

SEPA¹ Environmental Checklist

Purpose of checklist

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

Instructions for applicants

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

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

Instructions for lead agencies

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

Use of checklist for nonproject proposals

For nonproject proposals (such as ordinances, regulations, plans and programs), complete the applicable parts of sections A and B, plus the Supplemental Sheet for Nonproject Actions (Part D). Please completely answer all questions that apply and note that the words "project," "applicant," and "property or site" should be read as "proposal," "proponent," and "affected geographic area," respectively. The lead agency may exclude (for non-

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

projects) questions in “Part B: Environmental Elements” that do not contribute meaningfully to the analysis of the proposal.

STATE OF WASHINGTON

STATE ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT (SEPA)

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

WAC 197-11-960

Lead Agency: City of Port Townsend

Responsible Official: SEPA Responsible Official designated pursuant to PTMC 19.04.050

Proposal: Adoption of the City of Port Townsend 2026 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space (PROS) Plan Update

Type of Action: **NON-PROJECT ACTION** (Legislative / Programmatic) pursuant to WAC 197-11-704(2)

Date Prepared: April 2026

PURPOSE AND USE OF THIS CHECKLIST

This Environmental Checklist is prepared in accordance with the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), Chapter 43.21C RCW, and the SEPA Rules, Chapter 197-11 WAC, as adopted by reference in Port Townsend Municipal Code (PTMC) Chapter 19.04.

The purpose of this checklist is to provide a thorough, policy-level environmental analysis to support a SEPA threshold determination for a legislative, non-project action: adoption of the 2026 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space (PROS) Plan Update.

Consistent with RCW 43.21C.031 and WAC 197-11-060, this checklist evaluates environmental impacts to the greatest extent possible at the time of decision, while avoiding speculative analysis of impacts that cannot be meaningfully assessed absent a site-specific development proposal.

A. BACKGROUND

A.1 Name of Proposed Project

Adoption of the City of Port Townsend 2026 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space (PROS) Plan Update, a functional planning document implementing and refining Comprehensive Plan policies related to parks, recreation, open space, and environmental stewardship.

A.2 Name of Applicant

City of Port Townsend.

A.3 Applicant Address and Contact Information

City of Port Townsend
Community Services Department
250 Madison Street, Suite 3

Port Townsend, Washington 98368

Phone: (360)-344-3054

A.4 Date Checklist Prepared

April 2026.

A.5 Agency Requesting Checklist

City of Port Townsend Planning and Community Development, acting as Lead Agency under SEPA pursuant to PTMC 19.04.050.

A.6 Proposed Timing or Schedule (Including Phasing)

The proposed action consists solely of City Council adoption of a planning document, scheduled for hearings in May and June. The PROS Plan establishes long-range policies, inventories, and implementation strategies aligned with the 2025 Comprehensive Plan planning horizon (through 2045). Adoption does not authorize construction, approve funding, or establish implementation timelines.

Because this proposal is legislative, phasing relates only to future conceptual planning priorities and does not constitute action approval under SEPA.

A.7 Future Additions, Expansion, or Further Activity

Yes. The PROS Plan identifies potential future actions such as park improvements, trail connections, shoreline access projects, habitat restoration, and property acquisition.

Applicability and non-project explanation:

These actions are conceptual and programmatic only. Adoption of the PROS Plan does not approve, fund, permit, or otherwise authorize their implementation. Under WAC 197-11-704(2), such plans constitute non-project actions. Environmental impacts of any future projects will be evaluated through project-specific SEPA review when a development application or capital project proposal is submitted, consistent with Washington Supreme Court precedent prohibiting premature and segmented SEPA analysis (*Save Our Rural Environment v. Snohomish County*, 99 Wn.2d 363 (1983)).

A.8 Environmental Information Prepared and Relied Upon

Environmental information relied upon includes:

- 2026 PROS Plan Update
- 2025 Port Townsend Comprehensive Plan
- Shoreline Master Program
- Active Transportation Plan
- Stormwater Management Plan

- Determination of Non-Significance (DNS) and SEPA Checklist, November 16, 2022, for City of Port Townsend Capital Facilities Plan 2023-2028
- Determination of Non-Significance (DNS) and SEPA Checklist, June 29, 2023, for Comprehensive Plan and Municipal Code Section 12.04 Amendment Arising from Clarification and Refinement of the Sims Gateway Development Plan
- Determination of Non-Significance (DNS) and SEPA Checklist, August 23, 2023, Annual Amendments to Port Townsend Official Zoning Map
- Determination of Non-Significance (DNS) and SEPA Checklist, August 23, 2023, Annual Amendment to Port Townsend Comprehensive Plan and Municipal Code Title 17 Zoning to Increase Affordable Housing Capacity
- Determination of Non-Significance (DNS) and SEPA Checklist, January 24, 2024, Port Townsend Emergency Housing and Shelter Code Amendments to the Development Regulations of Port Townsend Municipal Code Title 17.
- Determination of Non-Significance (DNS) and SEPA Checklist, November 13, 2024, Proposed 2025-2030 Capital Facilities Plan.
- Determination of Non-Significance (DNS) and SEPA Checklist, January 15, 2025, Port Townsend 2025 Periodic Review of PTMC Chapter 19.05 Critical Areas Ordinance
- Corrected Determination of Non-Significance (DNS) and SEPA Checklist, April 23, 2025, Shoreline Master Program Periodic Update
- 2020 Parks Recreation and Open Space Plan
- Critical Areas regulations and environmental provisions in PTMC Titles 18 and 19

Reliance on existing environmental documents is expressly authorized by RCW 43.21C.034 and WAC 197-11-164 (Tiering) and is consistent with Ecology guidance encouraging use of existing planning-level environmental analysis.

A.9 Pending Governmental Approvals

None. This legislative action is not directly connected to any pending site-specific permit applications. The ongoing appeal of the 2026 Periodic Review of the Port Townsend Comprehensive Plan to the Growth Management Hearings Board may impact the subject area, namely within City limits.

A.10 Government Approvals or Permits Required

Port Townsend's Parks, Recreation and Tree and Trails Advisory Board and the Port Townsend Planning Commission recommended that City Council adopt the PROS Plan. Department of Commerce reviewed the proposed plan. Washington's recreation and Conservation Office also reviewed the plan for grant eligibility.

City Council adoption by ordinance or resolution. No construction, shoreline, or land-use permits are required for plan adoption.

A.11 Complete Description of Proposal

The proposal adopts a functional parks, recreation, and open space plan that implements Comprehensive Plan policy. The PROS Plan establishes citywide goals, policies, system inventories, equity-based level-of-service standards, and capital prioritization criteria. It does **not** authorize development, modify zoning, or approve site-specific actions.

A.12 Location of Proposal

The proposal applies **citywide**, within the incorporated boundaries of the City of Port Townsend.

REQUIRED NON-PROJECT ACTION ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

This proposal is a non-project action under WAC 197-11-704(2) because it adopts policies and plans but does not authorize physical development. Environmental analysis therefore focuses on:

- Policy-level environmental considerations
- Existing environmental conditions
- Whether adoption of the PROS Plan changes the direction, intensity, or rate of environmental impacts compared to adopted plans

Project-specific effects (e.g., grading amounts, vegetation removal, traffic generation, utility extensions) cannot be meaningfully evaluated at this stage and will be analyzed, where applicable, during SEPA review of individual development or capital project proposals, consistent with WAC 197-11-060(4) and Washington case law.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS

B.1 EARTH

a. General Description of the Affected Geographic Area

The area affected by this proposal is the entirety of the City of Port Townsend. The city contains a diverse range of physical conditions typical of a Puget Sound coastal community, including glacial uplands, rolling and steeply sloped terrain, coastal bluffs, wetlands, shoreline areas, and developed urban lands. These conditions are documented in the Comprehensive Plan and in the PROS Plan inventory. Because this is a citywide non-project action, analysis is conducted at a programmatic scale and does not focus on parcel-specific physical conditions.

b. Topography (Flat, Rolling, Hilly, Steep Slopes)

Topography across the city ranges from relatively flat lowland areas to rolling terrain and steep slopes, including coastal bluffs. Some areas include slopes exceeding 40 percent. Adoption of the

PROS Plan does not alter topography, modify slopes, or change development allowances on steep slopes. Existing slope conditions and regulatory protections remain unchanged.

c. Steepest Slope on the Site

Because the proposal applies citywide, the affected area includes a wide range of slope conditions, including slopes in excess of 40 percent in some locations. This question is applicable at a descriptive level but not determinative for impact analysis, as the proposal does not authorize ground disturbance. Any future development in steep-slope areas will be reviewed under existing geotechnical and critical areas regulations at the time of a development application.

