace Redevelopment would be anticipated.	Same as Alternative 1	Same as Alternative 1	Same as Alternative 1	Same as Alternative 1	Same as Alternative 1
Greenhouse Gas Emissions (construction-related, transportation and operations emissions)	New greenhouse gas emissions would be generated under Alternative 1 but levels would not be considered to be significant.	Same as Alternative 1	Greenhouse gas emissions would be greater than under Alternative 1 but increases would not be considered to be significant.	Greenhouse gas emissions would be highest under Alternative 3, but increases would not be considered to be significant.	Same as Alternative 1	As existing facilities are remodeled or replaced as necessary or on a programmed schedule, new facilities would be designed and constructed to be more energy efficient; therefore, greenhouse gas emissions could be less than under existing conditions.
Energy	Energy use would increase from existing conditions but increases would not be considered to be significant.	Same as Alternative 1	Energy use would be greater than under Alternative 1 but increases would not be considered to be significant.	Energy use would be highest under Alternative 3, but increases would not be considered to be significant.	Same as Alternative 1	As existing facilities are remodeled or replaced as necessary, or on a programmed schedule, new facilities would be designed and constructed to be more energy efficient; therefore, energy use could be less than under existing conditions.
3.6 Environmental Health						
<i>Construction</i>						
Disturbance/Release of Pollutants and Hazardous Materials	The potential exists for certain environmental health-related impacts to occur during construction including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Generating air pollutants as a result of dust from demolition, earthwork and/or emissions from construction vehicles; - Accidental spills of construction-related chemicals; and/or, - Exposure of asbestos-containing materials or lead-based paints. <p>With implementation of required health and safety measures, no significant impacts would be expected.</p>	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Buildings, utilities and roadways would be repaired or replaced as as necessary, or on a programmed schedule and would entail construction activities similar to Redevelopment Alternatives 1-4. Impacts would be as described under Alternative 1 but at a lower level of intensity and over a longer period of time.

	Alternative 1 - Lower Density	Alternative 1A - Lower Density with Less Office	Alternative 2 - Medium Density	Alternative 3 - Higher Density	Alternative 4 - Existing Zoning	No Action Alternative
Lead Concentrations in Soils	Redevelopment activities would occur in areas where lead concentrations in the soil may be above the MTCA Method A soil cleanup levels for unrestricted land uses. Development and compliance with a site-specific health and safety procedures (in compliance with federal, state and local regulations) would minimize the potential health risks for residents and workers on the site.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Buildings, utilities and roadways would be repaired or replaced as necessary, or on a programmed schedule and would entail construction activities similar to Redevelopment Alternatives 1-4. Impacts would be as described under Alternative 1 but at a lower level of intensity and over a longer period of time.
Dewatering	Dewatering may be needed for construction of underground structures and utilities, depending on the depth of excavation. Monitoring and treatment of the dewatering discharges would be conducted, as necessary, to limit impacts to receiving waters.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Buildings, utilities and roadways would be repaired or replaced as necessary, or on a programmed schedule and would entail construction activities similar to Redevelopment Alternatives 1-4. Impacts would be as described under Alternative 1 but at a lower level of intensity and over a longer period of time.
Steam Plant Demolition	The Steam Plant facility would not be demolished under this Alternative.	Same as Alternative 1.	Under this Alternative, the Steam Plant would be demolished. Residual material within the smokestack would need to be tested and characterized before demolition activities occur in order to select the appropriate offsite disposal. With implementation of required health and safety measures, no significant impacts would be expected.	Same as Alternative 2.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
<i>Operation</i>						
	No significant impacts would be anticipated.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
<i>Cumulative Impacts</i>						
	No significant cumulative impacts would be anticipated.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
3.7 Noise						
<i>Construction</i>	Noise from demolition and construction activities has the potential to impact nearby onsite and offsite receivers, particularly sensitive uses such as residences and the Harborview Medical Center. The temporary	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1, except that construction activity would occur at a lower level of intensity than Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.

		Alternative 1 - Lower Density	Alternative 1A - Lower Density with Less Office	Alternative 2 - Medium Density	Alternative 3 - Higher Density	Alternative 4 - Existing Zoning	No Action Alternative
		nature of construction coupled with restriction to daytime hours minimizes the potential for significant impacts from construction activities and equipment.					
	<i>Operation</i>						
	Traffic & Road Alternations	Outside of the immediate project area, traffic volumes on area roadways are not projected to increase significantly (i.e., more than double). In addition, no substantial road alterations are expected to be required. Overall, neither project-related traffic nor project-required road alterations would be expected to result in any significant noise impacts.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Little or no changes in off-site noise levels would be expected.
	HVAC & Mechanical Equipment	HVAC and mechanical equipment associated with new buildings on the project site could emit noise audible at off-site locations. However, noise from all such equipment would be required to comply with the applicable Seattle noise limits and would have minimal noise impacts on surrounding uses.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Noise from existing building equipment would be similar to existing conditions, and no significant impacts would be expected.
	Site Suitability	Portions of the site would be deemed unacceptable for residential uses under HUD noise criteria without implementation of noise mitigation (including extraordinary noise attenuation measures in an area within the SW Sector), due to the presence of I-5 and other major roadways.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
3.8 Land Use							
	<i>Construction</i>						
		Site preparation and building/infrastructure development over the buildout period could result in temporary impacts to onsite and offsite adjacent existing land uses including: dust from clearing, grading and demolition; emissions from construction	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Buildings, utilities and roadways would be repaired or replaced as necessary, or on a programmed schedule and would entail construction activities similar to Redevelopment Alternatives 1-4. Impacts would be as described under Alternative 1 but at a lower level of intensity and over a

	Alternative 1 - Lower Density	Alternative 1A - Lower Density with Less Office	Alternative 2 - Medium Density	Alternative 3 - Higher Density	Alternative 4 - Existing Zoning	No Action Alternative
	vehicles and equipment; soil erosion from removal of vegetation; increased noise levels; light and glare; and increased construction-related traffic. Overall, due to the temporary and periodic nature of construction, no significant impacts would be anticipated.					longer period of time.
<i>Operation</i>						
Displacement of Existing Uses - Residential	All existing residential structures would be demolished over time and the residents would be temporarily or permanently displaced and offered relocation assistance. Residents in good standing with SHA would be offered the opportunity to return to the redeveloped community.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	As buildings are remodeled or replaced as necessary, or on a programmed schedule, residents could be temporarily or permanently relocated and offered relocation assistance. Impacts would be as described under Alternative 1 but would be less intense and occur over a longer period of time.
Displacement of Existing Uses - Non-Residential	<p>The Seattle Parks Department Yesler Community Center and playground use would remain.</p> <p>The existing Steam Plant building and its associated storage and maintenance facilities uses would remain.</p> <p>All other existing non-residential tenants leasing space on the Yesler Terrace site would be temporarily or permanently displaced. Permanent displacement could occur due to potential changes in SHA's rental policies/rate or other economic factors. Some tenants could move directly into redevelopment neighborhood services/commercial or office space without being temporarily displaced.</p>	Same as Alternative 1.	<p>The Seattle Parks Department Yesler Community Center and playground use would remain.</p> <p>All other existing non-residential tenants leasing space on the Yesler Terrace site would be temporarily or permanently displaced. Permanent displacement could occur due to potential changes in SHA's rental policies/rate or other economic factors. Some tenants could move directly into redevelopment neighborhood services/commercial or office space without being temporarily displaced.</p>	Same as Alternative 2.	<p>The Seattle Parks Department Yesler Community Center and playground use would remain.</p> <p>The existing Steam Plant building and its associated storage and maintenance facilities uses would remain.</p> <p>The existing Jesse Epstein building and its associated office uses would remain.</p> <p>All other existing non-residential tenants leasing space on the Yesler Terrace site would be temporarily or permanently displaced. Permanent displacement could occur due to potential changes in SHA's rental policies/rate or other economic factors. Some tenants could move directly into redevelopment neighborhood services/commercial or office space without being temporarily displaced.</p>	As buildings are remodeled or replaced as necessary, or on a programmed schedule, non-residential tenants could be temporarily or permanently relocated. Impacts would be as described under Alternative 1 but would be less intense and occur over a longer period of time.
Conversion of Land Uses	Redevelopment of the site would result in the conversion of the site from a low-rise, multi-family residential complex into a dense	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Redevelopment of the site would result in the conversion of the site from a low-rise, multi-family residential complex into a dense	As buildings, roadways and utilities are replaced or repaired as necessary, or on a programmed schedule, they

	Alternative 1 - Lower Density	Alternative 1A - Lower Density with Less Office	Alternative 2 - Medium Density	Alternative 3 - Higher Density	Alternative 4 - Existing Zoning	No Action Alternative
	urban mixed use neighborhood with mid and high rise buildings.				urban mixed use neighborhood with low, mid and high rise buildings.	would be replaced in-kind in the same location; therefore, no conversion of land uses would be anticipated.
Changes in Density	The average residential density across the site would be 180 dwelling units per acre. The average office/hotel floor-area ratio (FAR) would be 7.5 on individual parcels.	The average residential density across the site would be 180 dwelling units per acre. The average office/hotel FAR would be 4.3 on individual parcels.	The average residential density across the site would be 227 dwelling units per acre. The average office/hotel FAR would be 7.6 on individual parcels.	The average residential density across the site would be 292 dwelling units per acre. The average office/hotel FAR would be 6.7 on individual parcels.	The average residential density across the site would be 74 dwelling units per acre. The average office/hotel FAR would be 2.0 on individual parcels.	The average residential density across the site would remain at 24 dwelling units per acre. The average FAR would remain at 2.0 on individual parcels.
Changes in Activity Levels	Activity levels on the site would substantially increase as a result of the 5,228 residents and 2,837 employees as well as the dense nature of the redevelopment. The general nature of the new site activity would be consistent with an urban mixed-use neighborhood.	Activity levels on the site would substantially increase as a result of the 5,228 residents and 1,507 employees as well as the dense nature of the redevelopment. The general nature of the new site activity would be consistent with an urban mixed-use neighborhood.	Activity levels on the site would substantially increase as a result of the 6,815 residents and 3,540 employees as well as the dense nature of the redevelopment. The general nature of the new site activity would be consistent with an urban mixed-use neighborhood.	Activity levels on the site would substantially increase as a result of the 8,315 residents and 4,256 employees as well as the dense nature of the redevelopment. The general nature of the new site activity would be consistent with an urban mixed-use neighborhood.	Activity levels on the site would substantially increase as a result of the 2,795 residents and 160 employees as well as the dense nature of the redevelopment but would be less than assumed under Alternatives 1-3. The general nature of the new site activity would be consistent with an urban mixed-use neighborhood.	Activity levels on the site would remain as under existing conditions with 1,231 residents and 142 employees as well as the less dense nature of the redevelopment.
Relationship to Onsite Uses	Proposed residential, office/hotel, neighborhood commercial and neighborhood services uses would be compatible with the existing Yesler Community Center and Steam Plant uses assumed to remain.	Same as Alternative 1.	Proposed residential, office/hotel, neighborhood commercial and neighborhood services uses would be compatible with the existing Yesler Community use assumed to remain.	Same as Alternative 2.	Proposed residential, office/hotel, neighborhood commercial and neighborhood services uses would be compatible with the existing Yesler Community Center, Steam Plant and Jesse Epstein building uses assumed to remain.	Existing onsite uses would remain as under existing conditions.
Relationship to Surrounding Uses - Land Use	Proposed residential, office/hotel, neighborhood commercial and neighborhood services uses would be compatible with the existing offsite uses.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	The relationship of existing onsite and adjacent offsite uses would remain as under existing conditions.
Relationship to Surrounding Uses - Height, Bulk and Scale	Considerable height differences in proposed onsite and adjacent offsite uses in some locations could be perceived as a significant impact without implementation of appropriate mitigation measures.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	The relationship of the height, bulk and scale of existing onsite and adjacent offsite building would remain as under existing conditions.
<i>Cumulative Impacts</i>						
	The mix of uses assumed for the Yesler Terrace site under Alternatives 1- 4 would be	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	If the site is not redeveloped, over time the level of development on the site could be

		Alternative 1 - Lower Density	Alternative 1A - Lower Density with Less Office	Alternative 2 - Medium Density	Alternative 3 - Higher Density	Alternative 4 - Existing Zoning	No Action Alternative
		<p>intended to provide a wide range of uses to support site residents and employees; this could lessen the pressure for new offsite development. Some new commercial development in the area could be indirectly generated, including in areas such as Little Saigon. The increase in intensity of development on the site under Alternatives 1-3 could result in requested zoning changes in the areas adjacent to the site.</p> <p>Redevelopment of Yesler Terrace could potentially result in changes to adjacent and nearby areas in the form of displacement of businesses, low income individuals, and/or the services that support them due to increased property values and/or rents.</p> <p>Little Saigon would experience incremental growth and development over time. This growth would occur with or without redevelopment of Yesler Terrace.</p> <p>Future development in the area would contribute to cumulative employment/population growth and intensification of land uses in this portion of the City.</p>					<p>out of scale with development in the surrounding area and the site would remain an underutilized area in close proximity to the urban core.</p> <p>Little Saigon would experience incremental growth and development over time. This growth would occur with or without redevelopment of Yesler Terrace.</p> <p>Other development in the area would contribute to cumulative employment/population growth and intensification of land uses in this portion of the City.</p>
3.10 Aesthetics/Light and Glare/Shadows							
	<i>Construction</i>						
	Aesthetic Character	Construction activities would be ongoing on portions of the site for extended periods of time and could temporarily affect the aesthetic character of the site and surrounding area. Measures to control air, noise, light intrusion and other construction related disturbances could lessen aesthetic impacts.	Similar to Alternative 1.	Similar to Alternative 1.	Similar to Alternative 1.	Similar to Alternative 1, except that construction activity would occur at a lower level of intensity than Alternative 1.	Minimal impacts to visual character would be anticipated as part of remodeling and replacing existing buildings, utilities and roadways as necessary, or on a programmed schedule; no significant impacts would be anticipated.