d. Soil Types and Agricultural Soils

Soils within Port Townsend are primarily glacial and coastal in origin and include upland soils, wetland soils, and bluff-related soils. Townsend gravelly loam (Tnc) and Clallam gravelly sandy loam (CmC) are the predominant soil groups within the City. There are no areas of agricultural land of long-term commercial significance within the city limits. The PROS Plan does not result in soil removal or conversion. Future soil disturbance, if any, would be evaluated during project-level review based on site-specific conditions.

e. Unstable Soils

Certain areas of the city include landslide-prone or erosion-prone soils. These areas are mapped and regulated under PTMC critical areas provisions. The PROS Plan does not change critical areas designations or protections. Evaluation of unstable soils is more appropriately addressed during site-specific geotechnical review at the development application stage.

f. Filling, Excavation, and Grading

Not applicable to plan adoption. This proposal does not authorize any physical work. Under WAC 197-11-060(4), SEPA does not require analysis of speculative activities not yet proposed.

g. Erosion Potential

Adoption of the PROS Plan does not create erosion potential. To the extent that policies emphasizing vegetation conservation, shoreline protection, and low-impact improvements are implemented in the future, erosion risks could be reduced. Any erosion impacts associated with future construction would be evaluated and mitigated during project-specific review.

h. Impervious Surfaces

The PROS Plan does not modify allowable impervious surface coverage or development standards. Indirect changes in impervious area could only occur through future projects, which would be reviewed under existing regulations.

i. Proposed Measures to Reduce Impacts to Earth

No mitigation measures are required for plan adoption. Existing PTMC regulations governing erosion, grading, geotechnical hazards, and critical areas will apply to future project actions applied for in conformance with the PROS Plan.

B.2 AIR

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

No direct emissions result from adoption of the PROS Plan, because the proposed action is legislative and does not authorize construction, operation, or maintenance activities. Adoption of the PROS Plan does not involve earthmoving, material handling, fuel combustion, or operation of equipment. Therefore, no emissions of criteria pollutants (e.g., particulate matter, nitrogen oxides, carbon monoxide), greenhouse gases, or toxic air contaminants occur as a direct result of the proposal. Because the plan does not approve physical improvements or facilities, there is no construction phase, no operational phase, and no maintenance phase associated with this action.

At a policy level, the PROS Plan emphasizes equitable access to parks, trails, and open space, including improvements to active transportation connectivity. Over time, implementation of these policies could indirectly support reductions in vehicle miles traveled by enabling walking, cycling, and proximity-based recreation. However, any such effect would be indirect, long-term, and dependent on future project-level actions, and therefore cannot be quantified or attributed to plan adoption with specificity.

Air quality impacts that would result from construction activities (e.g., dust, equipment emissions), operational characteristics (e.g., increased visitation, lighting, or facility use), or maintenance activities (e.g., landscaping equipment) are inherently site-specific and dependent on project design, scale, duration, and location. Under WAC 197-11-060(4), SEPA does not require speculative analysis of impacts when no specific project has been proposed. Accordingly, air quality impacts will be evaluated during project-specific SEPA review when a particular park improvement, facility, or infrastructure project is proposed and sufficient information exists to meaningfully evaluate emissions.

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

Port Townsend Paper Company pulp mill, located directly adjacent to the city limits, is a significant contributor of air pollutants and strong odors that impact portions of the city, largely dependent on wind strength and direction. However, no off-site emission sources are created or modified by adoption of the PROS Plan. Port Townsend, like other urbanized coastal communities, contains localized sources of air emissions such as vehicle traffic, marine activity, residential heating, and small-scale commercial operations. These existing conditions are independent of the PROS Plan

and are not affected by its adoption. The plan does not locate new uses, intensify land use, or alter transportation patterns in a way that would increase exposure to off-site emissions.

While future park improvements or facilities could be located in proximity to existing emission sources (e.g., roads or marine facilities), such proximity would depend on site selection and design decisions that have not yet been made.

Assessment of exposure to off-site emissions requires knowledge of specific site locations, prevailing wind patterns, distances to emission sources, and anticipated use patterns. These details are not yet known and cannot be meaningfully analyzed at the plan level. Such analysis will occur during project-level environmental review, where appropriate, based on site-specific conditions and applicable air quality standards.

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

No mitigation measures are required for plan adoption, because no adverse air quality impacts are caused by the non-project action itself. Because adoption of the PROS Plan does not generate emissions, no emission reduction or control measures are necessary at this stage. At a policy level, the plan supports long-term strategies—such as walkability, trail connectivity, and neighborhood access to open space—that are generally consistent with air quality improvement objectives.

If future park development or facility projects result in potential air quality impacts, mitigation measures (such as construction best management practices, dust control, equipment standards, or operational strategies) will be identified and required during project-specific permitting and SEPA review, consistent with applicable state and local regulations.

B.3 WATER

a. Surface Water

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

The affected geographic area (citywide Port Townsend) includes numerous surface water features. Surface water features within the City of Port Townsend include marine shoreline along Puget Sound, Port Townsend Bay, Admiralty Inlet, the Strait of Juan de Fuca, Kah Tai Lagoon, ponds, shoreline embayments, lagoons, freshwater wetlands, stormwater facilities, and seasonal drainage features. These resources are documented in the Critical Areas Ordinance, PROS Plan, and Comprehensive Plan inventories. Adoption of the PROS Plan does not alter the location, extent, or function of these surface waters. The plan recognizes these resources and emphasizes their protection, restoration, and integration into the parks and open space system where appropriate. No new water features are created and no existing waters are modified as a result of adopting the plan. Any direct interaction with surface waters (e.g., trail crossings, shoreline access

features, restoration activities) would depend on future project proposals with defined locations and scopes. Surface water impacts must therefore be evaluated during project-specific environmental review, when sufficient detail exists to assess hydrologic, ecological, and regulatory considerations.

2. Will the proposal require any work over, in, or adjacent to (within 200 feet) the described waters? If yes, please describe and attach available plans.

This question is applicable as a general inquiry but not applicable to the action being reviewed, because adoption of the PROS Plan does not authorize any physical work. The PROS Plan identifies shoreline access, habitat restoration, and environmental stewardship as long-term policy goals. However, it does not approve or permit construction, shoreline modifications, or work within or near surface waters. Existing regulatory frameworks, including the Shoreline Master Program and critical areas regulations, remain fully applicable. Work over, in, or adjacent to surface waters requires precise location, design, timing, and construction methods to evaluate potential impacts. These details will be provided at the time of a development application or capital project proposal, at which point shoreline permits, state and federal approvals, and project-level SEPA review will be required.

3. Estimate the amount of fill and dredge material that would be placed in or removed from surface water or wetlands, and indicate the area of the site that would be affected. Indicate the source of fill material.

Not applicable to plan adoption. No fill or dredge activities are proposed or authorized as part of this non-project action. The PROS Plan does not specify quantities, locations, or methods for any such activities. Fill or dredge impacts are inherently site-specific and require detailed design information. Consistent with SEPA's prohibition on speculative analysis, these impacts will be evaluated during project-level SEPA review when and if a specific proposal involving fill or dredging is advanced.

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

Not applicable to plan adoption. Adoption of the PROS Plan does not require or authorize withdrawal or diversion of surface waters. No water rights or water use changes occur as a result of the plan. If future park improvements or facilities require water use (e.g., irrigation systems or restrooms), water withdrawals and system connections will be evaluated during project design and permitting, including applicable SEPA review and utility approvals.

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

The affected geographic area includes portions of the city located within mapped floodplains; however, the proposal itself does not occupy or modify any specific site. Adoption of the PROS Plan does not alter floodplain boundaries, development standards, or flood hazard conditions. The plan

does not authorize development within floodplains and does not change regulatory controls governing flood hazard areas. Floodplain impacts can only be evaluated when a specific site is proposed for development. Future projects within flood hazard areas will be subject to floodplain regulations and project-specific SEPA review.

6. Does the proposal involve any discharges of waste materials to surface waters? If so, describe the type of waste and anticipated volume of discharge.

Not applicable. Plan adoption does not involve discharges of waste materials. No physical activity occurs that would generate discharges to surface waters. Potential discharges associated with facilities or infrastructure would be evaluated during permitting and SEPA review for specific projects.

b. Ground Water

1. Will groundwater be withdrawn from a well for drinking water or other purposes? Will water be discharged to groundwater?

Not applicable to plan adoption. Adoption of the PROS Plan does not involve groundwater withdrawals or discharges. Existing water supply and wastewater systems remain unchanged. Groundwater impacts depend on project location, water demand, and disposal methods and will be evaluated during project-specific review.