	Alternative 1 - Lower Density	Alternative 1A - Lower Density with Less Office	Alternative 2 - Medium Density	Alternative 3 - Higher Density	Alternative 4 - Existing Zoning	No Action Alternative
Light and Glare	New temporary sources of light and glare associated with infrastructure and building construction, construction equipment and lighting of the job site, would be introduced to the site during construction activities over the long-term buildout of the site. Construction lighting and glare could potentially be noticeable in certain areas proximate to the site. While noticeable, such lighting is not expected to cause significant impacts.	Similar to Alternative 1.	Similar to Alternative 1.	Similar to Alternative 1.	Similar to Alternative 1, except that construction activity would occur at a lower level of intensity than Alternative 1.	Minimal temporary sources of light and glare would be anticipated as part of remodeling and replacing existing building, utilities and roadways as necessary, or on a programmed schedule; no significant impacts would be anticipated.
<i>Operation</i>						
Visual Character	The visual character of the site would change to a higher density, mixed use development with high-rise and mid-rise buildings. The overall quality of building design would likely be higher compared to existing site conditions. It is assumed that building design, construction and materials would be coordinated through adoption and implementation of consistent design standards over the long-term buildout period. This would result in positive impacts relative to the visual character of the site.	Similar to Alternative 1.	Similar to Alternative 1, except that density and some building heights would be greater.	Similar to Alternative 1, except that density and some building heights would be greater than Alternatives 1 and 2.	The visual character of the site would change to a development with increased residential density in slightly taller 4-story buildings. The visual character of the site would primarily reflect denser residential uses, with similar levels of neighborhood services and office development as occur under existing conditions.	The visual character of the site would generally remain as under existing conditions.
City Protected Public Viewpoints	No significant impacts to City protected views would be anticipated.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Existing views to and from the site would remain.
Height Bulk & Scale	See Land Use above under Relationship to Surrounding Uses - Height, Bulk and Scale.	See Land Use above under Relationship to Surrounding Uses - Height, Bulk and Scale.	See Land Use above under Relationship to Surrounding Uses - Height, Bulk and Scale.	See Land Use above under Relationship to Surrounding Uses - Height, Bulk and Scale.	See Land Use above under Relationship to Surrounding Uses - Height, Bulk and Scale.	See Land Use above under Relationship to Surrounding Uses - Height, Bulk and Scale.
Light and Glare	New stationary and mobile sources of light and glare would be added to the site from increased residential density and new land uses including neighborhood commercial and office/hotel development. Relative to existing conditions, overall light and glare levels on the site would be greater, but would be typical of urban	Similar to Alternative 1, except that no hotel uses and less office development would be added to the site.	Similar to Alternative 1.	Similar to Alternative 1.	Additional residential uses would be added to the site, but no new office, neighborhood commercial or neighborhood services space would be added. The new residential uses would result in new light sources on the site and additional vehicles accessing onsite parking areas. Overall, due to the similarity of uses which would occur onsite under	Light and glare levels similar to those occurring under existing conditions are expected to continue on the site; no significant impacts would be anticipated.

	Alternative 1 - Lower Density	Alternative 1A - Lower Density with Less Office	Alternative 2 - Medium Density	Alternative 3 - Higher Density	Alternative 4 - Existing Zoning	No Action Alternative
	development and no significant impacts would be anticipated.				Alternative 4, the character of light and glare would be slightly greater than but generally similar to existing conditions.	
Reflected Solar Glare Impacts to I-5 and Boren Avenue	Glare impacts to I-5 and Boren Avenue would be similar to or less than Alternative 3.	Glare impacts to I-5 and Boren Avenue would be similar to or less than Alternative 3.	Glare impacts to I-5 and Boren Avenue would be similar to or less than Alternative 3.	No glare impacts would occur on I-5 or Boren Avenue within motorists' cone-of-vision (i.e. impacts that could impair a driver's vision) under the capacity model building orientations. Glare could be within the cone-of-influence at 4:00 PM on December 21 st under the worst case building orientations. With appropriate mitigation measures, no significant impacts would be anticipated.	Glare impacts to I-5 and Boren Avenue would not be anticipated because only low-rise buildings would be constructed on the site.	No glare impacts to I-5 or Boren Avenue would be expected.
3.11 Historic Resources						
<i>Construction</i>						
	During construction, the potential exists for structural instability/undermining and temporary dirt and unintended damage to the nearby historic properties within the APE. With implementation of construction monitoring and dust control measures, significant impacts would not be anticipated.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	As buildings are remodeled or replaced as necessary, or on a programmed schedule, non-residential tenants could be temporarily or permanently relocated. Impacts would be as described under Alternative 1 but would be less intense and occur over a longer period of time.
	Redevelopment would require demolition of the remaining residential buildings of the original (1941-1942) Yesler Terrace, the Jesse Epstein Building as well as its former Community Building. Yesler Terrace was listed in the Washington Heritage Register (WHR) in 1981 and is under review for eligibility for listing in the NRHP.	Same as Alternative 1.	Redevelopment would require demolition of the remaining residential buildings of the original (1941-1942) Yesler Terrace, the Jesse Epstein Building, the Steam Plant as well as its former community center and auditorium/gym. Yesler Terrace was listed in the WHR in 1981. The Steam Plant building was designated as a City Landmark in October 2010. The Controls and Incentives Agreement for the recently designated Steam Plant landmark may require retention of the Steam Plant building and stack. If not retained, demolition of the Steam Plant would be a	Same as Alternative 2.	Redevelopment would require demolition of the remaining residential buildings of the original (1941-1942) Yesler Terrace, as well as its former Community Building. Yesler Terrace was listed in the Washington Heritage Register (WHR) in 1981 and is under review for eligibility for listing in the NRHP.	Replacement of existing buildings as necessary, or on a programmed schedule, would require the demolition of certain units of the remaining residential buildings of the original (1941-1942) Yesler Terrace. Yesler Terrace was listed in the WHR in 1981.

	Alternative 1 - Lower Density	Alternative 1A - Lower Density with Less Office	Alternative 2 - Medium Density	Alternative 3 - Higher Density	Alternative 4 - Existing Zoning	No Action Alternative
				significant adverse impact.		
<i>Operation</i>						
	No operational impacts to historic resources from redevelopment of the Yesler Terrace site under would be anticipated.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	No operational impacts to historic resources from the Yesler Terrace site remaining under existing uses would be anticipated.
<i>Cumulative Impacts</i>						
	<p>Redevelopment could have an unintended impact on small-scale offsite historic buildings as a result of increases in property values in the area that could create pressure for redevelopment. Vulnerable historic resources include those that are not already recognized by listing in a historic register, but may be eligible for local designation and the protection that it affords. Smaller-scale, one- and two-story buildings in would be particularly vulnerable to demolition for redevelopment.</p> <p>The First Hill Streetcar Project could result in potential impacts to on-site historic resources (the Yesler Terrace Steam Plant) or to off-site listed or potentially eligible resource could occur including structural instability, undermining or temporary dirt/unintended damage.</p>	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	<p>The No Action alternative would not be anticipated to result in pressure on small-scale offsite historic buildings to be redeveloped.</p> <p>The First Hill Streetcar Project could result in potential impacts to on-site historic resources (the Yesler Terrace Steam Plant) or to off-site listed or potentially eligible resource could occur including structural instability, undermining or temporary dirt/unintended damage.</p>
3.12 Cultural Resources						
<i>Construction, Operation and Cumulative Impacts</i>						
	Impacts to Archaeological Resources	No impacts would be anticipated. The site has a low probability for containing archaeological resources.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
3.13 Transportation						
<i>Construction</i>						
		Construction-related traffic would occur in stages until redevelopment at the site is complete, and would likely be most noticeable during demolition and major earthwork stages. Construction employees would also generate traffic and parking demand. A Construction Management Plan would be	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Minimal construction-related traffic would be expected as part of remodeling and replacing existing buildings, utilities and roadways as necessary, or on a programmed schedule; no significant impacts would be anticipated.

	Alternative 1 - Lower Density	Alternative 1A - Lower Density with Less Office	Alternative 2 - Medium Density	Alternative 3 - Higher Density	Alternative 4 - Existing Zoning	No Action Alternative
	prepared, and no significant impacts would be anticipated.					
<i>Operation</i>						
Trip Generation Impacts	Alternative 1 would generate a net increase of 8,890 total daily trips for the site: – AM Peak Hr. Trips: 720 – PM Peak Hr. Trips: 750	Alternative 1A would generate a net increase of 7,470 total daily trips for the site: – AM Peak Hr. Trips: 590 – PM Peak Hr. Trips: 610	Alternative 2 would generate a net increase of 12,150 total daily trips for the site: – AM Peak Hr. Trips: 960 – PM Peak Hr. Trips: 1,020	Alternative 3 would generate a net increase of 15,390 total daily trips for the site: – AM Peak Hr. Trips: 1,200 – PM Peak Hr. Trips: 1,280	Alternative 4 would generate a net increase of 2,420 total daily trips for the site: – AM Peak Hr. Trips: 170 – PM Peak Hr. Trips: 190	Under the No Action Alternative a total of 1,600 daily trips are generated: – AM Peak Hr. Trips: 130 – PM Peak Hr. Trips: 150
Transit Trips (including trips on bus routes, Sound Transit's Link light rail system, and the future First Hill Street car line)	An estimated 8,490 total daily transit trips would occur for the site: – AM Peak Hr. Trips: 100 – PM Peak Hr. Trips: 130	An estimated 5,910 total daily transit trips would occur for the site: – AM Peak Hr. Trips: 570 – PM Peak Hr. Trips: 560	An estimated 10,750 total daily transit trips would occur for the site: – AM Peak Hr. Trips: 1,000 – PM Peak Hr. Trips: 1,025	An estimated 13,000 total daily transit trips would occur for the site: – AM Peak Hr. Trips: 1,175 – PM Peak Hr. Trips: 1,230 Additional ridership on bus Route 27 would increase the ridership load to a level that may be unacceptable (i.e. drivers may bypass stops when there is no more room on the bus).	An estimated 2,050 total daily transit trips would occur for the site: – AM Peak Hr. Trips: 165 – PM Peak Hr. Trips: 200	Under the No Action Alternative a total of 1,100 daily transit trips are estimated to occur onsite – AM Peak Hr. Trips: 100 – PM Peak Hr. Trips: 130
Intersection Levels of Service (LOS) Impacts	The additional project traffic would increase vehicle delay at 6 intersections that would operate at LOS F without the site redevelopment and would degrade the following intersections to LOS F: – 9 th Avenue/Alder Street – 8 th Avenue/Yesler Way With implementation of appropriate mitigation measures, no significant adverse impacts are anticipated.	The additional project traffic would increase vehicle delay at 6 intersections that would operate at LOS F without the site redevelopment and would degrade the following intersection to LOS F: – 9 th Avenue/Alder Street With implementation of appropriate mitigation measures, no significant adverse impacts are anticipated.	The additional project traffic would increase vehicle delay at 6 intersections that would operate at LOS F without the site redevelopment and would degrade the following intersections to LOS F: – 9 th Avenue/Alder Street – 8 th Avenue/Yesler Way – Broadway/E James Street With implementation of appropriate mitigation measures, no significant adverse impacts would be anticipated, except for at the intersection of Broadway/E James Street. The project's impact to this intersection would result in a significant, unavoidable adverse impact.	The additional project traffic would increase vehicle delay at 6 intersections that would operate at LOS F without the site redevelopment and would degrade the following intersections to LOS F: – 9 th Avenue/Alder Street – 8 th Avenue/Yesler Way – Broadway/E James Street – 9 th Avenue/Jefferson Street Significant impacts would be as described for Alternative 2.	The additional project traffic would increase vehicle delay at 6 intersections that would operate at LOS F without the site redevelopment. With implementation of appropriate mitigation measures, no significant adverse impacts are anticipated.	Many of the study area intersections would operate at LOS F in the future due to growth in traffic volumes. However, no significant impacts to LOS operations would be anticipated as a result of site generated traffic, which would remain similar to existing conditions.
Site Access and Internal Circulation	The street network and circulation concept would rely on using the existing roadway network in its existing location; no street vacations would occur. Additional street dedications	Same as Alternative 1.	The circulation infrastructure across the site would be comprehensively reconfigured to provide a more connected street grid network internally and to/from the surrounding	Same as Alternative 2.	Same as Alternative 1.	The existing street network and site access would remain in place.

		Alternative 1 - Lower Density	Alternative 1A - Lower Density with Less Office	Alternative 2 - Medium Density	Alternative 3 - Higher Density	Alternative 4 - Existing Zoning	No Action Alternative
		would occur to increase the width of 10 th Avenue/10 th Avenue S, S Washington Street and E Yesler Way to accommodate complete streets, low-impact development and green street improvements. Private access roads and drives would augment right-of-ways.		community. In order to achieve the reconfiguration, certain street vacations and new street dedications would be necessary.			
	Non-Motorized Facilities	Pedestrian facilities and connections would be improved throughout the site. The existing street system would be retained, some streets would be widened, and most sidewalks would be rebuilt as part of frontage improvements. New internal pedestrian connections would be created to link development to key community nodes. A new pedestrian connection south to S Main Street would be created to accommodate a future hillclimb from Jackson Street and would improve pedestrian access to the International District/Little Saigon.	Same as Alternative 1.	Pedestrian facilities and connections would be improved throughout the site, and the circulation infrastructure across the site would be comprehensively reconfigured to provide a more connected street grid network internally and to/from the surrounding community. As with Alternative 1, a new pedestrian connection south to S Main Street would be created to accommodate a future hillclimb from Jackson Street and would improve pedestrian access to the International District/Little Saigon.	Same as Alternative 2.	Similar to Alternative 1, except that no new pedestrian connection to S Main Street would be created to improve pedestrian access to the International District/Little Saigon.	The site's existing pedestrian facilities and connections would remain and would not be improved. No new pedestrian connection to S Main Street would be created to improve pedestrian access to the International District/Little Saigon.
	Traffic Safety	The project would increase traffic volumes through the 6 th Avenue/James Street intersection, which exceeds City of Seattle criteria for a high-collision location (with an average of 15 collisions per year). However, Yesler Terrace project traffic entering this intersection is not expected to result in a significant impact to safety conditions.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Traffic volumes similar to existing conditions would be anticipated to occur, and would not be expected to result in traffic safety problems.
3.14 Public Utilities							
	<i>Construction</i>						
		During construction, existing water mains and services would continue to service the site, or temporary bypass service would be implemented until the new water distribution system was complete and operational.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Some water service pipes from meters to buildings would be replaced.