2. Describe waste material discharged into the ground from septic tanks or other sources.

Not applicable. Plan adoption does not authorize septic systems or discharges.

c. Water Runoff (Including Stormwater)

1. Describe the source of runoff and method of collection and disposal.

Adoption of the PROS Plan does not generate stormwater runoff. Stormwater systems within Port Townsend include a mix of conveyance infrastructure governed by existing regulations. The PROS Plan does not modify drainage patterns or system capacities. Any changes in runoff associated with future park development or improvements would be evaluated during project design and SEPA review.

2. Could waste materials enter ground or surface waters?

Not applicable as a result of plan adoption.

3. Does the proposal alter or affect drainage patterns?

Not applicable. The PROS Plan does not change drainage patterns.

4. Proposed measures to reduce or control water impacts

No mitigation is required at the planning stage. Existing stormwater and water quality regulations will apply to future actions.

B.4 PLANTS

a. Check or list the types of vegetation found on the site (e.g., trees, shrubs, grass, wetlands, aquatic vegetation).

This question is applicable at a **programmatic and descriptive level** because the affected geographic area (the City of Port Townsend) contains a wide range of vegetation types.

Vegetation within Port Townsend includes deciduous and evergreen forest canopy, shrubs, grasses, landscaped park vegetation, wetland vegetation, and shoreline and nearshore plant communities. These vegetation types are documented in the 2026 PROS Plan Update and the 2025 Comprehensive Plan as part of citywide environmental inventories.

Adoption of the PROS Plan does not modify the extent, composition, or distribution of existing vegetation. Instead, the plan provides policy guidance recognizing vegetation as a critical component of ecological function, climate resilience, urban livability, and recreational experience. The presence of diverse vegetation types reflects existing environmental conditions rather than impacts attributable to the proposal.

Vegetation conditions and potential impacts vary significantly by location and project type. Detailed analysis of specific vegetation communities is only possible once a particular site, design, and scope of work are proposed. Such analysis will occur during project-specific SEPA review and applicable permitting processes when a development or capital project application is submitted.

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

Not applicable to plan adoption. Adoption of the PROS Plan does not authorize removal, clearing, or alteration of vegetation. No sites are designated for immediate development, and no ground-disturbing activity is approved. Therefore, there is no direct vegetation removal associated with this non-project action.

Indirectly, the PROS Plan emphasizes conservation, stewardship, and restoration of vegetation as a long-term policy objective. To the extent that future park improvements or projects are pursued, they may include a range of outcomes—from vegetation enhancement and invasive species removal to limited and regulated removal for facility upgrades or accessibility improvements. However, such outcomes are neither approved nor required by the plan itself.

Vegetation removal impacts depend on site-specific factors such as existing plant communities, project design, construction methods, and regulatory constraints. These factors cannot be

meaningfully evaluated without a development application. Accordingly, vegetation impacts will be analyzed during **project-level SEPA review**, where avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures can be identified based on site conditions.

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

This question is applicable as an inventory-level inquiry but does not identify plan-level impacts. The City of Port Townsend, as a whole, may contain areas where sensitive or protected plant species occur, particularly within wetland or shoreline environments. Adoption of the PROS Plan does not alter habitat conditions or increase the likelihood of impacts to threatened or endangered plant species. The plan explicitly acknowledges the importance of protecting sensitive ecological areas and integrating best practices for resource stewardship. Identification of threatened or endangered plant species and evaluation of potential impacts require site-specific surveys conducted in accordance with applicable standards. Such surveys and impact assessments will occur during **project-specific environmental review**, where appropriate, when development or restoration activities are proposed in areas with the potential to support sensitive plant species.

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

This question is applicable at a policy-level. The PROS Plan emphasizes long-term vegetation stewardship through policies supporting the use of native plants, habitat restoration, invasive species management, and enhancement of the urban forest canopy. These measures are framed as guiding principles rather than enforceable project approvals. Adoption of the plan signals the City's intent to prioritize ecological function and landscape resilience in future park and open space projects. Implementation of landscaping and vegetation enhancement measures depends on specific site conditions, funding, design, and regulatory review. The effectiveness and impacts of such measures will be evaluated during project planning and permitting, including SEPA review where applicable.

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

This question is applicable at a general, descriptive level. Like most urban environments, Port Townsend contains invasive and non-native plant species commonly associated with disturbed landscapes, rights-of-way, shoreline areas, and urban parks. These include species typical of the Pacific Northwest urban context. Adoption of the PROS Plan does not introduce new invasive species or alter existing conditions. The plan acknowledges invasive species as a long-term management challenge and supports coordinated management and restoration initiatives. Site-specific identification and management of invasive species will occur during implementation of individual projects, when appropriate surveys and mitigation strategies can be identified.

B.5 ANIMALS

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

This question is applicable at a citywide, programmatic scale. The City of Port Townsend supports a range of wildlife species typical of coastal, urban, and forested environments. These include birds (e.g., songbirds, raptors, shorebirds), mammals (e.g., deer, raccoons, small mammals), fish species associated with nearshore and freshwater habitats, and various invertebrates. These species distributions are part of existing environmental conditions and are documented in planning inventories referenced by the PROS Plan. Adoption of the PROS Plan does not alter habitat availability or species presence. Instead, the plan recognizes wildlife habitat as an integral component of open space and environmental quality. Species presence and habitat use vary widely by location and season. Detailed wildlife analysis requires site-specific data and will be conducted as part of project-specific environmental review when a development or capital project is proposed.

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

This question is applicable as a policy-level inquiry. While the broader region supports species protected under state or federal law (e.g., certain fish species or migratory birds), adoption of the PROS Plan does not create new threats or modify habitats in a way that would adversely affect protected species. The plan reinforces existing commitments to habitat protection and ecological integrity. Evaluation of impacts to threatened or endangered species requires site-specific surveys and consultation processes that occur during permitting and SEPA review for individual projects. These analyses are beyond the scope of a non-project action but are preserved for future review.

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

This question is applicable at a regional and contextual level. Port Townsend lies within regional migratory corridors used by birds and fish species typical of Puget Sound and the broader Pacific Flyway. Adoption of the PROS Plan does not disrupt these migration routes or introduce barriers to movement. On the contrary, policies supporting shoreline protection, habitat connectivity, and low-impact recreation may contribute positively to long-term habitat function. Potential impacts to migration routes would depend on the location and design of specific improvements or facilities. Such impacts will be assessed during project-level SEPA review as appropriate.

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

This question is applicable at the policy level. The PROS Plan includes policies promoting habitat preservation, restoration, and low-impact recreation to support wildlife coexistence within urban and shoreline environments. These measures are aspirational and programmatic, guiding future actions rather than mandating specific interventions. Implementation of wildlife preservation or enhancement measures requires site-specific design and evaluation. Such measures will be

refined and reviewed during the planning and permitting of individual projects, including SEPA review where required.

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

This question is applicable as a policy-level inquiry at a general, descriptive level. Like many maritime urban environments, Port Townsend may contain invasive animal species. These include species typical of the Pacific Northwest urban context. Adoption of the PROS Plan does not introduce new invasive species or alter existing conditions. The plan acknowledges invasive species as a long-term management challenge and supports coordinated management and restoration initiatives. Site-specific identification and management of invasive species will occur during implementation of individual projects, when appropriate surveys and mitigation strategies can be identified.

B.6 ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

a. What kinds of energy (electric, natural gas, gasoline, solar, wind, etc.) will be used for the proposal?

This question is applicable in form, but no energy is directly consumed by adoption of the PROS Plan, because the proposal is a legislative, non-project action. Adoption of the PROS Plan does not involve construction, operation, or maintenance activities and therefore does not require or consume electricity, fossil fuels, renewable energy, or other energy resources. No facilities are built, no equipment is operated, and no energy-using infrastructure is installed as part of the plan adoption action.

At the policy level, the PROS Plan articulates long-term goals that may influence future energy use indirectly. For example, policies promoting neighborhood-scale access to parks, expanded trail connectivity, and integration of recreation with non-motorized transportation networks may reduce reliance on vehicle travel for recreational purposes. These policy directions are consistent with broader sustainability and energy-efficiency objectives; however, any such effects are indirect, contextual, and dependent on future project-level actions, and therefore are not quantifiable or attributable to adoption of the plan itself.

Energy consumption impacts depend on the type, size, location, and design of individual projects (e.g., park facilities, lighting systems, maintenance operations). These details are not defined by the PROS Plan. Under SEPA's rule of reason, evaluation of energy use is deferred until a development application or capital project proposal is submitted, at which time energy demand and efficiency strategies can be meaningfully analyzed during project-specific SEPA review.

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

This question is generally applicable under SEPA, but **not applicable to plan adoption** because the proposal does not authorize development that could alter building placement, height, or massing. Adoption of the PROS Plan does not create structures, alter setbacks, or modify

development standards that would cast shadows or otherwise affect solar access. The plan contains no siting or dimensional standards and does not change zoning or allowable development envelopes.

At a conceptual level, the PROS Plan supports environmental stewardship and sustainable design principles, which are compatible with long-term solar access considerations. However, the plan itself has no direct effect on solar availability to adjacent properties. Potential solar access impacts can only be evaluated once a specific project location, building form, and height are proposed. Such analysis will be conducted during project-level SEPA review and applicable land use permitting, consistent with adopted development regulations.

c. What kinds of energy conservation features are included in the proposal?

This question is applicable at a **policy and aspirational level**, but not at an implementation level. The PROS Plan includes policy guidance encouraging long-term sustainability, efficient use of resources, adaptive reuse of existing facilities, and durable design that minimizes operational costs and environmental impacts. These policies establish direction rather than requirements. Adoption of the plan does not install energy-conserving systems or mandate specific technologies.

At a programmatic level, these policies reflect the City’s intent to integrate energy-efficient practices into future park and facility projects, where feasible and appropriate.

Energy conservation features (such as lighting efficiency, materials selection, or building systems) are inherently design-specific. Evaluation of their effectiveness and environmental impact will occur during the design, permitting, and SEPA review of individual projects, when specific proposals are advanced.

d. What kinds of natural resources (non-energy resources such as minerals, timber, fisheries, etc.) are used or affected by the proposal?

This question is applicable as a general inquiry, but no natural resources are used or affected by adoption of the PROS Plan. Adoption of the PROS Plan does not involve extraction or consumption of minerals, timber harvesting, fishing activities, or other use of natural resources. The plan does not authorize land-clearing, shoreline modification, or resource removal.

Conversely, the PROS Plan recognizes natural resources—such as forested areas, wetlands, and shoreline habitats—as assets to be protected and stewarded. Policy-level emphasis is placed on conservation rather than resource exploitation.

If a future project involves interaction with natural resources (e.g., shoreline restoration, reforestation, or trail construction), such impacts will be evaluated during project-specific SEPA review and associated permitting, where resource-specific considerations can be addressed in detail.

B.7 ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH

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

This question is applicable generally under SEPA, but not applicable in terms of direct impacts, because adoption of the PROS Plan does not authorize physical activities that could create environmental health hazards. Adoption of the PROS Plan does not involve handling, storage, or transport of hazardous materials; does not introduce industrial processes; and does not authorize construction activities that could increase risk of spills, fire, or exposure to toxic substances. No new sources of environmental health risk are created by the legislative action.

At the policy level, the PROS Plan emphasizes safe, accessible, and inclusive public spaces. These policies are aligned with reducing environmental health risks over time (e.g., improved access to outdoor recreation and green space), but such benefits are indirect and long-term. Environmental health risks associated with specific facilities or construction methods can only be assessed once those elements are proposed. Any such risks will be evaluated during project-level SEPA review and during compliance with applicable health, safety, and building codes as part of a development application.

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

Adoption of the PROS Plan does not authorize physical activities on sites that may be contaminated from past and present uses. Past uses in the planning area include auto repair facilities, fuel stations, dry cleaning, historic dump sites, underground storage tanks, industrial boat yard, and bulk oil dispensaries. Six sites in Port Townsend are listed on Ecology's Hazardous Sites List. Any contamination risks will be evaluated during project-level SEPA review and during compliance with applicable health, safety, and building codes as part of a development application.

- 2) Describe existing hazardous chemicals/conditions that might affect project development and design. This includes underground hazardous liquid and gas transmission pipelines located within the project area and in the vicinity.

Not applicable to this non-project action. Adoption of the PROS Plan does not involve development or design of future project actions, which will be reviewed for compliance with applicable health, safety, and building codes as part of a development application.

- 3) Describe special emergency services that might be required.

This non-project action will not require special emergency services. Future project-level development of park and recreation facilities will be reviewed for access to emergency services as appropriate.

- 4) Proposed measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards, if any: No mitigation measures are required at the planning stage. Because the PROS Plan does not create environmental health impacts, no avoidance or mitigation measures are necessary for plan adoption. Existing regulatory frameworks governing public

health, safety, noise, hazardous materials, and construction practices remain in effect. Mitigation measures will be identified and applied during project-specific review, where necessary, based on the nature and location of proposed actions.

5. Are there any hazardous materials that will be stored, used, or disposed of as part of this proposal?

Not applicable to this non-project action. Adoption of the PROS Plan does not involve the use, storage, or disposal of hazardous materials. No facilities are constructed and no operations are established as part of the proposal.

Potential hazardous materials use (e.g., fuels, cleaning agents, construction materials) would depend on the nature of a specific future project. Such materials would be managed in compliance with applicable regulations and reviewed during project-level SEPA analysis, where required.

b. What types of noise exist in the area that may affect the proposal?

This question is applicable as a contextual inquiry. The City of Port Townsend includes typical urban noise sources such as vehicle traffic, marine activity, and community uses. Adoption of the PROS Plan does not alter existing noise environments, because it does not authorize new uses or activities.

The plan's emphasis on parks and open spaces does not intensify noise sources; rather, such spaces may provide buffering and passive recreation opportunities.

Noise impacts associated with construction or operation of future facilities can only be assessed when project details are known. Such analysis will occur during project-specific SEPA review, where appropriate mitigation measures can be identified.

d. What types and levels of noise would be created by the proposal?

Not applicable. Plan adoption does not generate noise. No construction, operation, or maintenance noise occurs as a result of adopting the PROS Plan. Noise impacts from future park improvements or facilities are dependent on project design and activities and will be evaluated during subsequent SEPA review or permitting.

B.8 LAND AND SHORELINE USE

a. What is the current use of the site and adjacent properties? Will the proposal affect current land uses on or near the site?

This question is applicable at a citywide, programmatic level because the PROS Plan applies to the entire City of Port Townsend. Current land uses within the city include residential, commercial, institutional, industrial, public facilities, transportation, parks and open space, and shoreline uses regulated under the Shoreline Master Program. These uses are established by the Comprehensive Plan, zoning regulations, and shoreline designations. Adoption of the PROS Plan does not change

existing land uses, does not convert land from one use category to another, and does not authorize new or intensified uses on any parcel.

The PROS Plan functions as a policy-implementation document that guides long-term planning for publicly owned or publicly accessible parks, recreation facilities, and open spaces that are already contemplated in existing land use designations. As such, the proposal does not affect current land uses on or near any site at the time of adoption.

Indirectly, the plan may influence how the City prioritizes maintenance, enhancement, or stewardship of existing park and open space lands. These influences occur within the bounds of existing land use designations and do not represent a shift in land use pattern.

Any future project that modifies an individual site, such as a park improvement, facility upgrade, or acquisition, will occur on a site with a defined land use designation and will be evaluated for consistency with zoning, shoreline regulations, and SEPA at the time a development application or capital project proposal is submitted.

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

This question is applicable as a standard SEPA inquiry but is not applicable in effect for this proposal. There are no lands within the City of Port Townsend actively designated or used for agricultural production in the manner contemplated by SEPA's agricultural land considerations. Adoption of the PROS Plan does not convert agricultural land to non-agricultural use and does not interfere with ongoing agricultural activities.

If future land acquisition or reuse proposals were to involve land with a prior agricultural history, those circumstances would be evaluated at the project level. No such evaluation is required or appropriate for plan adoption.

c. Does the proposal include any land that is zoned or designated for industrial use? If so, describe current and proposed uses.

This question is applicable at a citywide descriptive level. The city includes areas zoned or designated for industrial or maritime-related uses. Adoption of the PROS Plan does not rezone any land, does not redesignate industrial property, and does not authorize conversion of industrial land to park or open space use.

Where the PROS Plan references potential future acquisition or access improvements, such references are conceptual and subject to future land use decisions, market conditions, funding availability, and regulatory review. The plan does not diminish the protection or availability of industrial lands identified in the Comprehensive Plan.

If a future proposal were to involve acquisition, reuse, or modification of land currently designated for industrial use, that proposal would require separate land use approvals and SEPA review, at which time compatibility, displacement, and cumulative impacts would be evaluated in detail.

d. Describe any structures on the site; are any proposed to be demolished or removed?

This question is applicable generally but not applicable in terms of direct impacts because this is a non-project action.

Adoption of the PROS Plan does not identify or authorize demolition or removal of any structures. No buildings or facilities are approved for construction, expansion, or removal as part of this action.