	Alternative 1 - Lower Density	Alternative 1A - Lower Density with Less Office	Alternative 2 - Medium Density	Alternative 3 - Higher Density	Alternative 4 - Existing Zoning	No Action Alternative
<i>Operation</i>						
Water Demand	Water demand would increase to an estimated: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 1,216,000 gallons per day (gpd) under average daily demand (ADD); – 2,433,000 gpd under maximum daily demand (MDD); and, – 4195 gallons per minute (gmp) under peak hourly demand (PHD). 	Water demand would increase to an estimated: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 1,081,000 gpd ADD; – 2,175,000 gpd MDD; and, – 3,600 gpm PHD. 	Water demand would increase to an estimated: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 1,362,000 gpd ADD; – 2,725,000 gpd MDD; and, – 4,208 gpm PHD. 	Water demand would increase to an estimated: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 1,642,000 gpd ADD; – 3,283,000 gpd MDD; and, – 4,877 gpm PHD. 	Water demand would increase to an estimated: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 327,000 gpd ADD; – 653,000 gpd MDD; and, – 1,325 gpm PHD. 	Water demand is assumed to be the same as under existing conditions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 83,000 gpd ADD; – 221,000 gpd MDD; and, – 709 gmp PHD.
Water System Improvements	All existing water mains on and in the vicinity of the site would be adequate to meet the estimated peak hourly demand and fire hydrant flow.	Same as Alternative 1.	It is assumed that street improvement would include water main improvements in the NW and NE Sectors for 9 th Avenue, Fir Street, and 10 th Avenue. The existing water main bisecting the East of Boren Sector is assumed to be removed and a new water main installed on E Fir Street. In the SW and SE Sectors, a new 8-inch water main would be installed.	Same as Alternative 2.	All existing water mains on and in the vicinity of the site would be adequate to meet the estimated peak hourly demand and fire hydrant flow.	It is assumed that some water service pipes from meters to buildings would be replaced and fire sprinkler service would be provided for existing buildings.
Sanitary Sewer Flows	Sewer flows would increase to an estimated: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 1,310,000 gallons per day (gpd) under average daily flow (ADF) – 6.09 cubic feet per (cfs) second under peak hourly flow (PHF). 	Sewer flows would increase to an estimated: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 1,020,000 gpd ADF – 4.75 cfs PHF 	Sewer flows would increase to an estimated: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 1,700,000 gpd ADF – 7.88 cfs PHF 	Sewer flows would increase to an estimated: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 2,040,000 gpd ADF – 9.45 cfs PHF 	Sewer flows would increase to an estimated: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 490,000 gpd ADF – 2.26 cfs PHF 	Sanitary flows are assumed to be the same as under existing conditions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 250,000 gpd ADF – 1.15 cfs PHF
Sewer System Improvements	Existing combined sewer mains would be reused where existing mains have sufficient capacity. A new combined sewer main would be located in 8 th Avenue that connects to the existing combined sewer main at Yesler Way, and a new combined sewer main would be located in S Main Street to provide sewer service to the SW and SE Sectors.	Same as Alternative 1.	Sewer mains would be replaced or new lines installed for new roadways that would be constructed. Stormwater would be separated from sewer flows onsite and then connected at the downstream end of the site to the existing combined sewer mains. Additional sewer flow would be conveyed to the West Conveyance Basin. Sewer flows from the NE Sector would be conveyed south across Yesler Way to a new sewer main located in 10 th Avenue S to S Main Street.	Same as Alternative 2.	Combined sewer mains would be reused or replaced as described for Alternative 1.	It is assumed that the majority of the existing side sewers and private trunk lines would require extensive repairs or replacement to remain functional.

	Alternative 1 - Lower Density	Alternative 1A - Lower Density with Less Office	Alternative 2 - Medium Density	Alternative 3 - Higher Density	Alternative 4 - Existing Zoning	No Action Alternative
Electrical	The baseline peak electric load would increase relative to existing conditions and would be less than estimated for Alternative 2. All overhead electrical lines would be replaced with new overhead lines.	Similar to Alternative 1, except that the baseline peak electric load would be less than Alternative 1.	It is estimated that a baseline peak electric load of 5.1 megawatts (MW) with annual electricity consumption of 38,000 MWh would be generated. The on-site electrical distribution system would likely be replaced with an underground system.	Similar to Alternative 2, except that the baseline peak electric load would be greater.	The baseline peak electric load would increase relative to existing conditions and would be less than estimated for Alternative 2. Approximately 30 percent of the overhead electrical lines would be replaced.	Electric loads similar to existing conditions would be expected to continue.
<i>Cumulative Impacts</i>	It is assumed that any necessary improvements, extensions or connections to existing utilities associated with other redevelopment in the site vicinity would be made in compliance with applicable City of Seattle regulations, and no significant cumulative impacts would be anticipated.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
3.15.1 Public Services - Parks and Recreation						
<i>Construction</i>	Construction activity could result in temporary and periodic increases in dust and noise levels which could affect the use of onsite and adjacent offsite SHA and City-owned parks and open space facilities. These impacts would be periodic and temporary in nature and would not be anticipated to be significant.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	No new parks, open space or recreational facilities would be assumed to be provided under the No Action Alternative; therefore, no impacts would be anticipated.
<i>Operation</i>	The existing onsite Yesler Playfield would be displaced to accommodate redevelopment. Existing playfield users would need to relocate to other offsite City-owned facilities.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	The existing onsite Yesler Playfield would remain.
	The four existing onsite P-Patches would be displaced to accommodate redevelopment. Existing P-Patch users would need to apply for space in new onsite or existing offsite P-Patches.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	The existing onsite P-Patches would remain.
	The seven existing onsite small play areas would be displaced as development occurs. New play areas would be developed as existing facilities are displaced.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	The existing onsite small play areas and aging play equipment would remain.

	Alternative 1 - Lower Density	Alternative 1A - Lower Density with Less Office	Alternative 2 - Medium Density	Alternative 3 - Higher Density	Alternative 4 - Existing Zoning	No Action Alternative
	<p>Approximately 14.7 acres of parks and open space would be provided onsite including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 11.9 acres of SHA parks, open space and recreational facilities: 4.6 acres of public open space, 7.3 acres of semi-private open space, and private open space in the form of balconies and courtyards. - The existing 1.4-acre Yesler Community Center and play area - The existing 1.4-acre steep slope and inaccessible area in the SW Sector that would remain. 	<p>Approximately 15.2 acres of parks and open space would be provided onsite including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 12.4 acres of SHA parks, open space and recreational facilities: 4.6 acres of public open space, 7.8 acres of semi-private open space, and private open space in the form of balconies and courtyards. - The existing 1.4-acre Yesler Community Center and play area - The existing 1.4-acre steep slope and inaccessible area in the SW Sector that would remain. 	<p>Approximately 15.9 acres of parks and open space would be provided onsite including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 14.5 acres of SHA parks, open space and recreational facilities: 5.1 acres of public open space, 9.4 acres of semi-private open space, and private open space in the form of balconies and courtyards. - The existing 1.4-acre Yesler Community Center and play area 	<p>Approximately 16.1 acres of parks and open space would be provided onsite including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 14.7 acres of SHA parks, open space and recreational facilities: 5.5 acres of public open space, 9.2 acres of semi-private open space, and private open space in the form of balconies and courtyards. - The existing 1.4-acre Yesler Community Center and play area 	<p>Approximately 14.5 acres of parks and open space would be provided onsite including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 11.7 acres of SHA parks, open space and recreational facilities: 3.8 acres of public open space, 7.9 acres of semi-private open space, and private open space in the form of balconies and courtyards. - The existing 1.4-acre Yesler Community Center and play area - The existing 1.4-acre steep slope and inaccessible area in the SW Sector that would remain. 	<p>The amount of parks and open space area would remain as under existing conditions.</p>
<i>Cumulative Impacts</i>						
	<p>Development of the First Hill Streetcar would be adjacent to onsite uses and could cause air quality and noise impacts to adjacent onsite parks and open space resources; these impacts would be temporary and periodic in nature and would not be anticipated to be significant.</p> <p>Once the First Hill Streetcar project is operational in 2012, the alignment would run through the Yesler Terrace Redevelopment site bringing new visitors to the area from other parts of the City. An increase in the use of onsite and nearby offsite parks and open space areas could be experienced.</p> <p>The displacement of the existing Yesler Playfield would also reduce the number of sports fields in the area available for league rental and informal use contributing to the City-wide existing high demand for field time during evening and weekend hours. As only one league is currently renting the field for use, the impact of the displacement of the field to the existing sportsfield shortage</p>	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	No cumulative impacts would be anticipated.

	Alternative 1 - Lower Density	Alternative 1A - Lower Density with Less Office	Alternative 2 - Medium Density	Alternative 3 - Higher Density	Alternative 4 - Existing Zoning	No Action Alternative
	would not be significant.					
3.15.2 Public Services – Schools						
<i>Construction</i>						
	No new schools are anticipated to be constructed to accommodate new student enrollment; therefore, no construction impacts would be anticipated.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
<i>Operation</i>						
	Approximately 599 new students (300 elementary, 125 middle school and 174 high school students) would be generated under this alternative. The number of new students generated from the Yesler Terrace Redevelopment would likely exceed the forecast available capacity at the three attendance area schools assigned to the site.	Same as Alternative 1	Impacts would be similar to Alternative 1 except approximately 830 new students (415 elementary, 174 middle school and 241 high school students) would be generated under this alternative.	Impacts would be similar to Alternative 1 except approximately 1014 new students (507 elementary, 213 middle school and 294 high school students) would be generated under this alternative.	Impacts would be similar to Alternative 1 except approximately 210 new students (105 elementary, 44 middle school and 61 high school students) would be generated under this alternative.	Enrollment would remain as under Existing Conditions and would continue to be accommodated at the three attendance area schools assigned to the site.
<i>Cumulative Impacts</i>						
	No cumulative impacts would be anticipated.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
3.15.3 Public Services - Fire and Emergency Medical Services						
<i>Construction</i>						
	Calls for Fire/EMS Services could increase due to incidents related to on-site construction activities (i.e., construction-related accidents or injuries) and for inspection of specific construction projects onsite. Existing Fire Department staffing and equipment are expected to be sufficient to handle any increased service needs during site construction, and no significant impacts are anticipated.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1, except that construction activity would occur at a lower level of intensity than Alternative 1.	Minimal calls for Fire/EMS services would be anticipated as part of remodeling and replacing existing buildings, utilities and roadways as necessary, or on a programmed schedule; no significant impacts would be anticipated.

	Alternative 1 - Lower Density	Alternative 1A - Lower Density with Less Office	Alternative 2 - Medium Density	Alternative 3 - Higher Density	Alternative 4 - Existing Zoning	No Action Alternative
<i>Operation</i>						
	Increases in the on-site population and employment with the Yesler Terrace redevelopment would be incremental and would be accompanied by increases in demands for all types of services provided by the Fire Department, including fire protection, BLS and EMS. The Fire Department indicates that they have sufficient capacity and resources to absorb potential increased calls related to fire suppression, rescue and salvage services and EMS.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Existing rates of calls for fire/EMS services would be expected to continue. The current site layout, which contributes to policing difficulties due to dead-end streets and sidewalks and steep slopes, would not be improved.
<i>Cumulative Impacts</i>						
	No cumulative impacts from nearby offsite projects would be anticipated.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
3.15.4 Public Services – Police						
<i>Construction</i>						
	During construction, there could be an increase in demand for police services due to construction site theft and vandalism. Existing Police Department staffing and equipment are expected to be sufficient to handle increased service needed for onsite construction activities.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1, except that construction activity would occur at a lower level of intensity than Alternative 1.	Minimal increased need for police services would be anticipated as part of remodeling and replacing existing buildings, utilities and roadways as necessary, or on a programmed schedule; no significant impacts would be anticipated.
<i>Operation</i>						
	Increases in the on-site population and employment would be incremental and would be accompanied by increases in demand for police service; however, the exact number of incremental new calls cannot be quantified. Additional safety problems and need for police services are not anticipated due to SHA's continued funding for dedicated police staff, and SPD's implementation of the Neighborhood Policing Plan, which has and will add additional officers to the force. As well, the design and layout of the site, increased residential density,	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	The continuation of existing rates of calls for police services would be expected. The current site layout, which contributes to policing difficulties due to dead-end streets and sidewalks and steep slopes, would not be improved.

	Alternative 1 - Lower Density	Alternative 1A - Lower Density with Less Office	Alternative 2 - Medium Density	Alternative 3 - Higher Density	Alternative 4 - Existing Zoning	No Action Alternative
	increased activity levels, and improved site lighting would be anticipated to contribute to safety improvements. No significant impacts are anticipated.					
<i>Cumulative Impacts</i>						
	No cumulative impacts would be anticipated.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
3.15.5 Public Services - Solid Waste						
<i>Construction</i>						
	Solid waste would be generated by both demolition and construction activities. To the extent feasible, construction-generated solid-waste would be recycled or composted.	Same As Alternative 1.	Same As Alternative 1.	Same As Alternative 1.	Same As Alternative 1, except that construction activity would occur at a lower level of intensity than Alternative 1.	As existing facilities are remodeled or replaced, construction-related solid waste would be generated but in lower amounts and over a longer period of time than the redevelopment alternatives. To the extent feasible, construction-generated solid-waste would be recycled or composted.
<i>Operation</i>						
	Solid waste generated under Alternative 1 would be greater than under existing conditions and is estimated to be approximately 2,519 tons per year. Solid waste management services may be provided by SHA Solid Waste Division or other providers depending upon logistical and economic conditions	Similar to Alternative 1 except up to 2,213 tons of solid waste could be generated.	Similar to Alternative 1 except up to 3,256 tons of solid waste could be generated.	Similar to Alternative 1 except up to 3,976 tons of solid waste could be generated.	Similar to Alternative 1 except up to 1,022 tons of solid waste could be generated.	The amount of solid waste generated under the No Action Alternative would be assumed to be the same as is produced under existing conditions. Solid waste management services would be assumed to continue to be provided by SHA's Solid Waste Division.
<i>Cumulative Impacts</i>						
	No cumulative impacts from nearby offsite projects would be anticipated.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
3.15.6 Public Services – Community Services						
<i>Construction</i>						
Community Service Providers	During construction, it is possible that some community service organizations and programs located on the site could move directly into redeveloped space without having to move offsite, it is also possible that some organizations and programs would need to relocate offsite during construction. Some organizations could choose to	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1, except that construction activity would occur at a lower level of intensity than Alternative 1.	It is assumed that the existing community service providers which lease space from SHA would remain onsite, provided that SHA and service providers who are currently contracted for services enter into a new contract after current agreements expire. Existing SHA programs/services which serve Yesler Terrace residents could

	Alternative 1 - Lower Density	Alternative 1A - Lower Density with Less Office	Alternative 2 - Medium Density	Alternative 3 - Higher Density	Alternative 4 - Existing Zoning	No Action Alternative
	permanently relocate offsite due to the inconveniences associated with a temporary move. It is assumed that other similar rental properties are available in Seattle which could accommodate the onsite community service providers.					be expected to continue.
Residents' Access to Services	Redevelopment could temporarily disrupt residents' access to community services which are based on the site, due to the need for some residents to temporarily relocate offsite during construction. SHA relocation staff would identify the service needs of each household and link residents with comparable services in areas to which they relocate, or transportation fare vouchers would be provided for travelling to appointments. No significant impacts would be anticipated.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1, except that construction activity would occur at a lower level of intensity than Alternative 1.	Minimal disruption to residents' access to community services would be anticipated as part of remodeling and replacing existing buildings, utilities and roadways as necessary, or on a programmed schedule; no significant impacts would be anticipated.
Community Access to Services	Some community service programs/organizations, such as the Yesler Community Center, based onsite that are available to the wider community (i.e. beyond Yesler Terrace residents) would continue to be available and accessible throughout the redevelopment construction process. Other programs/ services could be either temporarily or permanently relocated from the site. Depending on where in the community these programs relocated, they could be more or less accessible to the community.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1, except that construction activity would occur at a lower level of intensity than Alternative 1.	Minimal disruption to community access to community service programs/organizations based onsite would be anticipated as part of remodeling and replacing existing buildings, utilities and roadways as necessary, or on a programmed schedule. It is assumed that the existing community service providers which lease space from SHA would remain onsite, provided that SHA and service providers who are currently contracted for services enter into a new contract after current agreements expire. No significant impacts would be anticipated.
<i>Operation</i>						
	Approximately 28,000 SF of neighborhood services space would be provided onsite and the Yesler Community Center would be retained. Neighborhood services uses could include (but are not limited to) police, education, library, social	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	The existing onsite neighborhood services space would remain.