The plan acknowledges existing park facilities and infrastructure for inventory and planning purposes only. It does not approve modification, removal, or replacement of any structures.

Demolition or modification of structures requires site-specific review and permits. Any proposal involving structural changes would undergo project-level SEPA review, building permit review, and any additional regulatory processes required by the PTMC.

e. What is the current zoning classification of the site and adjacent properties? Will the proposal affect zoning classifications?

This question is applicable at a regulatory context level. Zoning classifications within Port Townsend are established through the Comprehensive Plan and implementing zoning code. Adoption of the PROS Plan does not amend zoning districts, does not revise use tables, and does not change development standards. All existing zoning classifications remain in effect.

The PROS Plan is explicitly an implementing functional plan, not a regulatory amendment. It provides guidance for planning public parks and open spaces within existing zoning frameworks and does not create new development rights.

Washington courts have consistently held that adoption of a planning document that does not amend zoning or authorize development does not constitute a de facto rezone or land use approval (*Save Our Rural Environment v. Snohomish County*).

Any development proposal inconsistent with zoning would require separate legislative or quasi-judicial action and accompanying SEPA review at that time.

f. What is the current Comprehensive Plan designation of the site and adjacent properties? Will the proposal affect those designations?

This question is applicable because the PROS Plan implements Comprehensive Plan policies. The PROS Plan does not amend the Comprehensive Plan land use map or designations. Instead, it

implements parks, recreation, and open space policies already adopted as part of the Comprehensive Plan.

By functioning as a subordinate functional plan, the PROS Plan operates within the policy framework already reviewed under SEPA during the 2025 Comprehensive Plan update. It does not change planned land use patterns, development capacity, or growth allocation. Any proposal to amend Comprehensive Plan designations would be subject to its own SEPA review process at the time such an amendment is proposed.

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

This question is applicable because Port Townsend contains regulated shoreline areas. Shoreline areas within the city are regulated under the adopted Shoreline Master Program. Adoption of the PROS Plan does not modify shoreline environment designations, does not change allowable shoreline uses, and does not authorize shoreline development.

The PROS Plan recognizes shoreline access, ecological function, and public enjoyment as long-term goals but defers all regulatory authority to the Shoreline Master Program and other existing regulations.

Any future shoreline access improvement, restoration project, or recreational facility within shoreline jurisdiction will require shoreline permits and project-specific SEPA review, at which time shoreline impacts will be thoroughly evaluated.

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

The planning area includes environmentally sensitive areas (including geologically hazardous, frequently flooded and wetlands, aquifer recharge areas, and fish and wildlife habitat) as indicated on the City's Critical Areas Map. Environmentally sensitive areas associated with specific projects will be reviewed with project-level design and permitting.

i. Has the proposal been reviewed for consistency with applicable land use plans and policies?

This question is applicable and affirmatively addressed. The PROS Plan is explicitly designed to be consistent with the 2025 Comprehensive Plan, the Shoreline Master Program, and applicable PTMC provisions. It does not introduce conflicting policy direction and does not supersede adopted regulatory frameworks. Consistency with adopted plans ensures that adoption of the PROS Plan does not introduce new or unanticipated land use impacts beyond those already considered during comprehensive planning.

Consistency of individual projects with comprehensive planning and zoning policies will be evaluated at the time of a development or capital project application, as required by applicable law.

j. Would the proposal significantly affect population, density, or intensity of land use?

This question is applicable at a cumulative effects level. The PROS Plan does not increase development capacity, does not change density allowances, does not house or displace any residents, and does not alter intensity of land use. Population growth assumptions and land use intensities are established in the Comprehensive Plan and were evaluated under SEPA during that adoption process.

The PROS Plan supports recreational and open space improvements that respond to anticipated population growth but does not drive or induce additional growth beyond what is planned. If a future proposal were to intensify land use, that proposal would be subject to zoning review, Comprehensive Plan consistency review, and SEPA at the time it is proposed.

B.9 HOUSING

a. Approximately how many existing housing units will be removed or demolished as a result of the proposal? If any, describe.

This question is applicable as a SEPA checklist item, but no housing units are removed or demolished as a result of this proposal. Adoption of the PROS Plan does not authorize demolition of existing structures, does not identify housing sites for conversion, and does not approve any land acquisitions that would displace housing. The plan functions as a policy and planning document focused on parks, recreation, and open space and does not include regulatory changes that would enable or incentivize removal of housing.

The plan inventories existing parks and open spaces and identifies conceptual opportunities to improve or expand public recreational access, primarily on already-public land or through voluntary future actions that would be subject to separate approvals. Nothing in the PROS Plan directs or compels conversion of residential land or removal of housing units.

If a future, specific proposal were to involve acquisition or redevelopment of property containing housing units, that proposal would require project-specific approvals, including SEPA review, at which time potential housing displacement and associated impacts would be fully evaluated. Such impacts are not reasonably foreseeable at the plan adoption stage and cannot be speculated upon consistent with SEPA's rule of reason.

b. Approximately how many housing units will be provided as a result of the proposal? If any, describe.

This question is applicable but no housing units are provided by adoption of the PROS Plan. The PROS Plan does not approve residential development, does not increase residential capacity, and does not modify zoning or Comprehensive Plan designations related to housing. It is not a land use or housing policy document and does not include provisions that would directly or indirectly result in the construction of new housing units.

The plan may indirectly support community livability by enhancing access to parks, recreation, and open space, which are factors often associated with housing demand and quality of life. However, such indirect effects are contextual and do not constitute provision of housing or changes to housing supply attributable to the plan.

Any housing development proposal would be subject to zoning, Comprehensive Plan consistency review, and project-specific SEPA analysis at the time a development application is submitted.

c. Will the proposal affect the number or type of housing units available to the public or alter housing affordability?

This question is applicable as a social and land-use context inquiry. Adoption of the PROS Plan does not directly affect the number, type, or affordability of housing units. The plan does not change development regulations, does not alter allowable density, and does not displace housing. It implements Comprehensive Plan policies by planning for recreational infrastructure in a manner that supports overall community well-being.

At a broader policy level, enhanced access to parks and open space can be associated with improved neighborhood quality of life, which over time may influence housing market dynamics. However, these relationships are indirect, multifactorial, and not attributable to the adoption of a functional plan alone. SEPA does not require speculative analysis of such macroeconomic effects.

If future projects under the PROS Plan were proposed that could directly affect housing availability or affordability—such as redevelopment of a site containing housing or to add housing—those impacts would be evaluated during project-specific SEPA review, when details about location, scale, and displacement potential are known.

d. Will the proposal result in the displacement of residents or businesses? If so, describe.

This question is applicable, but no displacement results from adoption of the PROS Plan. Adoption of the PROS Plan does not authorize demolition, redevelopment, or change of use that would displace residents or businesses. The plan does not designate properties for acquisition or redevelopment in a manner that causes displacement, and it does not alter zoning or land use entitlements.

Displacement impacts are inherently site-specific and must be evaluated at the time a concrete proposal is advanced. Any future proposal with displacement potential would require project-specific SEPA review and any applicable relocation or mitigation measures required by law.

B.10 AESTHETICS

a. What is the aesthetic character of the site and surrounding area? What is the tallest height of any proposed structure(s), not including antennas; what is the principal exterior building material(s) proposed?

This question is applicable at a citywide and descriptive level, given the scope of the non-project action. The City of Port Townsend contains a broad range of aesthetic environments, including historic downtown areas, residential neighborhoods, waterfront and shoreline vistas, forested open spaces, and developed parks and recreation facilities. These aesthetic characteristics are intrinsic to the city's identity and are documented in comprehensive and functional plans. As a non-project action, adopting the PROS Plan will not construct structures, meaning that height and principal exterior materials will be assessed in future project-level actions.

Adoption of the PROS Plan does not alter existing visual conditions. It does not approve new buildings, structures, lighting, or landscape modifications. The plan recognizes scenic and visual qualities as important components of park and open space planning and encourages context-sensitive design for future improvements.

Aesthetic impacts depend on site-specific attributes, design details, scale, materials, and context. Such analysis can only be conducted when a particular project is proposed and detailed design information is available.

b. What types of views are present in the area? Will the proposal affect views?

This question is applicable at a contextual level. Port Townsend supports a variety of valued views, including marine and shoreline views, views of open space and forested areas, and neighborhood streetscapes. Adoption of the PROS Plan does not block, modify, or otherwise affect views because it does not authorize construction or changes in building form.

At the policy level, the plan's emphasis on stewardship and enhancement of open spaces may support the preservation and appreciation of existing views, but it does not guarantee or alter specific view corridors.

Potential view impacts from structures or landscape changes will be evaluated during project-specific SEPA review, where height, location, and design can be assessed relative to surrounding viewsheds.

c. What types of architectural styles and/or materials are common in the area? Will the proposal alter these characteristics?

This question is applicable as a contextual inquiry. Architectural styles and materials throughout Port Townsend reflect the city's historic legacy, residential character, and coastal setting. Adoption of the PROS Plan does not introduce new architectural styles or materials because it does not authorize construction or design standards.

The plan includes high-level guidance encouraging context-appropriate, durable, and aesthetically sensitive design for future park and recreation improvements, consistent with existing policies.

Architectural and material impacts are design-specific and must be evaluated during permitting and SEPA review of individual projects.

d. Will the proposal result in glare or reflection that could affect views or safety?

Not applicable to plan adoption. No structures, surfaces, or lighting systems are authorized by adoption of the PROS Plan. Therefore, there is no source of glare or reflection associated with this action. If future projects involve reflective materials or lighting, glare impacts will be evaluated during design review, permitting, and SEPA analysis at the project level.

e. Proposed measures to reduce aesthetic impacts, if any.

No mitigation measures are required for plan adoption. Because adoption of the PROS Plan does not result in aesthetic impacts, no avoidance or mitigation measures are necessary at this stage. Existing design guidelines, historic preservation requirements, and development standards remain in effect and will govern future projects.

Aesthetic mitigation measures—such as landscape screening, building articulation, or design modifications—will be identified and applied during project-specific review, where appropriate.

B.11 LIGHT AND GLARE

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

This question is applicable as a standard SEPA inquiry; however, it is not applicable in effect because adoption of the PROS Plan does not authorize physical development or lighting installations. Adoption of the PROS Plan does not involve construction, installation, or operation of lighting systems. No new light sources, reflective surfaces, or illumination schedules are created by this legislative action. Therefore, no direct light or glare impacts occur at any time of day as a result of adopting the plan.

At a policy level, the PROS Plan includes general guidance related to safety, accessibility, and stewardship in public spaces. These policies are aspirational and do not prescribe lighting locations, intensities, fixtures, or technologies. As such, they do not create light or glare impacts independent of future project actions.

Light and glare impacts depend on site location, fixture type, height, orientation, lumen output, reflective materials, and hours of operation—details that can only be evaluated once a specific facility or improvement is proposed. When future park facilities, trail improvements, or amenities are advanced, lighting impacts will be reviewed during **project-specific SEPA analysis** and applicable permitting and design review processes.

b. Could light or glare from the proposal adversely affect views or nearby residences?

This question is applicable generally, but no adverse effects occur as a result of plan adoption. Because the PROS Plan does not authorize any light-emitting features, it does not affect nearby residences, viewpoints, or sensitive areas through glare or illumination. Existing lighting conditions in neighborhoods, parks, and shoreline areas remain unchanged by this action.

At a conceptual level, the plan’s emphasis on context-sensitive design acknowledges the importance of minimizing impacts to surrounding uses, including residential areas and natural environments. However, such considerations remain policy guidance until applied through specific projects.

Potential impacts to nearby residences or views from lighting are inherently site-specific. Evaluation of such impacts will occur during **project-level SEPA review** and, where applicable, design review or shoreline permitting, when lighting details and locations are known.

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

Existing light sources in Port Townsend are typical of an urban environment. As light and glare are site-specific, evaluation of such impacts will occur during project level SEPA and other relevant permitting to assess the impacts of off-site light and glare.

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

No mitigation measures are required for plan adoption. Because adoption of the PROS Plan does not result in light or glare impacts, no reduction or control measures are necessary at this stage. Existing municipal regulations, design standards, and best practices—addressing lighting placement, intensity, and shielding—remain in effect for future development.

If future projects propose lighting that could affect surrounding properties or natural areas, mitigation measures (such as shielding, reduced intensity, curfews, or fixture selection) will be identified and required during project-specific SEPA review and permitting.

B.12 RECREATION

a. What designated and informal recreational opportunities would be affected by the proposal?

This question is applicable and central to the proposal, as the PROS Plan is expressly focused on parks, recreation, and open space. Adoption of the PROS Plan does not remove or displace existing recreational opportunities. Existing parks, trails, open spaces, and recreational facilities remain available and unchanged upon adoption of the plan. Instead, the PROS Plan provides a long-term framework to guide future investments, maintenance, and enhancements to the recreational system.

The plan identifies existing recreational assets, evaluates community needs, and sets policy direction for improving access, equity, and functionality over time. These effects are programmatic

While the PROS Plan identifies conceptual projects and priorities, any actual modification of recreational facilities—such as construction of amenities, trail connections, or facility upgrades—will be evaluated during project-specific SEPA review, when details about location, design, and scope are known.

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

This question is applicable, but no displacement of recreational uses occurs as a result of plan adoption. The PROS Plan does not authorize changes that would eliminate or restrict current recreational uses. It does not close parks, remove trails, or reduce access to open space. Instead, it is intended to support continuity, enhancement, and equitable distribution of recreational opportunities.

If a future project were to temporarily or permanently displace a recreational use (e.g., during construction or repurposing of a facility), such impacts would be evaluated during project-level SEPA analysis, including consideration of avoidance, minimization, or temporary relocation strategies.

c. Would the proposal create new recreational uses or opportunities? If so, describe.

This question is applicable at a policy and planning level. Adoption of the PROS Plan does not immediately create new recreational facilities or opportunities. However, it establishes a policy framework that may lead to future enhancements such as expanded trail networks, improved access to shoreline areas, upgraded park amenities, and increased programming. These outcomes are contingent on future actions, funding, and approvals.

As a planning document, the PROS Plan sets direction rather than implementing improvements. Any new recreational opportunities arise only upon subsequent project approval.

Creation of new recreational uses involves physical development and operational considerations that can only be evaluated at the time a specific project proposal is advanced. Environmental impacts associated with new facilities or uses will be reviewed during project-specific SEPA processes.

d. Could the proposal affect recreational demand or use patterns?

This question is applicable at a programmatic level. Adoption of the PROS Plan may influence long-term patterns of recreation demand by prioritizing equitable access, neighborhood-scale parks, and diverse recreational opportunities. These changes are incremental and strategic rather than immediate or physically disruptive.

The plan does not impose restrictions or reallocate access that would cause adverse recreational impacts. Rather, it provides a planning framework intended to align recreational services with population growth and community needs already contemplated by the Comprehensive Plan.

Shifts in recreational demand related to specific facilities or programs will depend on the nature and location of future projects and will be considered during project planning and environmental review as appropriate.

e. Proposed measures to reduce or control recreational impacts, if any.

No mitigation is required for plan adoption. Because adoption of the PROS Plan does not create adverse recreational impacts, no mitigation measures are necessary at this stage. The plan itself is designed to enhance recreational access, reduce inequities, and improve system sustainability over time.

If future projects result in temporary disruptions or changes to recreational access, mitigation measures—such as phased construction, temporary facilities, or signage—will be developed and reviewed during project-specific SEPA analysis and project implementation.

B.13 HISTORIC AND CULTURAL PRESERVATION

a. Are there any buildings, structures, or sites located on or near the site that are listed or eligible for listing on national, state, or local historic registers? If so, describe.

This question is applicable at a citywide, contextual level, because the City of Port Townsend contains numerous historic and cultural resources. Port Townsend is known for its historic downtown, waterfront district, residential neighborhoods, and culturally significant landscapes. These resources are documented through local, state, and federal inventories and are protected through existing preservation regulations and policies. Adoption of the PROS Plan does not alter the designation, status, or integrity of any historic or cultural resource.

The PROS Plan inventories parks, open spaces, and publicly accessible lands and acknowledges the historic and cultural significance of certain areas where applicable. However, the plan does not authorize construction, demolition, alteration, or adaptive reuse of any structures. Its role is limited to policy guidance and planning considerations.

Evaluation of impacts to historic or cultural resources requires site-specific information about proposed work (e.g., ground disturbance, structural modification, visual impacts), which is not available at the planning stage. Any future project affecting historic resources will undergo project-specific SEPA review and any additional review required by historic preservation laws at the time of a development or capital project application.

b. Are there any places, structures, or objects of cultural, archaeological, tribal, or religious significance on or near the site? If so, describe.

This question is applicable at a programmatic level. The lands within Port Townsend include areas

of cultural and archaeological importance, including traditional tribal use areas, historic landscapes, and locations with potential archaeological sensitivity—particularly along shorelines and older settlement areas. Adoption of the PROS Plan does not disturb land, alter landscapes, or otherwise affect these resources.

The PROS Plan acknowledges the presence and importance of cultural and tribal history and encourages respectful stewardship of culturally significant sites within park and open space planning contexts.