	Alternative 1 - Lower Density	Alternative 1A - Lower Density with Less Office	Alternative 2 - Medium Density	Alternative 3 - Higher Density	Alternative 4 - Existing Zoning	No Action Alternative	
	services, non-profits, government funded health agencies, and SHA offices open to the public. It is possible that additional and/or different social service providers or organizations to those based onsite currently, would locate on the site. All current SHA programs which are provided at Yesler Terrace would likely be continued within the redeveloped site.						
3.16 Socioeconomics							
	<i>Construction</i>						
	Construction activities would result in new temporary, periodic construction employment opportunities during the approx. 20-year site buildout.	Similar to Alternative 1.	Similar to Alternative 1.	Similar to Alternative 1.	Similar to Alternative 1, except that construction activity would occur at a lower level of intensity than Alternative 1.	The existing housing units onsite would be renovated or replaced as necessary, or on a programmed schedule and minimal construction impacts would be expected.	
	Residents would be required to temporarily relocate to accommodate demolition and construction activities. All residents would be offered relocation assistance in compliance with the federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisitions Policies Act of 1970. All existing low-income housing would be replaced onsite, and all residents who maintain eligibility for low income housing would have the opportunity to return to the redeveloped site.	Similar to Alternative 1.	Similar to Alternative 1.	Similar to Alternative 1.	Similar to Alternative 1.	Repair and replacement of existing residential buildings would take less time than the redevelopment alternatives, and would likely result in a shorter duration of residential displacements, if any. No significant impacts would be anticipated.	
	The relocation of residents during construction could temporarily impact community cohesion; however, a phased construction process could help to minimize these impacts. Permanent impacts could result because some residents could choose to permanently leave the site.	Similar to Alternative 1.	Similar to Alternative 1.	Similar to Alternative 1.	Similar to Alternative 1.	Less of an impact to community cohesion would likely result because residential displacement would occur for a shorter duration, if at all. No significant impacts would be anticipated.	
	Indirect Impacts	During periods of high construction activity, surrounding businesses could temporarily	Similar to Alternative 1.	Similar to Alternative 1.	Similar to Alternative 1.	Similar to Alternative 1.	Minimal indirect impacts would be anticipated as a result of remodeling and replacing

	Alternative 1 - Lower Density	Alternative 1A - Lower Density with Less Office	Alternative 2 - Medium Density	Alternative 3 - Higher Density	Alternative 4 - Existing Zoning	No Action Alternative
	experience indirect impacts to revenues from construction traffic, rerouting of traffic, utilities service disruptions, and limited access. These impacts would be regulated by City code. Some business could also experience an increase in business due to increased numbers of construction workers in the area.					existing buildings, utilities and roadways as necessary, or on a programmed schedule; no significant impacts would be anticipated.
<i>Operation</i>						
Community Cohesion and Public Well Being	Changes to the existing site demographics and economic diversification of the onsite community would occur. Public well being would be enhanced via improved building design, pedestrian access, vehicular access and aesthetic character. Redevelopment would provide updated neighborhood services space and neighborhood commercial uses could provide residents with amenities within walking distance of their homes, as well as with space for social networking opportunities. Office/hotel and neighborhood commercial uses could also provide residents with access to employment opportunities.	Similar to Alternative 1.	Similar to Alternative 1.	Similar to Alternative 1.	Changes to the existing site demographics and economic diversification would occur from the addition of market rate housing to the site (no additional types of low income housing would be developed). Public well being would be enhanced similarly to Alternative 1 except that no neighborhood commercial or office/hotel space would be developed. No employment opportunities would be provided, and less space would be available for social networking.	Repair or replacement of existing buildings would take less time than the redevelopment alternatives, and shorter, if any, residential displacements would occur, resulting in less of an impact on community cohesion. Public well being would not be enhanced by reconfiguring the site design, or adding mixed use development to the site.
Housing	Total residential units onsite would increase from 561 to 3,000 units, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 561 extremely low income units - 239 very low income units - 660 low income units - 1,540 market rate units 	Same as Alternative 1.	Total residential units onsite would increase from 561 to 4,000 units, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 561 extremely low income units - 335 very low income units - 950 low income units - 2,154 market rate units 	Total residential units onsite would increase from 561 to 5,000 units, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 561 extremely low income units - 335 very low income units - 1,231 low income units - 2,873 market rate units 	Total residential units onsite would increase from 561 to 1,523 units, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 561 extremely low income units - 962 market rate units 	No additional residential units would be added to the site.
Population	The permanent, on-site residential population could increase to approximately 5,228 residents. Population characteristics (age, gender, ethnicity and income) would likely shift to be more reflective of the site vicinity and the City, due to the diversity of the housing stock which would be developed.	Same as Alternative 1.	The permanent, on-site residential population could increase to approximately 6,815 residents. Population characteristics would shift generally as described for Alternative 1.	The permanent on-site residential population could increase to approximately 8,315 residents. Population characteristics would shift generally as described for Alternative 1.	The permanent on-site residential population could increase to approximately 2,795. Population characteristics would shift generally as described for Alternative 1.	There would be a continuation of existing population levels, together with a continuation of the site's existing demographic characteristics.

	Alternative 1 - Lower Density	Alternative 1A - Lower Density with Less Office	Alternative 2 - Medium Density	Alternative 3 - Higher Density	Alternative 4 - Existing Zoning	No Action Alternative
Employment	Redevelopment would increase employment on the site by providing space for up to 2,837 jobs related to office, hotel, neighborhood commercial and neighborhood services uses. Most existing jobs based onsite could be temporarily or permanently displaced, except for the Yesler Community Center, which would be retained. Also, 20 ground level extremely low income housing units would be configured to meet the requirements for in-home daycare businesses, allowing this existing business use to continue on the redeveloped site.	Redevelopment would increase employment on the site by providing space for up to 1,507 jobs related to office, neighborhood commercial and neighborhood services uses. The continuation of existing employment opportunities would be as described for Alternative 1.	Redevelopment would increase employment opportunities on the site by providing space for up to 3,540 jobs related to office, hotel, neighborhood commercial and neighborhood services uses. The continuation of existing employment opportunities would be as described for Alternative 1.	Redevelopment would increase employment opportunities on the site by providing space for up to 4,256 jobs related to office, hotel, neighborhood commercial and neighborhood services space. The continuation of existing employment opportunities would be as described for Alternative 1.	Minimal additional employment opportunities would be created on the site, because the L3 zoning would not permit new commercial or office development. Space for approximately 160 jobs would be provided. The Jesse Epstein building, the Steam Plant and the Yesler Community Center would be retained, and existing jobs based in these buildings would be assumed to be maintained to the same or similar capacity as currently exist onsite. Also, 20 of the extremely low income housing units would be configured to meet the requirements for in-home daycare businesses, allowing this existing business use to continue on the redeveloped site.	The existing minimal employment based on the site could be expected to continue (i.e. approximately 142 jobs, including 10 in the Yesler Community Center).
Indirect Impacts	Redevelopment would result in increased density and an economically diversified population. This could result in increased spending for goods and services in nearby areas.	Similar to Alternative 1.	Similar to Alternative 1.	Similar to Alternative 1.	Similar to Alternative 1.	Minimal indirect impacts would be expected as a result of remodeling and replacing existing buildings, utilities and roadways as necessary, or on a programmed schedule; no significant impacts would be anticipated.
<i>Cumulative Impacts</i>	Redevelopment of the site along with planned and potential development in the site area would add to the cumulative population, employment and housing growth in the City of Seattle and the First Hill neighborhood in particular. Increased spending for goods and services could occur in nearby neighborhoods. Redevelopment of the site could contribute to broad changes in adjacent and nearby areas in the form of the displacement of businesses and/or low income individuals. While possible, such impacts would also be dependent on other conditions, such as favorable market/	Same as Alternative 1	Same as Alternative 1	Same as Alternative 1	Same as Alternative 1	Minimal cumulative impacts would be anticipated as a result of remodeling and replacing existing buildings, utilities and roadways as necessary, or on a programmed schedule; no significant impacts would be anticipated.

		Alternative 1 - Lower Density	Alternative 1A - Lower Density with Less Office	Alternative 2 - Medium Density	Alternative 3 - Higher Density	Alternative 4 - Existing Zoning	No Action Alternative
		economic conditions, local plans and zoning, political support and other broad development trends that are already in progress.					
3.17 Environmental Justice							
	<i>Construction</i>						
		Construction noise would be subject to applicable City of Seattle noise limits, and noise mitigation measures could be implemented to reduce the extent to which on and offsite receivers are affected by construction noise. No disproportionate adverse impacts would be anticipated.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1, except that construction activity would occur at a lower level of intensity than Alternative 1.	Minimal construction noise would be expected as part of remodeling and replacing existing buildings, utilities and roadways as necessary, or on a programmed schedule; no significant impacts would be anticipated.
		Construction activities could affect air quality due to emissions from construction-related sources and equipment and dust from construction activities including grading, sloping and filling. Some construction phases would also cause odors, particularly during paving operations using tar and asphalt. Overall, with implementation of the controls required for the various aspects of construction activities and consistent use of best management practices, construction would not be expected to significantly affect air quality. No disproportionate adverse impacts would be anticipated.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1, except that construction activity would occur at a lower level of intensity than Alternative 1.	Minimal air quality impacts would be expected as part of remodeling and replacing existing buildings, utilities and roadways as necessary, or on a programmed schedule; no significant impacts would be anticipated.
	Hazardous Materials Abatement	Residents would be relocated from buildings prior to any hazardous materials abatement and would not be exposed to contaminants during remediation activities. No disproportionate adverse impacts would be anticipated.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
	<i>Operation</i>						
	Site-Related Health Hazards	Redevelopment of the site would eliminate site-related health hazards which are associated with Yesler Terrace's aging buildings and infrastructure.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Repair and replacement of individual buildings could eliminate some site-related health hazards associated with aging buildings and

		Alternative 1 - Lower Density	Alternative 1A - Lower Density with Less Office	Alternative 2 - Medium Density	Alternative 3 - Higher Density	Alternative 4 - Existing Zoning	No Action Alternative
		Specifically, demolition and redevelopment would eliminate mold problems caused by water intrusion through building foundations and poor ventilation. Also, a major rodent infestation associated with old steam pipes would be corrected by removal of this infrastructure which is no longer in use. Sewer and water infrastructure problems would be improved and sidewalks and planters would be improved to meet or exceed current City of Seattle standards. Existing site-related health hazards related to lead-based paint, asbestos and lead contaminated soils would be eliminated.					infrastructure. Existing elevated existing lead concentrations in shallow soils around the site would remain, unless entire buildings were replaced. In such cases it is assumed that additional characterization, removal and proper disposal of soil with lead concentrations exceeding regulatory cleanup levels would occur.
	Air	No significant air impacts are expected as a result of redevelopment due to increased traffic on area roadways. However, certain toxic air pollutants associated with roadways in the vicinity of the Yesler Terrace site would exceed health-based standards to the degree that there is a potentially elevated health risk in long-term residency near busy roads. These conditions would not be expected to result in a disproportionately high and adverse impact to low income or minority populations, due to the anticipated equitable distribution throughout the site of low income and market rate housing.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Existing adverse air quality conditions could be considered to disproportionately affect the site's low income population due to the fact that no market rate housing would be added to the site.
	Noise	No significant noise impacts are expected as a result of redevelopment. However, portions of the site would be deemed unacceptable for residential uses under HUD noise criteria, without implementation of noise mitigation (including extraordinary noise attenuation measures in an area within the SW Sector) due to the site's	Same as Alternative 1	Same as Alternative 1	Same as Alternative 1	Same as Alternative 1	Existing adverse noise conditions could be considered to disproportionately affect the site's low income population due to the fact that no market rate housing would be added to the site.

		Alternative 1 - Lower Density	Alternative 1A - Lower Density with Less Office	Alternative 2 - Medium Density	Alternative 3 - Higher Density	Alternative 4 - Existing Zoning	No Action Alternative
		proximity to I-5 and other major roadways. No disproportionate or adverse impacts would be anticipated unless a larger portion of low-income units were placed in those areas of the site with worse noise conditions.					
3.18 Wind Analysis							
	Impacts to Harborview Medical Center Heliport Operations	Impacts would be similar to or less than Alternative 3.	Impacts would be similar to or less than Alternative 3.	Impacts would be similar to or less than Alternative 3.	Under Alternative 3, a minimal change in winds would occur in the vicinity of the helipad. No significant impacts to heliport operations are anticipated with implementation of appropriate mitigation measures.	Under Alternative 4, no high-rise buildings would be developed, and no impacts to helicopter performance would be expected.	Wind patterns under the No Action Alternative are assumed to be the same as under existing conditions, and no impacts to helicopter performance would be expected.

1.5 Mitigation Measures and Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

The following list highlights the mitigation measures and significant unavoidable adverse impacts that would potentially result from the alternatives analyzed in this Draft EIS. This list is not intended to be a substitute for the complete discussion of mitigation measures within each element that is contained in Chapter 3.

Proposed mitigation measures are those actions to which the Seattle Housing Authority has committed and/or those actions that are required by code, laws, or local, state and federal regulations.

Possible mitigation measures are additional actions that could be undertaken to mitigate environmental impacts.

Earth

The following required/proposed and other possible mitigation measures would address potential earth related impacts resulting from construction activities associated with the Yesler Terrace Redevelopment.