Identification and evaluation of archaeological and cultural resources require site-specific surveys and consultation with affected tribes where appropriate. Such work will occur at the time of project-specific environmental review, when the nature and extent of ground-disturbing activities are known.

c. Describe the extent to which the proposal may affect historic preservation efforts or cultural resources.

This question is applicable, but no adverse effects occur as a result of plan adoption. Adoption of the PROS Plan does not undermine historic preservation efforts. It does not change preservation regulations, does not diminish protections for historic resources, and does not approve projects that could adversely affect such resources. In some cases, the plan may reinforce preservation goals by highlighting the importance of historic parks, landscapes, and public spaces as part of the community's identity.

Any future proposal with the potential to affect historic or cultural resources would be reviewed individually through **project-level SEPA analysis** and applicable historic preservation review procedures before approval.

d. Proposed measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts to historic or cultural resources, if any.

No mitigation measures are required at the planning stage because no impacts are caused by plan adoption. Existing regulatory frameworks governing historic and cultural resources remain in effect. The PROS Plan does not supersede or replace those requirements.

Mitigation measures—such as avoidance, documentation, design modification, or consultation—will be identified and implemented during project-specific review if and when a project with potential impacts to historic or cultural resources is proposed.

B.14 TRANSPORTATION

a. Identify public streets, highways, transit routes, and other transportation facilities serving the area.

This question is applicable at a citywide and system-level. Port Townsend is served by a network of local streets, state facilities, pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, and transit services. The PROS Plan references this transportation network primarily to support integration of parks, trails, and

open spaces with non-motorized access and community connectivity. Adoption of the plan does not modify or expand transportation infrastructure.

The plan complements, but does not amend, adopted transportation plans and policies.

Specific transportation improvements, if any, related to future park or trail projects would be evaluated during project-specific SEPA review and applicable transportation permitting when those projects are proposed.

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

This question is applicable at a citywide and system-level. Port Townsend is served by Jefferson Transit Authority, which recently updated its comprehensive plan. Port Townsend's Comprehensive Plan goals and policies now include direction to coordinate development of park and recreation facilities with Jefferson Transit Authority to maximize accessibility via public transit. The PROS Plan complements, but does not amend, this and other adopted transportation policies. Future project-level actions for park and recreation uses will be evaluated for access to public transit.

c. Will the proposal require or result in new or altered transportation facilities? If so, describe.

This question is applicable, but no new or altered transportation facilities are authorized by plan adoption. Adoption of the PROS Plan does not approve road construction, street widening, parking facilities, or changes to transit infrastructure. It identifies conceptual opportunities for trail connections and non-motorized access improvements, but these are not authorized or designed through the plan.

Any proposal to construct or alter transportation facilities will require separate review, including traffic analysis and **project-level SEPA review**, when details concerning alignment, design, and use are available.

d. Will the proposal affect traffic volumes, circulation, or level of service?

This question is applicable as a traffic and circulation inquiry. Adoption of the PROS Plan does not generate vehicle trips or alter traffic circulation. It does not approve facilities that would attract traffic or increase demand. Any incremental changes in travel behavior related to improved parks or trails would result from future projects rather than the planning document itself.

At a policy level, the plan supports non-motorized access and proximity-based recreation, which may contribute positively to mobility options but does not adversely affect vehicular level of service.

Traffic impacts must be evaluated using project-specific information, such as use intensity, parking supply, and access points. This analysis will occur during project-specific SEPA review if a future proposal has the potential to affect traffic conditions.

e. Will the proposal require new or expanded parking facilities?

Not applicable to plan adoption. The PROS Plan does not approve or require parking facilities. Parking needs associated with future park or recreation improvements will depend on specific project characteristics and locations. Parking impacts will be evaluated during project planning and SEPA review when specific use patterns and parking demands can be assessed.

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

This question is applicable on a citywide-level. The city of Port Townsend is served by Washington State Coupeville Ferry via a dock in downtown Port Townsend. Jefferson County International Airport is located outside city-limits, four miles to the southwest.

g. Will the proposal interfere with, affect or be affected by the movement of agricultural and forest products on roads or streets in the area? If so, generally describe.

This question is applicable as a traffic and circulation inquiry. Adoption of the PROS Plan does not generate vehicle trips or alter traffic circulation that would be impacted by existing transportation of agricultural and forest products on streets in Port Townsend. Future project-level development of park and recreation facilities will be reviewed for circulation impacts during submittal and environmental review.

h. Proposed measures to reduce or mitigate transportation impacts, if any.

No transportation mitigation measures are required for plan adoption. Because adoption of the PROS Plan does not generate transportation impacts, no mitigation measures are necessary at this stage. Existing transportation regulations and planning processes remain applicable.

If future projects create transportation impacts, mitigation measures—such as access management, non-motorized facilities, or parking strategies—will be developed and reviewed during project-specific SEPA analysis.

B.15 PUBLIC SERVICES

a. Would the proposal result in an increased demand for public services, including police, fire protection, emergency medical services, schools, parks, or other governmental services? If so, generally describe.

This question is applicable as a standard SEPA inquiry but no increase in demand for public services results from adoption of the PROS Plan. Adoption of the PROS Plan does not authorize physical development, population growth, or changes in land use intensity. Accordingly, it does not directly increase demand for police services, fire protection, emergency medical services, schools, or utilities. No facilities are constructed, no new uses are approved, and no operational programs are initiated as part of the plan adoption action.

The plan itself functions as a long-range planning document that evaluates existing recreational assets, identifies maintenance and stewardship needs, and establishes policy direction for future improvements. In this sense, the PROS Plan may improve the City's ability to manage existing

public services more efficiently by prioritizing investments and maintenance in the parks and recreation system. However, such improvements do not increase service demand beyond what is already anticipated by the Comprehensive Plan.

Increased demand for public services occurs only when specific development or capital projects are proposed that alter population, usage intensity, or operational needs. Any future project implemented under the PROS Plan—such as construction of a new facility or significant expansion of an existing park amenity—would be evaluated during project-specific SEPA review, at which time impacts on police, fire, emergency response, and other services would be assessed based on defined project characteristics.

b. Would the proposal require the provision of new or expanded public services? If so, describe.

This question is applicable, but the proposal does not require new or expanded public services. Adoption of the PROS Plan does not commit the City to expanding police, fire, emergency, or other governmental services. While the plan identifies long-term strategies for parks and recreation, all implementation actions are contingent on future budgeting, staffing decisions, and project approvals. Adoption of the plan itself does not allocate resources or expand service capacity.

Where the plan discusses maintenance, safety, or accessibility objectives, these are intended to guide long-term planning rather than create immediate service obligations. If a future project under the PROS Plan would require additional staffing, emergency access, or service capacity, those needs would be identified and evaluated during project-specific SEPA review and budget authorization processes.

c. How would the proposal affect existing public service facilities?

This question is applicable at a policy and management level. Adoption of the PROS Plan does not alter existing public service facilities or operational protocols. The plan inventories and assesses the condition of parks and recreation infrastructure but does not approve modifications or expansions. Existing facilities remain in place and continue to operate under current management and service levels.

The PROS Plan may, over time, influence decision-making related to maintenance prioritization and coordination among departments. Such influence is strategic and does not constitute an environmental impact under SEPA.

Any project proposing to modify or expand public service facilities would undergo project-specific environmental review and facility-specific planning at the time it is proposed.

d. Proposed measures to reduce or mitigate impacts to public services, if any.

No mitigation measures are required for plan adoption. Because adoption of the PROS Plan does not result in increased demand for public services, no mitigation is necessary at this stage. Existing planning, budgeting, and service coordination frameworks remain in effect.

Mitigation measures related to public services—such as phased implementation, interdepartmental coordination, or infrastructure upgrades—would be identified and applied during project-specific SEPA review and project planning when future actions are proposed.

B.16 UTILITIES

a. Describe the utilities serving the site (electricity, water, sewer, stormwater, solid waste, communications, etc.).

This question is applicable at a **citywide, descriptive level**, given the scope of the proposal. The City of Port Townsend is served by established utility systems that include electric power, potable water, sanitary sewer, stormwater conveyance, solid waste collection, and communications infrastructure. These systems are designed to serve existing development and growth patterns anticipated in the Comprehensive Plan.

Adoption of the PROS Plan does not modify utility service areas, system capacities, or operational characteristics. Existing utility infrastructure and regulatory oversight remain unchanged.

Utility service requirements depend on the location, scale, and design of specific development projects. Any changes to utility demand or infrastructure will be evaluated during project-specific SEPA review and utility coordination processes when projects are proposed.

b. Will the proposal require new, expanded, or upgraded utility facilities? If so, describe.