Required/Proposed Mitigation Measures

- Appropriate foundation support systems would be determined during the design and permitting of specific infrastructure and building projects.
- Site-specific seismic analyses would be conducted during design and permitting, in accordance with City of Seattle Municipal Code requirements.
- The design of infrastructure and buildings would incorporate seismic provisions of the current version of the International Building Code.
- Site-specific analyses of development planned adjacent to or within the steep slope/slide-prone areas in the southern portion of the site would be conducted during the design and permitting. These analyses would identify appropriate methods of slope stabilization and other measures to prevent potential landslide impacts (see **Appendix D** for details).
- The existing drainage tunnels below the slide area in the southern portion of the site would be protected during construction or improved with appropriately designed new infrastructure. Drainage provisions would include measures to collect and route both groundwater and surface water runoff away from slide-prone areas for discharge to appropriate downslope locations.
- During construction, a temporary erosion and sedimentation control plan (TESCP) and Best Management Practices would be implemented to control erosion. These measures would be consistent with City of Seattle regulations, and could include the following:

- Limit areas of exposure;
 - Schedule earthwork during drier times of the year;
 - Retain existing vegetation where possible;
 - Seed or plant appropriate vegetation on exposed areas as soon as earthwork is completed;
 - Route surface water through temporary drainage channels around and away from disturbed soils or exposed slopes;
 - Intercept and drain water from any surface seeps, if encountered;
 - Use silt fences, temporary sedimentation ponds, or other suitable sedimentation control devices to collect and retain possible eroded material;
 - Cover exposed soil stockpiles and exposed slopes with plastic sheeting, as appropriate;
 - Use straw mulch and erosion control matting to stabilize graded areas and reduce erosion and runoff impacts to slopes, where appropriate; and,
 - Temporarily cease work under certain, limited circumstances, if weather conditions warrant.
 - Rock pads or truck washing stations to limit excess soil materials from entering the right-of-way.
- Temporary shoring systems would be installed to address the potential for impacts associated with construction excavations. The design and construction of excavation shoring systems would include an evaluation of nearby adjacent structures and utilities (e.g., the I-5 retaining wall located along the west side of the site, adjacent building foundations, existing drainage tunnels, etc.), and incorporate measures to limit impacts to these structures/utilities.
 - Site-specific investigations and analyses would be conducted during the design and permitting process in order to identify appropriate measures to address the potential need for and impacts of excavation dewatering. These measures could include site-specific design and control of dewatering systems, minimizing the extent and duration of dewatering, and monitoring for settlement.
 - As necessary, groundwater discharged during construction could be monitored to assess the water quality and need for treatment, to comply with applicable state and local requirements (see Section 3.6, **Environmental Health**, for details).
 - Fill from grading activities would be designed to prevent settlement impacts to adjacent structures. As appropriate, monitoring could be conducted during construction to verify that no significant settlement occurs.
 - Excavated soil not reused onsite as structural fill (if determined to be suitable for that purpose), would be transported offsite and disposed of at an appropriate disposal location in accordance with all applicable local, state and federal regulations.
 - Foundation construction impacts could be mitigated by proper design and construction of temporary excavation shoring and dewatering systems. Ground elevation surveys could be conducted in conjunction with pre- and post-construction inspections and photographic surveys of structures or facilities located near foundation construction activities.

- A permanent stormwater control system would be installed and maintained, in accordance with City of Seattle regulations (see Section 3.3, **Water Resources**, and **Appendix F** for further information).

Other Possible Mitigation Measures

- The following measures could be employed to address potential impacts during drilled shaft installation of deep foundation support of structures:
 - Casings could be installed to control caving of soils during drilled shaft installation for deep foundation support of structures
 - Vibration monitoring and ground elevation surveys could be conducted near construction activities;
 - Spoils generated during drilled shaft installation could be disposed of in accordance with applicable local, state, and federal requirements.

Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

No significant unavoidable adverse impacts would be anticipated.

Air Quality

The following required/proposed and other possible mitigation measures would address potential air quality impacts resulting from construction activities associated with the Yesler Terrace Redevelopment. No significant operational air quality impacts were identified and therefore, no operational mitigation measures are proposed.

Required/Proposed Mitigation Measures

- Construction contractors would be required to comply with all relevant federal, state and local air quality rules.

Other Possible Mitigation Measures

In addition, implementation of best management practices would reduce emissions related to the construction phase of the project. Possible management practices for reducing the potential for air quality impacts during construction include measures for reducing both exhaust emissions and fugitive dust. The Washington Associated General Contractors brochure *Guide to Handling Fugitive Dust from Construction Projects* and the PSCAA suggest a number of methods for controlling dust and reducing the potential exposure of people to emissions from diesel equipment. A list of some of the possible control measures that could be implemented to reduce potential air quality impacts from construction activities follows:

- Use only equipment and trucks that are maintained in optimal operational condition.
- Require all off-road equipment to have emission reduction equipment (e.g., require participation in Puget Sound Region Diesel Solutions, a program designed to reduce air pollution from diesel, by project sponsors and contractors).
- Use car-pooling or other trip-reduction strategies for construction workers.

- Implement restrictions on construction truck and other vehicle idling (e.g., limit idling to a maximum of 5 minutes).
- Spray exposed soil with water or other suppressant to reduce emissions of PM and deposition of particulate matter.
- Pave or use gravel on staging areas and roads that would be exposed for long periods.
- Cover all trucks transporting materials, wetting materials in trucks, or providing adequate freeboard (space from the top of the material to the top of the truck bed), to reduce PM emissions and deposition during transport.
- Provide wheel washers to remove particulate matter that would otherwise be carried off site by vehicles to decrease deposition of particulate matter on area roadways.
- Cover dirt, gravel, and debris piles as needed to reduce dust and wind blown debris.
- Stage construction to minimize overall transportation system congestion and delays to reduce regional emissions of pollutants during construction.

Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

No significant unavoidable adverse impacts would be anticipated.

Water Resources

The following required/proposed and other possible mitigation measures would address potential impacts to water resources associated with the Yesler Terrace Redevelopment.

Required/Proposed Mitigation Measures

Construction

- Temporary erosion and sedimentation control measures and BMPs would be utilized during construction in accordance with the City of Seattle Drainage Code (see **Appendix F** for a list of specific BMPs that could be used).
- A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) would be prepared and implemented as required by the City's Drainage Code.
- Construction entrances, wheel washes, street cleaning, and other BMPs would be used to prevent tracking of soils beyond the project limits.
- BMPs for concrete work would include the following:
 - Cement trucks wash water would not be disposed of onsite, but would be returned to the off-site batch plant for recycling as process water; and,
 - New concrete work would be covered and protected from rainfall until cured.

- The generation of dissolved zinc and copper would be minimized through prohibitions on the use of unsealed external copper and galvanized metal, except where required by Code and/or necessary for public safety and/or where no feasible alternative exists. Zinc and copper source controls would extend to rooftops, which would be constructed of inert materials so that roof runoff would bypass water quality treatment facilities.
- Measures to control any impacts of excavation dewatering on groundwater could include: site-specific design and careful control of dewatering systems, minimizing the extent and duration of dewatering, and reinfiltration of extracted groundwater (see **Appendix D** for details).
- If it is determined that wetlands are located onsite and impacts to these wetlands is necessary for redevelopment, the project would comply with applicable requirements (i.e. in the City of Seattle critical areas ordinance; see Section 3.4, **Plants and Animals**, for details).

Operation

- A hydraulic analysis of the stormwater drainage and wastewater systems would be completed during the design phase of the Yesler Terrace Redevelopment to determine necessary improvements to the City's and site's drainage and wastewater infrastructure. Improvements could include: additional GSI and stormwater flow control facilities onsite, and/or upsizing of downstream combined sewer pipes.
- The design and construction of the permanent stormwater control system, including conveyance and GSI flow control facilities, would be in accordance with the City's Drainage Code.
- The Yesler Terrace Redevelopment would mitigate for the increases in impervious surface area and at the minimum provide flow control for stormwater runoff. The flow control facilities would reduce the peak stormwater discharge from the site relative to existing conditions and could help reduce CSOs, which can occur during heavy rainfall events.
- A Stormwater Operation and Maintenance Plan would be prepared for both public and private stormwater systems.

Other Possible Mitigation Measures

- Specialized products, such as Chitosan or Electrocoagulation (sediment coagulation agents), and other water quality treatment systems could be used during construction if warranted and approved by the City.

Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

No significant unavoidable impacts would be expected.

Plants and Animals

The following required/proposed and other possible mitigation measures would address potential impacts to plants and animals associated with the Yesler Terrace Redevelopment.

Required/Proposed Mitigation Measures

- If it is determined that wetlands are located onsite, and fill of these wetlands is required, the project would comply with applicable wetland, buffer and other requirements in the City of Seattle critical areas ordinance. Mitigation for habitat loss for Category IV wetlands could include:
 - Constructing a wetland of equal function to the lost wetland function;
 - Planting an area of native vegetation equal to or greater in size than the area of the developed wetland, and removal of invasive species in the area to be planted;
 - Constructing a bioengineered/infiltration facility, such as a bioretention cell or bioretention plant, that replicates the hydrologic and/or water quality benefit of the developed wetland; or,
 - Constructing a green roof or roof garden that replicates the hydrologic and/or water quality benefit of the developed wetland
- If the potential wetlands onsite are determined to be “waters of the U.S.,” pursuant to the CWA, the project would comply with the Army Corps of Engineers’ regulations for any impacts to these wetlands.
- Construction methods and sequencing would be implemented to preserve exceptional trees proposed to be retained onsite, including:
 - Install chain-link fencing around exceptional trees before mobilization to prevent damage from construction activities;
 - Locate root systems visually or by other means (such as using underground radar equipment) to determine where construction activities should not occur;
 - Remove or replace impervious areas near exceptional trees with permeable surfaces to provide more water to root systems; and,
 - Preserve trees that have a preservation value lower than moderate and are adjacent to an exceptional tree because removing the tree would harm the trees intended for preservation during construction activities.
- For exceptional trees that cannot be preserved or transplanted within the site, mitigation would be provided by installing one or more new trees for every exceptional tree removed, as approved by the City.
- Nest removal for any migratory bird species protected under MBTA would occur outside of nesting season after birds have fledged.
- As possible, native plants would be installed and invasive plants removed in accordance with Executive Order 13112. Native plants would be included in the landscape plan, as possible, to provide habitat for native animals.

Other Possible Mitigation Measures

- To the extent feasible, construction methods and sequencing could be implemented to preserve valuable trees proposed to be retained onsite.
- A thorough landscape maintenance program could be established during and after construction to ensure that the proposed vegetation remains healthy and free of invasive/undesirable plants.
- Additional trees could be installed to support the City's 30-year goal of 20 percent canopy coverage for all sites zoned multi-family or 15 percent canopy coverage for all sites zoned commercial/mixed use.
- Arboriculture practices could be implemented for the remaining trees to ensure a long and healthy tree life.

Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

No significant unavoidable adverse impacts would be anticipated.

Climate Change, Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Energy

The following possible mitigation measures would address potential impacts to climate change, energy use and greenhouse gas emissions from the Yesler Terrace Redevelopment:

Possible Mitigation Measures

- **Natural Drainage and Green Roofs** – Green roofs can provide additional open space, opportunities for urban agriculture and decreased energy demands by reducing the cooling load for the building. Green Stormwater Infrastructure (GSI) would be developed for flow control and water quality treatment to the maximum extent feasible.
- **Tree Protection** – The City of Seattle has aggressive urban forest goals in order to help restore tree cover which has been lost due to development. Trees can provide stormwater management, habitat value, noise buffering, air purification, carbon sequestration, and mitigation of the urban heat island effect. Trees also have a positive effect on property values and neighborhood quality. Protection of existing trees, as feasible, and careful attention to new tree planting could help meet the Seattle Comprehensive Urban Forest Management Plan Goals for multi-family residential and commercial development by achieving 15-20 percent overall tree canopy within 30 years.
- **Urban Agriculture** – New P-patch Community Gardens and rooftop gardens could be provided within the site for residents to grow food. Balconies, decks, and right-of-way planting strips could also be utilized for individual residents' agriculture needs. A farmer's market could be established for residents to sell locally grown food, and small micro-retail spaces and food vendor carts could also be allowed where value-added food products could be sold.

- **Native Plants** – Native plants are adapted to the local climate and do not depend upon irrigation after plant establishment for ultimate survival. Landscaping with native plants, beyond that required by code, could be planted to reduce water demand and integrate with the local ecosystem.
- **District Infrastructure Systems for Energy, Water and Waste** – District Infrastructure Systems aggregate enough service demands to make local neighborhood utility solutions feasible. District infrastructure systems could be used as one approach to provide necessary infrastructure services, if determined to be feasible. District solutions may reduce greenhouse gases by utilizing renewable sources of energy and increasing the use of local resources, materials and supplies. District parking solutions and car sharing are designed to reduce vehicle trips. Water reuse and anaerobic digesters may reduce sewer flows. Rainwater capture may reduce stormwater flows. Water reuse and rainwater capture could also reduce potable water demands. District systems for Yesler Terrace could potentially include energy, potable water, wastewater, and solid waste.
- **Waste Management and Deconstruction** – When existing buildings need to be demolished, there are often opportunities to reduce the amount of waste being sent to the landfill with sustainable waste management strategies. In the Seattle area, standard practice for building construction and demolition results in fairly high recycling rates of over 50 to 60 percent. However, these rates can be increased by implementing aggressive demolition recycling. Such efforts can require considerable additional effort on the part of the contractor. Some of the options under consideration that could mitigate waste generated by the Yesler Terrace project include on-site source separated recycling, potential reuse of demolition materials on-site, deconstruction of existing buildings, and salvage and reuse of building components.

Due to the presence of asbestos and lead-based paint in the majority of the existing onsite buildings, it is unlikely that solid waste resulting from most building demolition would be recyclable. Building materials would be tested as part of demolition activities in order to determine the levels of contamination present. The test results would be used to determine whether building materials could be recycled, would be sent to a landfill or to a specialized facility that handles hazardous waste (see Section 3.6, **Environmental Health**, for details).

- **Building Design** – Building design at Yesler Terrace could integrate a wide variety of green building features. Green building encompasses energy and water conservation, waste reduction, and good indoor environmental quality. Tools and standards that are used to measure green building performance could be used at Yesler Terrace. Some options include: Built Green, LEED, and the Evergreen Sustainable Development Criteria. Custom green building guidelines could also be developed to guide building design and construction. Some of the specific building design strategies that might be considered include solar panels for electricity generation or domestic solar hot water, energy star rated appliances, water conserving fixtures beyond code, low toxic materials, finishes, and flooring, energy and water sub-metering for individual units, high efficiency fixtures such as dual flush toilets, toilet flushing and irrigation supplied by recaptured wastewater or rainwater, dual plumbing systems for all new buildings to accommodate water reuse, and wind generated alternative energy.

Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

The direct and indirect impacts of the greenhouse gas emissions and energy use of any of the Yesler Terrace Redevelopment alternatives are not considered to be significant adverse impacts.

Environmental Health

The following required/proposed mitigation measures would address potential impacts to humans or the environment from existing hazardous materials/conditions as a result of the Yesler Terrace Redevelopment.

Required/Proposed Mitigation Measures

- Additional characterization, removal, and proper disposal of soil with lead concentrations greater than the MTCA cleanup level would be conducted.
- A site-specific health and safety plan would be prepared that includes the safety requirements of WAC 296-843, Hazardous Waste Operations, and WAC 296-155, Safety Standards for Construction Work, to minimize the potential for workers to be exposed to hazardous materials during construction and to address appropriate handling and disposal of any soil with contaminant concentrations greater than the MTCA cleanup levels.
- Conventional dust control measures would be implemented to minimize the exposure of workers and the immediate surrounding populations to construction-generated dust (see Section 3.2, **Air Quality**, for details).
- Spill prevention and response planning would be conducted prior to the start of construction to prevent and, if needed, respond to hydraulic oil or fuel spills.
- Proper characterization of contaminated soil and/or asphaltic concrete pavement, as part of site clearing, grading, or general excavating, would be conducted in order to select an appropriate offsite disposal site.
- Dewatering may be needed for construction of underground structures (e.g., parking garages) and utilities, depending on the depth of the facility. Monitoring, and potentially treatment, of dewatering discharges would be performed, as necessary, to limit impacts to receiving waters in the event the dewatering water contains contaminated or turbid groundwater.
- A King County Waste Discharge permit would be required to discharge any dewatering water to the combined sewer. Monitoring of dewatering discharges would be necessary to determine whether physical and chemical parameters are within King County discharge limits. If parameters are outside acceptable limits, treatment would be necessary prior to discharging to combined sewer.
- During construction activities, possible contaminants in soil could become entrained in stormwater. Stormwater treatment and monitoring would be conducted during demolition

and/or construction activities (see Section 3.3, **Water Resources**, for details on water quality treatment).

- Building demolition would be conducted after a hazardous building materials survey has been completed to identify the presence of such materials (e.g., ACBM or lead-based paint) and remove or stabilize them prior to demolition.
- If underground steam pipes (associated with the former Steam Plant) are uncovered during site grading or excavation activities, they would need to be evaluated for the potential presence of hazardous materials (i.e., asbestos-containing pipe wrap).
- The SHA Brownfields site would need to remain in the Department of Ecology's Voluntary Cleanup Program until a "No Further Action" letter is issued.
- At the Steam Plant, residual material within the smokestack and the stack itself may contain potentially hazardous materials. Testing of the residual material and the smokestack would be performed prior to any demolition activities. Proper characterization of any hazardous materials identified within the smokestack would be conducted in order to select an appropriate offsite disposal site (this mitigation measure only applies to Alternatives 2 and 3).
- If unanticipated contamination is discovered, the project would need to comply with applicable cleanup provisions, based on MTCA regulations.

Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

No significant unavoidable adverse impacts would be anticipated.

Noise

The following required/proposed and other possible mitigation measures would address potential noise impacts to sensitive on and offsite receivers as a result of the Yesler Terrace Redevelopment.

Required/Proposed Mitigation Measures

- Construction activities would be subject to applicable City of Seattle noise limits.
- HVAC equipment, particularly equipment proposed to be located outside or on the tops of buildings, would need to be selected, located and designed to ensure compliance with City of Seattle's daytime and nighttime noise limits at nearby receiving locations.

Other Possible Mitigation Measures

Construction

Some relatively simple and inexpensive practices can reduce the extent to which people are affected by construction noise and ensure that construction noise levels stay within the applicable daytime sound level limits. Examples include the following:

- Use properly sized and maintained mufflers, engine intake silencers, engine enclosures, and turning off idle equipment.
- Make construction contracts specify that mufflers be in good working order and that engine enclosures be used on equipment when the engine is the dominant source of noise.
- Locate stationary equipment as far away from sensitive receiving locations as possible. Where this is not feasible, or where noise impacts are still significant, place portable noise barriers around the equipment, with the opening directed away sensitive receiving locations.
- To the extent feasible, substitute hydraulic or electric models for impact tools such as jack hammers, rock drills and pavement breakers to reduce construction and demolition noise. Electric pumps could be specified if pumps are required.
- Explore the feasibility of using broad-band or ambient sensing vehicle back-up alarms, which are typically less noticeable than traditional pure-tone alarms.
- Locate construction staging areas expected to be in use for more than a few weeks as far as possible from sensitive receivers, particularly residences.
- Use quiet equipment and temporary noise barriers to shield sensitive uses, and orient work areas to minimize noise transmission to sensitive off-site locations.

Operation

Sound levels at numerous locations on the project site currently exceed HUD guidelines for residential locations and would continue to do so in the future with any of the proposed alternatives. Therefore, some or all of the following mitigation measures should be considered:

- Place outdoor use areas (where quiet conditions are required for optimal use) both away from the perimeter of the site and in locations that are "shielded" by buildings (i.e. where buildings are located between the exterior use area and major roadways).
- If feasible, locate office buildings on the western edge of the SW Sector adjacent to I-5, instead of residences.
- Minimize site grading that increases on-site ground-level elevations that would give lower portions of buildings near I-5 a more direct line-of-sight to the freeway (thereby increasing noise levels).

- Use construction materials and techniques in all buildings on the east, south, and west site perimeter that will reduce interior sound levels in residences to 45 dBA L_{dn} or less.
- Use dynamic venting systems (or air conditioning units) for those residences that are in "normally unacceptable" or "unacceptable" locations to eliminate the need to open windows for ventilation. This would also be useful for office buildings in order to provide interior spaces conducive to typical office operations (i.e., reading, writing, conversations, etc.).

Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

No significant unavoidable adverse impacts would be anticipated from the proposal. However, the site suitability analysis indicates that portions of the site, even under existing conditions and the No Action Alternative, would be deemed unacceptable under HUD noise criteria without implementation of noise mitigation, including extraordinary noise attenuation measures in an area within the SW Sector, due to the presence of I-5 and other major roadways.

Land Use

Ultimately, the design guidelines, development standards and the Planned Action Ordinance for this proposal would guide redevelopment of the Yesler Terrace site over the long-term. These plans, regulations and standards, along with individual project review by the City, would serve as mitigation to preclude any potential significant land use impacts from future redevelopment and ensure compatibility among site uses and uses in the site vicinity.

The following possible mitigation measures would further address potential land use compatibility issues, particularly related to compatibility with adjacent uses and among uses within the site itself.

Required/Proposed Mitigation Measures

- SHA's decision on which development plan to implement will likely include SHA-imposed design standards to help mitigate land use, and height, bulk and scale impacts.
- As part of the Project Actions, design guidelines will be prepared by SHA and the City, and future development would be reviewed for conformance with those design guidelines.
- The new zone designation for the site will establish zoning standards to mitigate land use, and height, bulk, and scale impacts.
- As the existing residential units currently operating in-home day care businesses are displaced, under all alternatives it is assumed that a portion of the ground level, extremely low income housing units within the redeveloped site would be configured to meet the requirements for licensed in-home daycare businesses.

Other Possible Mitigation Measures

- Features that could be incorporated into the plans under Alternatives 1-3 that would address the relationship of proposed uses on the site to surrounding uses include provision of:
 - Land uses that are compatible with and complement uses within the site and in the surrounding area in terms of land use type and height/bulk/scale, such as developing single-use high-rise office or hotel buildings only in the areas of the site adjacent to existing offsite high-rise office/medical use buildings.
 - A mix of uses that creates opportunity for the establishment of a live-work-play environment for existing and new tenants.
 - Public parks and open space area that can serve as a resource to Yesler Terrace residents and employees.
 - Provision of landscaping and street trees around the site perimeter in order to provide a buffer between onsite redevelopment and existing offsite adjacent uses.
- Implementation of specific mitigation measures to ensure that new land uses are compatible with onsite existing retained uses and offsite uses such as street level setbacks, upper level setbacks and landscape design guidelines. See Section 3.10, **Aesthetics/Light and Glare/Shadows**, for a complete list of specific mitigation measures, as well as Appendix Q, **Urban Design Approach**, for guidance for specific design guidelines. See Section 2.8.4, **Building Heights**, for criteria for spacing of high-rise buildings.
- Additional mitigation measures related to air quality, noise, views, transportation and public services would be provided to lessen the potential for impacts from redevelopment of the site (see Section 3.2, **Air Quality**, Section 3.6, **Noise**, Section 3.10, **Aesthetics/Light and Glare/Shadows**, Section 3.12, **Transportation** and Section 3.13, **Public Services** for details).

Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

Significant adverse land use impacts would not be anticipated under Alternatives 1-4 as the proposed land uses are compatible with existing offsite uses.

No significant unavoidable adverse height, bulk or scale related impacts would be anticipated with implementation of appropriate mitigation measures, including those listed above.

Redevelopment is assumed to occur consistent with the above mitigation measures, adopted standards, guidelines, and regulations for Yesler Terrace, including a Planned Action Ordinance.

Relationship to Plans and Policies

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are identified specifically for the Relationship to Plans, Policies and Regulations section. Mitigation measures for other elements of the environment address the Relationship to Plans and Policies.

Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

No significant unavoidable adverse impacts are anticipated.

Aesthetics/Light and Glare/Shadows

Required/Proposed Mitigation Measures

Aesthetics

The following measures would be implemented to lessen potential aesthetic impacts.

- The Land Use Code text amendment, and/or Planned Action Ordinance, is expected to include zoning standards that specify heights and setbacks, and also design guidelines. As permit applications are submitted, the City will review the proposed development for conformance with those standards and guidelines.
- Street landscaping would be provided that meets or exceeds City of Seattle regulations, and would serve as a partial buffer to offsite development.

Other Possible Mitigation Measures

Height, Bulk and Scale

The following measures, or ones similar to them, could be implemented to lessen potential height, bulk and scale impacts to offsite development surrounding the site.

- Yesler Terrace building heights could be limited where Yesler Terrace development would be across the street from offsite areas where zoning regulations limit offsite building heights to 75 feet or less. For example, Yesler Terrace building heights could be limited to 150 feet within 80 to 120 feet of such offsite locations. The actual setback distance and heights could be determined on a case by case basis since some site locations may not pose unreasonable impacts to lower height buildings. This approach would create a stepping of building heights adjacent to the lower height and density zoning and subsequently limit shadow impacts and increase the availability of light to the adjacent sites.
- Upper level building setbacks could be required for buildings above 65 to 85 feet in order to open the sky view from the street and create a less imposing physical building scale near the lower, offsite height and density zoning.
- Building façade lengths could be limited and minimum building spacing required above building heights of 65 feet to 85 feet to reduce the wall effect from tall buildings which could create excessive shadow and view impacts to adjacent buildings.
- Maximum floor plate sizes could be established for residential high-rise buildings, similar to limits currently in place for residential towers in Downtown zones.
- Ground level building setbacks could be used for high-rise buildings to create a wider separation between lower and higher density zoning.

- Minimum ground and upper level building setbacks could be required for buildings adjacent to the property lines of offsite parcels with considerably lower maximum building heights in order to provide separation between areas with lower density development.

Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

No significant unavoidable adverse height, bulk or scale related impacts would be anticipated with implementation of appropriate mitigation measures, including those listed above.

Aesthetics - Light and Glare

The following measures would help to reduce overall light and glare impacts for the project in the immediate vicinity of the Yesler Terrace site.

Required/Proposed Mitigation Measures

- Street trees and the use of building materials with relatively low-reflectivity at street level would minimize reflective glare-related impacts to pedestrians and nearby residents immediately adjacent to the site.
- Pedestrian-scale lighting would be provided consistent with code, function and safety requirements.
- Exterior lighting would include fixtures to direct the light downward and/or upward and away from on and off-site land uses.

Other Possible Mitigation Measures

Construction

- Construction-related lighting could be shielded and directed away from adjacent land uses.

Operation

- As the glare analysis indicates, neither the worst case building orientations nor the capacity modeled building orientations and locations would result in significant glare impacts (i.e. glare within the drivers cone-of-influence) to I-5 at any times of day or year except on December 21st, at 4 PM² under the worst case building orientations. In this instance, the high-rise building located at the south end of the SW Sector causes the glare impact. In order to avoid this glare impact, the worst case building orientation could be avoided for the building causing the glare. It is assumed that changing the building orientation, alone or in combination with other measures, would mitigate this impact. No significant glare impacts to Boren Avenue are anticipated to occur under

² The four dates analyzed for the glare analysis were selected because they are representatives of times of the year. It should be noted, however, that solar glare-related impacts may also occur at other times of the day and days of the year.

either the worst case or capacity modeled building orientations for the times of day and year evaluated.

- While building façade materials have not yet been determined, reflectivity of glazing would likely be dictated by the nature of glass that is employed and the requirements set forth by the City's Energy Code and LEED energy requirements, if LEED certification is sought. Excessively-reflective surfaces (i.e. mirrored glass, or polished metals) that go beyond what is required to meet energy-related code provisions could be avoided for buildings with the potential to result in glare impacts.
- Additional measures to mitigate glare could include recessing glazing to produce areas of glare shadow which would reduce the amount of glare being reflected from the building, angling glazing in the building façade with an orientation that will eliminate glare in a driver's cone-of-influence and will cast glare in directions with less of an impact to traffic, and limiting the percentage of glazing on certain building facades to reduce glare impacts to surrounding buildings and roadways. Additional glare studies could be required for individual permit application to verify glare impacts and mitigation.

Aesthetics - Shadows

No significant impacts have been identified and no mitigation is proposed.

Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

No significant unavoidable adverse impacts would be anticipated.

Historic Resources

The following possible mitigation measures would address potential impacts to historic resources resulting from the Yesler Terrace Redevelopment:

Possible Mitigation Measures

- Demolition of Yesler Terrace Steam Plant (a designated City of Seattle Landmark) – Changes to the exterior (designated feature) of the Steam Plant, including demolition of the building, cannot be undertaken without the review and approval of the Landmarks Preservation Board. There have been few occasions when the Board has approved demolition of a local landmark. However, should the Board approve demolition of the Steam Plant, mitigation would not be required. Given that such a step would result in the loss of a historic resource, it should be mitigated by HABS documentation
- Demolition of original (1941-1942) Yesler Terrace – Documentation of the property should be undertaken to mitigate its loss and should be easily accessible to the public. There are several options for providing a historic record, including development of a historic record in accordance with DAHP standards; development and posting of an expanded entry about Yesler Terrace on HistoryLink.org, the online encyclopedia of Washington State history; development of an oral history program by the Museum of History and Industry involving current and former long-term Yesler Terrace residents and managers, as well as early participants in SHA's history; and development and onsite installation of interpretive exhibits or interpretive artwork about the original Yesler

Terrace, its social and cultural history, and buildings. Such exhibits or artwork should be located on the exterior, in easily accessible and visible locations on the new project site. Consideration should be given to an exhibit within or outside the Steam Plant. Any exhibit text should be provided in a variety of languages given the cultural diversity of Yesler Terrace. Retention and rehabilitation of the original Yesler Terrace Steam Plant, which does have architectural integrity, could also mitigate the loss of the overall property.