This question is applicable, but no new or expanded utility facilities are required as a result of plan adoption. The PROS Plan does not approve facilities, buildings, or infrastructure that would require new utility connections or increased capacity. While future park improvements may require utility service (e.g., lighting, restrooms), adoption of the plan itself does not commit the City to upgrading or extending utilities.

Utility impacts, including capacity requirements and infrastructure improvements, can only be properly evaluated when a specific project proposal is made. Such evaluation will occur during project-level SEPA review, utility system review, and capital planning processes.

c. Will the proposal increase demand for utilities or affect existing utility services?

This question is applicable at a cumulative and operational level. Adoption of the PROS Plan does not increase utility demand. No new uses or intensification of existing uses are authorized. Utility demand projections remain governed by the Comprehensive Plan and associated utility planning documents.

Indirectly, the PROS Plan may guide future decisions that affect how utilities are used in park and recreation facilities (e.g., efficiency improvements), but such outcomes depend entirely on future project-level actions.

Potential increases in utility demand associated with specific facilities or amenities will be analyzed during project-specific SEPA review when usage intensity, infrastructure needs, and mitigation options can be evaluated.

d. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts to utilities, if any.

No mitigation measures are required for plan adoption. The PROS Plan does not generate utility impacts that require mitigation. Policies encouraging efficiency, sustainability, and lifecycle planning are aspirational and do not mandate specific utility actions.

Utility mitigation measures—such as capacity upgrades, efficiency technologies, or phasing strategies—will be identified and implemented during project-specific review of future development or capital projects.

C. Signature

[Find help about who should sign²](#)

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

X

Type name of signee: Melody Sky Weaver

Position and agency/organization: Director of Community Services

Date submitted: 4/28/26

D. Supplemental sheet for nonproject actions

[Find help for the nonproject actions worksheet³](#)

Do not use this section for project actions.

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

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

³ <https://ecology.wa.gov/regulations-permits/sepa/environmental-review/sepa-guidance/sepa-checklist-guidance/sepa-checklist-section-d-non-project-actions>

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

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

This question is applicable to all non-project actions and requires analysis of whether adoption of a plan or program, in and of itself, causes changes to environmental outputs. Adoption of the PROS Plan does not directly increase:

- discharge to surface water or groundwater,
- emissions to air,
- production, storage, use, or release of toxic or hazardous substances, or
- production of noise.

The PROS Plan is a policy document. It does not authorize construction, operation, or maintenance activities that generate environmental outputs. No physical actions occur upon adoption. Consequently, no quantifiable environmental emissions, discharges, or releases occur as a result of this legislative action.

Indirect or secondary effects—such as changes in air emissions, water runoff, or noise—would only occur *if and when* a specific park, trail, shoreline access, facility, or infrastructure project is proposed and constructed in the future. These effects are not caused by adoption of the PROS Plan itself; they depend entirely on future discretionary decisions, funding, design, and permitting.

Any future proposed project with the potential to produce emissions, discharges, hazardous substance use, or noise will be subject to project-specific SEPA review at the time a development application or capital project proposal is submitted. At that stage, impacts will be analyzed using site-specific, design-specific, and operational information, and mitigation measures will be considered where required.

D.2 How would the proposal be likely to affect land use patterns, including population, development density, or rate of growth?

This question is applicable to non-project actions that might influence land use or growth patterns. Adoption of the PROS Plan does not:

- change zoning classifications,
- modify Comprehensive Plan land use designations,
- increase allowable development density,
- alter development capacity, or
- change population growth assumptions.

Growth, density, and land use patterns in Port Townsend are established by the 2025 Comprehensive Plan and its implementing regulations, which have already undergone SEPA review. The PROS Plan is a functional, implementing document that responds to those adopted growth assumptions by planning for adequate parks, recreation, and open space to serve the anticipated population.

While high-quality parks and open space are widely recognized as contributing to community livability, adoption of the PROS Plan does not induce development, accelerate growth, or alter land use patterns in a manner that is independent of the Comprehensive Plan framework.

If a future project under the PROS Plan were proposed that would affect land use patterns—such as redevelopment of a site or acquisition of land with existing uses—those impacts would be evaluated during project-specific SEPA review at the time of application.

D.3 How would the proposal be likely to increase demands on transportation or public services, or change traffic patterns?

This question is applicable, as transportation and public service demands are typical considerations in SEPA review. Adoption of the PROS Plan does not approve facilities, programs, or operations that generate trips, require new transportation infrastructure, or increase demand for police, fire, emergency medical services, schools, or utilities.

At the policy level, the PROS Plan supports:

- neighborhood-scale access to parks and recreation,
- non-motorized trail connectivity, and
- integration of recreation with active transportation planning.

These policy directions are intended to complement existing transportation networks and may, over time, support shifts toward walking and bicycling for recreational trips. However, such changes are speculative and indirect and depend on future capital investments and project-level decisions.

Transportation and public service impacts associated with specific projects—such as a new facility or significant upgrade—will be evaluated during project-specific SEPA review, including traffic analysis and coordination with service providers, when warranted.

D.4 How would the proposal be likely to affect natural systems such as increase discharge to water; emissions to air; production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or production of noise, water, plants, or animals?

This question is applicable as a cumulative and policy-level inquiry. Adoption of the PROS Plan does not directly affect air quality, water resources, vegetation, or wildlife. Rather, it establishes policies intended to:

- protect and enhance ecological function,
- prioritize habitat stewardship and restoration,
- integrate environmental considerations into park planning, and
- reduce environmental degradation over time.

Because no land-disturbing activities are authorized, no direct adverse impacts to natural systems occur. To the extent the plan influences future actions, it does so by promoting environmentally responsible planning rather than by enabling harmful activities.

Any future project with the potential to affect natural systems will be evaluated during project-specific SEPA review using site-specific environmental information and applicable regulatory standards.

D.5 How would the proposal be likely to affect energy consumption or resource use?

This question is applicable at a policy-level for non-project actions. Adoption of the PROS Plan does not directly consume energy or natural resources. No construction, operation, or maintenance activities occur. The plan contains policy guidance encouraging efficient use of resources, adaptive reuse, and sustainable practices in future projects.

Any potential changes in energy consumption or resource use would arise solely from future projects implemented under the plan, and not from plan adoption itself.

Energy and resource impacts associated with specific facilities or improvements will be analyzed during project-specific SEPA review, where design, technology, and operational parameters are known.

D.6 How would the proposal be likely to use or affect environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated (or eligible or under study) for governmental protection; such as parks, wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, threatened or endangered species habitat, historic or cultural sites, wetlands, floodplains, or prime farmlands?

Adoption of the PROS Plan will not directly affect environmentally sensitive areas. Within Port Townsend, critical areas such as wetlands, shorelines, floodplains, and fish and wildlife conservation areas are designated and protected under the City’s critical areas ordinance and shoreline master program. The city also contains historic and cultural resources, including the National Historic Landmark District and Fort Worden State Park, which are subject to federal, state, and local protections.

Future recreation development and maintenance will remain subject to these protective regulations.

D.7 How would the proposal be likely to affect land and shoreline use, including whether it would allow or encourage land or shoreline uses incompatible with existing plans?

Adoption of the PROS Plan will not allow or encourage uses incompatible with the City's Comprehensive Plan, zoning code, critical areas ordinance, or Shoreline Master Program.

D.8 How would the proposal be likely to affect environmental health, safety, or risk of exposure to hazards?

This question is applicable to non-project actions as a precautionary inquiry. Adoption of the PROS Plan does not introduce hazardous materials, increase exposure to environmental hazards, or create risks to public health or safety. No hazardous substances are used, stored, or transported as part of plan adoption.

Conversely, the plan supports long-term community health outcomes by encouraging access to open space, outdoor recreation, and safe public environments.

Environmental health and safety impacts associated with construction activities, facility operations, or site conditions will be evaluated during project-specific SEPA review and applicable permitting processes.

D.9 Could the proposal reasonably be expected to have significant adverse environmental impacts that cannot be adequately addressed by existing laws and regulations?

Based on the analysis in Parts B and D, adoption of the PROS Plan cannot reasonably be expected to result in probable significant adverse environmental impacts. The plan does not authorize actions that would bypass existing environmental regulations, and it does not diminish the applicability of federal, state, or local environmental protections.

Instead, the plan operates within and reinforces existing regulatory frameworks governing land use, environmental protection, shoreline management, critical areas, historic preservation, public services, and utilities.

Environmental impacts associated with future projects will be fully addressed through project-specific SEPA review, ensuring compliance with all applicable laws and regulations.