- Potential Structural Instability/Undermining – Care should be taken in order to avoid structural damage to nearby buildings that could occur due to construction-related vibrations and/or earthwork. All excavation, earthwork, pile driving, etc. should be designed and monitored in order to minimize and/or immediately address any such impacts to nearby or adjacent historic properties. Monitoring should include crack monitors placed on nearby structures, periodic observation, and photography to document the structural integrity of the historic buildings and determine whether there was resulting damage of interior or exterior finishes, or exterior masonry and/or framing. If such damage occurs as a result of the project, damage should be mitigated through repairs to the affected buildings.
- Temporary Dirt/Unintended Damage – Care should be taken in order to avoid or limit the introduction of atmospheric elements that could alter and/or potentially damage historic building fabric or architectural features of nearby historic resources. All construction activity should be monitored in order to prevent and address any such impacts to adjacent or nearby historic properties. Consider limiting access near historic properties of construction vehicles carrying excavation materials. Dust control measures would be implemented (see **Section 3.2, Air Quality** of the DEIS for details).
- Development pressure on low-scale properties – Mitigation in the form of preservation planning should be undertaken, by development and submittal of landmark nomination reports for those buildings offsite within the APE that are potentially eligible for listing as Seattle Landmarks but not currently designated.
- Adjacency Analysis - SEPA calls for design analysis and review of new construction adjacent to or across the street from a designated local landmark, by the City Historic Preservation Officer.
- If Section 106 consultation results in a finding that the federal undertaking would have an adverse effect upon an NRHP-listed or -eligible property or district, Section 106 requires measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate such effects. A binding commitment to such measures is memorialized in a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the parties and incorporated into the federal agency's Record of Decision.

Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

With implementation of the proposed mitigation measures, no significant unavoidable adverse impacts would be anticipated.

Cultural Resources

Although no archaeological sites or ethnographic places have been identified within the APE of the Yesler Terrace site and the site is considered to have a low potential to contain such

resources, unanticipated resources could be encountered during construction. If at any time during construction archaeological resources were observed, the following mitigation measures would be implemented to address potential impacts to cultural resources resulting from the Yesler Terrace Redevelopment:

Required/Proposed Mitigation Measures

- Project site work would be temporarily suspended at the location of the archaeological resource, the project manager would immediately be notified and a professional archeologist would document and assess the discovery. The DAHP and all concerned tribes would be contacted for any issues involving Native American sites.
- If project activities expose human remains, either in the form of burials or isolated bones or teeth, or other mortuary items, work in that area would be stopped immediately. Local law enforcement, DAHP, and affected tribes would be immediately contacted. No additional excavation would be undertaken until a process has been agreed upon by these parties, and no exposed human remains would be left unattended.

Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

No significant unavoidable adverse impacts would be anticipated.

Transportation

This section presents potential measures to mitigate the transportation-related impacts of the project. Many of these measures would be incorporated into the site design. The following list presents measures to mitigate short-term construction impacts as well as long-term impacts to all modes of travel. It also details potential Transportation Management Plan elements to reduce travel by single-occupant vehicle.

Required/Proposed Mitigation Measures

Mitigation of Construction Impacts

Construction impacts would occur in stages until all development at Yesler Terrace is complete. Prior to commencing construction of the West of Boren Sectors, SHA and/or its prime contractor(s) would prepare a Construction Management Plan. This plan would document the following:

- Truck haul routes to and from the site.
- Peak hour restrictions for construction truck traffic and how those restrictions would be communicated and enforced.
- Truck staging areas (e.g., locations where empty or full dump trucks would wait or stage prior to loading or unloading.)
- Construction employee parking areas.

- Road or lane closures that may be needed during utility construction or relocation, roadway construction, or building construction. If any arterial street is affected by a partial or full closure, the contractor should also prepare a Maintenance of Traffic Plan detailing temporary traffic control, channelization, and signage measures.
- Mechanism for notifying community if road or lane closures would be required.
- Sidewalk and/or bus stop closures and relocations.

Other elements or details may be required in the Construction Management Plan to satisfy street use permit requirements of the City of Seattle. SHA and the contractor would incorporate other City requirements into an overall plan, if applicable.

Off Site Roadway Improvements

The traffic operations analysis determined that the Yesler Terrace redevelopment would increase vehicle delay at 6 intersections that would operate at LOS F without the Yesler Terrace redevelopment, and cause up to 4 other intersections to degrade to LOS F (the specific number of intersections in this latter category depends upon the Alternative). Potential mitigation measures at 9 of the 10 locations have been evaluated and are summarized in **Table 3.13-14**. No mitigation is possible for the intersection of Broadway/E James Street where changes to the signal timing and phasing are already proposed to accommodate the First Hill Streetcar. The impact that Alternative 2 and 3 would have to this intersection is noted as an unavoidable adverse impact.

Table 3.13-14
(Excerpted from Section 3.13)
POTENTIAL INTERSECTION MITIGATION

Int. #	Intersection Name	Description of Improvement	Mitigation Needed for Alternative?				
			Alt 1	Alt 1a	Alt 2	Alt 3	Alt 4
6	12th Avenue/ E Cherry Street	Restripe E Cherry Street to provide conventional left turn phasing (instead of separate phases for eastbound and westbound traffic).	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
19	Rainier Avenue S/ S Dearborn Street	Add a southbound right turn pocket on Rainier Avenue S.			✓	✓	
21	7th Avenue/ Cherry Street	Change cycle length to full cycle to match intersection at 6th Avenue/Cherry Street.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
22	9th Avenue/ Cherry Street	Convert to an all-way, stop-controlled intersection.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
26	9th Avenue/ Jefferson Street	Provide a second northbound lane at the all-way stop-controlled intersection.			✓	✓	
28	9th Avenue/ Alder Street	Convert to an all-way, stop-controlled intersection.	✓	✓	✓	✓	
31	8th Avenue/ Yesler Way (Alts 1 & 4) or 9th Avenue/Yesler Way (Alts 2 & 3) ^a	Install a traffic signal with left-turn pockets on all approaches. The left-turn pockets would allow the traffic signal phase for left turning vehicles to be separated from pedestrian crossing movements.	✓	✓	✓	✓	
33	6th Avenue/ James Street	Retime intersection.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
34	6th Avenue/ Yesler Way	Signalize.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Source: Heffron Transportation, Inc., September 2010.

^a Intersection would not exist with this alternative. Alternatives 2 and 3 would vacate 8th Avenue and replace it with a parallel street, 9th Avenue.

Transit

Increased ridership from the project could increase loads on Route 27 to unacceptable levels. This route currently operates on 20 to 30-minute headways during the PM peak hour. Yesler Way is designated as part of the City's UVTN, for which the goal is service at least every 15 minutes. Increased service on the Route 27 would alleviate the loading. Another idea that has been considered, although is not part of any future plan, is to divert the Route 3/4 from James Street to Yesler Way to avoid congestion at the I-5 interchange. That route has very frequent service which could accommodate the additional riders from Yesler Terrace.

The Seattle Housing Authority will work with King County Metro and SDOT to evaluate service needs as development at Yesler Terrace progresses. A key milestone would be 2016 when King County Metro may redeploy various service on First Hill and Capitol Hill in response to the University Link project opening. In addition, Seattle Housing Authority could be a partner with

other agencies pursuing funding opportunities, particularly new federal grants in which low-income housing and sustainable development increase a project's chance of funding.

Non-Motorized Facilities

Extensive pedestrian and bicycle improvements would be made throughout the Yesler Terrace site, including street frontage improvements as well as connecting paths throughout the site. New connections would also be made to areas beyond Yesler Terrace, including south towards S Jackson Street. This connection would improve pedestrian access to the International District and key transit routes along S Jackson Street or at the International District and King Street transit stations. Many of the reconstructed streets would provide new or enhanced facilities for bicycles.

Other pedestrian and bicycle amenities would be provided on the site including pocket parks, resting areas, bike racks, secured long-term bicycle storage (in garages), and showers and locker facilities in office buildings.

SHA will coordinate with the First Hill Streetcar project to improve the crosswalks at the Boren Avenue/Yesler Way intersection. The crosswalk across the south leg of the intersection is located along the school walk route between Yesler Terrace and Bailey-Gatzert Elementary School. The First Hill Community Plan recommended improving this crossing location (City of Seattle 1998).

Freight

Truck access would be provided for all buildings. Where possible, service drives would be created to the side or back of buildings to provide access to loading docks. Truck access and loading requirements within the site would be determined for individual building applications; however, most buildings could be designed to accommodate just small to medium-sized trucks since large trucks are not often used for deliveries near the downtown core area of Seattle. The exception would be for a potential grocery store.

On-street loading zones could also be provided. These should be limited to one per block face and located near service drives and away from pedestrian entrances. If an occasional large truck is needed for a delivery (e.g., during a business or resident move), then temporary on-street loading could be provided with a street-use permit.

Transportation and Parking Management Plans

Transportation Management Plans (TMPs) would be implemented for various elements of the Yesler Terrace Redevelopment. Parcels where office uses are to be built would likely be sold to developers. These parcels could be required to have individual TMPs that are directed at reducing employee commute trips. SHA would retain ownership and management of its low income residential units. SHA could distribute information to its tenants (in several languages, as needed) regarding transportation options.

TMP Goal

Seattle's Comprehensive Plan for the First Hill/Capitol Hill Urban Center established a trip goal that all peak period trips using non-SOV modes reach 75 percent by the year 2010 and 80

percent by 2020. This means that trips by single-occupant vehicle (SOV) should be no more than 25 percent of the peak period trips in 2010, or 20 percent in 2020. These goals are consistent with the analysis performed for the Yesler Terrace EIS. Overall, the trip generation estimates that are the basis for the traffic impact analysis assume that about 25 percent of the office trips would be made by single-occupant-vehicles (SOVs) and about 10 percent of the residential and retail trips would be made by SOVs.

The Comprehensive Plan goals could be adopted as the short and long-range goals in TMPs for office development at Yesler Terrace. For each office building within Yesler Terrace, it is recommended that within 5 years of occupancy, no more than 25 percent of the employee commute trips should be by SOV; within 10 years of occupancy, no more than 20 percent of the employee commute trips should be by SOV.

TMP Elements – Office Building

The office-related TMPs could be required consistent with the City of Seattle's Director's Rule (DPD Director's Rule 19-2008). The Yesler Terrace redevelopment would have many site amenities and design treatments that would promote the use of alternative transportation modes. These features would be inherent in the site design, and prescribed through the Project Actions. Therefore, the TMP for each building only needs to address on-going management elements and site-specific design treatments. **Table 3.13-15** lists the elements from the Director's Rule (along with the specific element number) that should be included in each office building's TMP. Some of the elements may not be needed at all locations as noted.

TMP for Residential Uses

SHA would provide centralized management for its low income units at Yesler Terrace. This would create the opportunity to provide information about alternative modes of transportation. This could include information (in multiple languages) about transit routes, stop locations, and schedules, car-sharing programs, and walking/bicycle routes.

Table 3.13-15
(Excerpted from Section 3.13)
TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT PLAN (TMP) ELEMENTS FOR OFFICE BUILDINGS

TMP Elements from Seattle Director's Rule 19-2009		Check all that apply	Notes
Building and Frontage Features			
1	Install commuter information center in appropriate location	As needed	May not be needed at all locations if centrally located.
3	Provide on-site shower and locker facility	√	
7	Provide bicycle storage and amenities	√	
Management & Promotion			
8	Appoint Building Transportation Coordinator	√	
9	Produce and distribute a commuter information packet	√	
10	Require tenant participation in the TMP	√	
11	Submit regular reports about TMP elements as required by the City	√	
12	Conduct biennial survey of TMP effectiveness	√	
Parking Management			
15	Charge for parking at market rate for the site's vicinity	√	
17	Prohibit price reductions for all-day parking (e.g., "Early Bird" specials)	√	
18	Unbundle parking from building leases	√	
19	Provide designated parking spaces for car share programs	As needed	May not be needed at all sites if centrally located.
20	Create flex-use parking passes that provide fewer days of parking than a monthly pass	√	
Transit, Carpool & Vanpool Programs			
22	Provide free parking for vanpools registered with a public agency	√	
23	Provide information about ride-match opportunities	√	
24	Provide reserved spaces for registered vanpools in convenient area that has adequate clearance and maneuvering space	√	
Bicycle/Walking Programs			
27	Offer incentive for commuters who bicycle or walk to work	√	

Source: DPD Director's Rule 19-2008, December 31, 2008.

Note: The numbers in the right hand column match the element numbers from the Director's Rule.

Other Possible Mitigation Measures

Parking

Off-street Parking Supply

Off-street parking supply within the site area would be determined for individual buildings. The parking supply rate used for each residential building may differ based on the income target, average unit size, and whether the units would be rented or owned. Neighborhood services and retail parking supplies should be determined based on specified use needs and may vary by building.

Several parking management strategies and programs could be implemented to reduce the overall parking supply on the Yesler Terrace site, including:

- **Share office parking on weeknights and weekends.** Parking at key office garages could be made available for evening and weekend use by residential visitors or for residents who commute during the day. This would reduce the parking supply required.
- **Unbundle parking from office leases.** Office tenants could be required to pay for parking as a separate fee from their office space lease. This promotes use of alternative transportation modes by itemizing the cost of parking.
- **Charge for parking.** All office employees and visitors could be required to pay for parking at the market rate in the area. Discounts for all-day parking (e.g., Early Bird specials) should be discouraged.
- **Offer a flex-pass for parking that limits the number of days an employee can park.** Most parking passes are sold on a monthly basis and allow unlimited parking during that month. A flex-pass would be a lower-cost option that would limit the number of days it can be used each month. This type of pass is a good option for employees who may take transit or ride a bike to work some days a week, but need a car on certain days for work or personal business.
- **Do not reserve individual spaces for office parking.** Leases could be structured so that parking spaces at office buildings are not reserved for individual users. This allows all office parking to be shared by employees, and reduces the overall supply requirement.
- **Provide for car-sharing programs.** Car-sharing programs (e.g., Zipcar) allow residents and/or site employees to share a pool of vehicles, which reduces parking demand.

On-Street Parking Supply

Most of the on-street parking within the existing Yesler Terrace site is part of residential parking zone (RPZ) 7. With the redevelopment, most of the RPZ should be retained; however, the large increase in residents may substantially increase demand for RPZ permits. This could be particularly true if there is a cost for off-street parking associated with a new unit. The City's RPZ policies related to permit eligibility are applied evenly to all RPZ zones throughout the City. Therefore, changing the eligibility requirements may require that a subzone be created for just

Yesler Terrace, and new ordinance language adopted limiting the eligibility of RPZ permits in this subzone. Potential eligibility limits, which would have to be vetted by City legal staff, could include:

- Issuing RPZ permits based on a hardship or need, which could include an income limit or a vehicle ownership requirement for work or school.
- Issuing RPZ permits on a lottery basis (which is done in some other cities).
- Limiting or prohibiting guest permits, and requiring visitors to park off-street.

Some of the on-street parking should be converted to short-term parking for use by customers of adjacent retail businesses or neighborhood services. Because of its location near the downtown core, it is likely that short-term on-street parking would be enforced as paid parking with payment available at pay stations.

Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

Redevelopment of Yesler Terrace would increase vehicular traffic and transit use in the site vicinity. The project would add traffic and increase delay to one intersection where future changes are proposed as part of the First Hill Streetcar project: Broadway/E James Street. Traffic generated by Alternatives 2 and 3 would degrade operations at this intersection to LOS F during the PM peak hour. Mitigation is not feasible at this intersection due to constrained rights-of-way, track requirements, and signal operations needed for the Streetcar.

Utilities

The following required/proposed and other possible mitigation measures would address potential impacts to public utilities resulting from the Yesler Terrace Redevelopment:

Required/Proposed Mitigation Measures

Water

- The design and construction of all water distribution facilities would comply with the City of Seattle regulations for extensions and improvements to the City's water system.
- Water mains would be located within the site's existing dedicated roadway network for Alternatives 1, 1A and 4, and in the new public roadway network or easements for Alternatives 2 and 3, consistent with the City of Seattle public utilities regulations and design standards.

Sanitary Sewer

- A hydraulic analysis of stormwater drainage and wastewater systems would be completed during the design phase of the Yesler Terrace Redevelopment to determine necessary improvements to the City's and site's drainage and wastewater infrastructure. Improvements could include additional upsizing of the combined sewer pipe downstream of the Yesler Terrace Redevelopment in Main Street and 7th Avenue S, as well as GSI and stormwater flow control at the site (see Section 3.3, **Water Resources**, for details).

- The design and construction of public sanitary sewer systems would comply with the City of Seattle standard plans and specifications for extensions and improvements to the City's sewer system.
- Sewer mains would be located within the site's existing dedicated roadway network for Alternatives 1, 1A and 4, and in the new public roadway network or easements for Alternatives 2 and 3, consistent with the City of Seattle public utilities regulations and design standards.

Other Possible Mitigation Measures

- The Yesler Terrace Redevelopment could include provisions to encourage water conservation and/or reuse during building construction and long-term operation of the redevelopment.

Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

No significant unavoidable adverse impacts would be anticipated.

Public Services - Parks and Recreation

Future increases in employment and population at the site over the assumed 20-year buildout period under Alternatives 1-4 would be incremental and would be accompanied by increases in demands on park and recreational resources onsite and in the site vicinity. These impacts would be addressed by the following required/proposed and other possible mitigation measures:

Required/Proposed Mitigation Measures

- Onsite parks, open space and recreational facilities would be provided with redevelopment. These resources would include a substantial amount of new usable public and semi-private open space to accommodate the increased population and serve the surrounding community. If these facilities are not owned or maintained by the City, they would not be included in the City's official calculations of parks and open space gaps but would, in practice, serve to offset existing open space deficiencies in the area.
- A portion of the tax revenues generated from development of the site – potentially including construction sales tax, retail sales tax, business and occupation tax, property tax, utilities tax, leasehold excise tax, and other fees from City licenses and permits during site redevelopment – would accrue to the City of Seattle and could help offset demands for public services, including parks and recreation. The City's CIP has identified a need for another new park in the First Hill Urban Village, where Yesler Terrace is located, but a site has not yet been selected. SHA, as a First Hill community stakeholder, would continue to advocate for additional parks and open space resources in the neighborhood.
- It is anticipated that increases in employees and resident population onsite over the buildout period, along with general growth in this area of the City, would be planned for through the City's ongoing capital facilities planning process.

- Under all alternatives it is assumed that a portion of the ground level, extremely low income housing units within the redeveloped site would be configured to meet the requirements for licensed in-home daycare businesses to accommodate existing relocated daycare uses.
- New P-Patch community gardens could be provided onsite in the Commons Park area, each sector park and on rooftop gardens, provided at some buildings. Provision of these new P-Patch facilities could offset displacement of the existing P-Patch gardens located in the SW Sector.

Other Possible Mitigation Measures

- SHA could enter into an agreement with the Seattle Public School District to develop an active ballfield or improve the existing ballfield on the Bailey-Gatzert Elementary School grounds to offset the elimination of the existing onsite playfield due to redevelopment.

Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

No significant unavoidable adverse impacts would be anticipated.

Public Services - Schools

Future increases in housing units and students associated with these units over the assumed 20-year buildout period under Alternatives 1 through 4 would be incremental and would be accompanied by increases in demands on the Seattle Public Schools District. As noted in **Section 3.15.2**, the three existing attendance area schools and the Central District may not have the capacity to accommodate the additional students from the Yesler Terrace Redevelopment (Garfield High School is already over capacity). These impacts would be addressed by the following required/proposed and other possible mitigation measures:

Required/Proposed Mitigation Measures

- A portion of the tax revenues generated from development of the site – potentially including construction sales tax, retail sales tax, business and occupation tax, property tax, utilities tax, leasehold excise tax, and other fees licenses and permits – would accrue to the City of Seattle and the School District and could help offset demand for services from the District.

Other Possible Mitigation Measures

- It is anticipated that increases in student population over the buildout period would be addressed through the Seattle School District capital facilities capacity planning process (policy H13.00) to insure that no significant impacts would occur as a result of redevelopment at Yesler Terrace. As stated in **Section 3.15.2.1**, the Seattle School District could take any or a combination of the following actions to match capacity and enrollment as buildout occurs on the Yesler Terrace site:
 - Adding, relocating or removing programs;
 - Adjusting school boundaries;
 - Adjusting geographic zones for option schools;

- Adding or removing portables;
- Adding to or renovating buildings; and/or,
- Opening, reconstituting or closing buildings.

Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

No significant unavoidable adverse impacts would be anticipated.

Public Services - Fire and Emergency Medical Services

The following required/proposed mitigation measures would address potential impacts to Fire and EMS Services from the Yesler Terrace Redevelopment:

Required/Proposed Mitigation Measures

- Increases in population and employment over the 20-year buildout of the Yesler Terrace project would be incremental and would be accompanied by increases in demand for fire/EMS services under all of the EIS redevelopment alternatives. A portion of the tax revenues generated from redevelopment of the site – including construction sales tax, retail sales tax, business and operation tax, property tax, utility tax and other fees, licenses and permits - would accrue to the City of Seattle and could help offset demand for public services.
- All new buildings would be constructed in compliance with the 2006 Fire Code, which is comprised of the 2006 International Fire Code with Seattle amendments, as adopted by City of Seattle Ordinance 122491.

Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

No significant unavoidable adverse impacts would be anticipated.

Public Services - Police Services

The following required/proposed and other possible mitigation measures would address potential impacts to police services resulting from the Yesler Terrace Redevelopment:

Required/Proposed Mitigation Measures

- Increases in population and employment over the 20-year buildout of the Yesler Terrace project would be incremental and would be accompanied by increases in demand for police services under all of the EIS redevelopment alternatives. A portion of the tax revenues generated from redevelopment of the site – including construction sales tax, retail sales tax, business and operation tax, property tax, utility tax and other fees, licenses and permits - would accrue to the City of Seattle and could help offset demand for police services.
- The portions of the site that are under construction during phased redevelopment of the site could be fenced and lit, and monitored by surveillance cameras to help prevent construction site theft and vandalism.

- Permanent site design features could be included to help reduce criminal activity and calls for service, including: orienting buildings towards sidewalks, streets and/or public open spaces; providing convenient public connections between buildings onsite and to the surrounding area; and, providing adequate lighting and visibility onsite.
- SHA would continue funding for one dedicated police staff at the site, who serves as a Community Police Team officer to work with Yesler Terrace management and residents on crime and crime-related concerns.

Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

No significant unavoidable adverse impacts would be anticipated.

Public Services - Solid Waste

The following possible mitigation measures would address potential solid waste impacts resulting from the Yesler Terrace Redevelopment:

Possible Mitigation Measures

In conjunction with the overall stewardship and sustainability principle of the redevelopment, the following mitigation measures could be employed by SHA in order to reduce the amount of solid waste generated by the Yesler Terrace redevelopment, thereby reducing impacts on collection by SHA Solid Waste Division and on disposal at the SRDS and ultimately the Columbia Ridge Landfill and Recycling Center in Gilliam County, Oregon:

- Accommodate onsite composting using various types of equipment, including earth bins and anaerobic digestion;
- Provide or encourage household composting units;
- Provide offsite composting after site collection; and/or,
- Expand urban agriculture on the site to utilize organic waste.

SHA could hire additional drivers, add vehicles to their fleet, extend workdays and/or add additional workdays in order to handle the additional solid waste from the Yesler Terrace Redevelopment, even with implementation of some or all of the above mitigation measures.

Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

No significant unavoidable adverse impacts would be anticipated.

Public Services - Community Services

The following required/proposed mitigation measures would address potential impacts resulting to community services from the Yesler Terrace Redevelopment:

Required/Proposed Mitigation Measures

The displacement of existing community service providers onsite would require SHA to comply with the federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of

1970 (URA). The URA applies to projects with federal funding, such as Yesler Terrace, that involve the displacement of organizations/businesses. Specifically, requirements of the URA include:

- Relocation advisory services;
- A minimum 90 days written notice to vacate prior to requiring possession; and,
- Reimbursement for moving and reestablishment expenses.

During the construction process, in accordance with the tenant relocation plan, Yesler Terrace residents would be linked with service providers in areas to which they relocate in order to ensure continuity of services during the redevelopment of the site (see Section 3.16, **Socioeconomics**, for additional information on the tenant relocation plan).

Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

No significant unavoidable adverse impacts would be anticipated.

Socioeconomics

Increases in employment, population and housing would occur gradually within the site over the 20-year buildout period. No significant adverse impacts to community cohesion, public well being, population, employment and housing would be expected to result from any of the redevelopment alternatives and as a result, no other mitigation measures are identified for these elements.

Required Proposed Mitigation Measures

Regulatory Compliance - Residential Displacement

SHA would comply with the following regulations:

- The Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (URA), which provides benefits for persons or organizations involuntarily displaced as a result of federally funded projects.³

Tenant Relocation Plan – Temporary Relocation

The following measures are intended to address temporary relocation of residents during the construction process. All residents who remain in good standing with SHA and who maintain their eligibility for low income housing would have the option of returning to the redeveloped Yesler site as new units become available.

Relocation Involvement

- SHA would provide for extensive involvement of residents in relocation planning and would disseminate and communicate information about the timing of and resident choices related to relocation. These involvement and communication efforts would likely include the following:

³ 49 CFR Part 24.

- Community-wide relocation planning meetings to inform the community about relocation and solicit feedback on an effective approach;
- Relocation surveys to assist with the development of relocation options and procedures that conform to the priorities and preferences of residents;
- A language-based telephone hotline (interpreted into the seven primary languages spoken at Yesler Terrace) to provide information and allow for resident feedback (anonymous, if desired) on meetings and upcoming surveys or other activities;
- Website that includes regular updates on the progress of the project and answers to frequently asked questions;
- Articles in the newspaper that is distributed to SHA residents by Neighborhood House (The Voice) to share information on relocation benefits, options, Section 8 rules, and development progress; and regular relocation orientation meetings to explain relocation benefits and housing options (Meetings would be interpreted into the primary languages spoken in the Yesler Terrace community).

Relocation Options

- As required by the URA, residents would be offered a range of relocation assistance options. The URA applies to projects with federal funding, such as Yesler Terrace, that involve the displacement of people from their homes. Specifically, requirements of the URA include:
 - Provide a minimum 90 days written notice prior to relocation;
 - Provide reimbursement for moving expenses; and,
 - Provide payments for the added cost of renting comparable replacement housing.
- Some SHA tenants would be able to temporarily relocate to on-site units that would not be removed until later phases of demolition, and since construction would be phased, some residents would be able to move directly from their existing unit to a redeveloped unit, without having to leave the site.

SHA would provide the following relocation options to residents depending upon the availability of various resources, such a rental assistance vouchers, etc.:

- Relocation to another SHA-owned public housing development or to other SHA-owned property, where space is available. Residents who plan to return to the newly redeveloped Yesler Terrace community would have priority to be relocated to existing SHA housing.
- Tenant-based (Section 8) Housing Vouchers could be provided. These vouchers are for renting housing within privately-owned apartments or homes. At this time it is not known if or how many Vouchers may be available for Yesler Terrace residents.
- SHA would pay the difference (if any) between what tenants paid at Yesler Terrace for their unit and utilities versus any increase in a comparable unit, for up to 42 months or in a lump sum amount if the resident so chooses.

Relocation Assistance

- In conjunction with placing residents in comparable assisted housing situations, SHA would also provide a package of relocations benefits for Yesler Terrace residents to prepare and assist residents with the actual task of moving. Regardless of the type of relocation which residents receive, an SHA relocation team would assist residents with their moves, reimburse the resident for the cost of the move, and/or provide a fixed moving expense and relocation allowance. Eligible tenants (i.e. elderly or disabled) could request assistance with packing and unpacking. SHA would provide the following specific assistance:
 - Link residents with service providers in areas to which they relocate in order to ensure continuity of services;
 - Provide transportation or transportation assistance (bus tokens, taxi scripts etc.) and accompany residents to visit potential units;
 - Assist residents with applications for relocation benefits and/or rental applications;
 - Coordinate with moving companies;
 - Assist with the transfer of utility accounts;
 - Pay for the cost of utility disconnections and reconnections; and,
 - Pay for storage of personal property, if necessary.

The proposed moving assistance provisions described above would meet the cost allowance and payment requirements of the URA.

- SHA would notify residents 18 months in advance of planned demolition and relocation activity. This early notification exceeds federal requirements by six months. SHA staff would also provide one-on-one counseling to residents who would be relocated in order to help them identify and understand options for relocation assistance, including the overall package of benefits that they would receive. Residents would have at minimum of 6 to 8 weeks from the initial counseling session to determine which benefit package they prefer. However, this timeframe will not prevent residents from choosing a different benefit option if they so choose prior to receiving benefits.

Permanent Tenant Relocation

Residents may choose to permanently move from Yesler Terrace. Residents who do not wish to return to the redeveloped community may elect to receive a lump sum payment in compensation for their displacement, in order to make their own housing arrangements.

Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

No significant unavoidable adverse impacts would be expected.

Environmental Justice

Required/Proposed Mitigation Measures

Construction

- All construction activities would be required to comply with City of Seattle Municipal Code regulations as related to air quality and noise.

- The areas of the site undergoing construction would be secured and non-accessible after hours to prevent the creation of an attractive nuisance which could result in safety/public health impacts to the residential population on-site.
- Abatement, remediation, and disposal of any hazardous materials on site would occur in accord with local, state, and federal regulations prior to start of construction or demolition activities on site.

Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

No significant unavoidable adverse impacts would be anticipated as a result of the redevelopment alternatives (Alternatives 1-4), providing that low income housing is not concentrated in those areas of the site subject to the worst noise conditions. The No Action Alternative could result in a significant unavoidable adverse impact in that there would continue to be a disproportionate adverse impact to the site population with respect to the existing adverse air and noise conditions.

Wind

Mitigation Measures

- The building layout and associated height of structures at the site would be below the wider southern glide path.

Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

No significant unavoidable adverse impacts are anticipated, with implementation of appropriate mitigation measures.