1 What is the purpose of this EIS, and why is it being proposed?

The objective of this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is to identify potential alternatives and associated impacts of the development of the 371-acre Lawson Hills area of the City of Black Diamond (see Exhibits 1-1 and 1-2).

The Lawson Hills area generally consists of two subareas, the Main Property and the North Triangle. The “Main Property” is located between the SR 169/Roberts Road intersection to the west and extends into King County to the east. The “North Triangle” is located on the west side of SR 169, approximately one mile north of the SR 169/Roberts Road intersection.

The City has received an application from the BD Lawson Partners (the Applicant) for development of Lawson Hills under the City’s Master Planned Development Ordinance. This EIS will review impacts and mitigation of the proposed project, which is considered herein as Alternative 2, as well as three alternative development scenarios.

The intent of the EIS is to provide an impartial discussion of significant environmental impacts and to inform decision makers and the public of reasonable alternatives, including mitigation measures that would avoid or minimize adverse impacts or enhance the environmental quality of the Lawson Hills MPD area. The EIS may mention non-significant impacts or mitigation measures to satisfy other environmental review laws or requirements.
Exhibits in this EIS are intended to provide a general graphical depiction of built and natural environment conditions and may not be accurate to the parcel level.
Exhibit 1-2

Study Area for Lawson Hills

Exhibits in this EIS are intended to provide a general graphical depiction of built and natural environment conditions and may not be accurate to the parcel level.
The City may find that the EIS (and the MPD Application representing Alternative 2) include sufficient information and analysis to adopt a Planned Action Ordinance or to consider raising SEPA thresholds for the MPD area.

This would allow for flexibility for an applicant to submit supplemental documentation and/or addendums as specific development plans are submitted and project-related impacts are identified.

2 What is the planning horizon?

For the alternatives under consideration, the planning horizon is assumed to be 2025. However, some impacts will not be fully realized until after 2025, and in those instances, longer planning horizons have been identified.

3 What alternatives are being considered?

There are four alternatives under consideration for the Lawson Hills area:

- Alternative 1 – No Action
- Alternative 2 – Master Planned Development (MPD) Proposal
- Alternative 3 – Mitigated MPD
- Alternative 4 – Fiscally Balanced MPD

Each of these alternatives is briefly summarized in this chapter. More detail on all four alternatives can be found in Chapter 2.

Alternative 1 – No Action

Alternative 1 (No Action) assumes that the Lawson Hills area will develop consistent with its current low- and medium-density residential zoning. Residential development is expected to occur slowly and incrementally as individual landowners develop their property. Alternative 1 assumes that development will not occur by master plan and will not follow the City’s Master Planned Development (MPD) process. There are no multi-family units, schools, commercial, or office developments in Alternative 1. Sensitive areas, such as wetlands, wildlife, and surface water, would be protected as required by the City’s Sensitive Areas Ordinance (SAO).
This alternative includes 1,330 single-family dwelling units. The number of dwelling units was determined by subtracting sensitive lands and their buffers from the total Lawson Hills area acreage and assuming minimum 7,200-square foot lot sizes.

**Alternative 2 – MPD Proposal**

Alternative 2 (MPD Proposal) represents the Applicant’s proposal as submitted, with the intent to follow the requirements and stipulations of the City’s MPD Ordinance (Chapter 18.98 of the City Municipal Code). The ordinance allows for a master planned approach that would accommodate a mix of low-, medium-, and high-density residential, commercial, retail, and office uses. This alternative includes the required amount of open space to provide both sensitive areas buffers and recreational opportunities. In addition, this alternative provides for inclusion of one 10-acre elementary school site, located in the northern section of the Main Property. The application states that additional school sites would be provided off-site.

Alternative 2 includes 930 single-family and 320 multi-family units, for a total of 1,250 dwelling units on 156 acres, and 390,000 square feet of commercial and office space on the North Triangle.

**Alternative 3 – Mitigated MPD Proposal**

Alternative 3 (Mitigated MPD Proposal) would also follow a master planned approach and would be subject to the MPD Ordinance requirements. Alternative 3 would include a greater amount of land set aside for open space, more on-site school facilities, and would cluster a fewer number of residential units in a more dense development pattern, away from sensitive areas. Alternative 3 would have less commercial/office square footage in the North Triangle than Alternative 2, reflecting a reduced demand due to fewer residential units.

---

**What is an MPD?**

An MPD is a Master Planned Development which is subject to the policies and procedures outlined in Chapter 18.98 of the City Municipal Code. The MPD allows for mixed-use neighborhood development that incorporates residential, commercial, open space, and civic/public services (such as schools). The minimum size of an MPD is 80 acres, and must be under single ownership.
The mitigated approach to Alternative 3 includes the following components:

- **Land Use** – Cluster more intense development on less buildable acreage, further from sensitive areas. There are less residential units overall, generating a lower total population and fewer infrastructure impacts.

- **Open Space** – Provide more open space (50 percent of total land area), particularly as it relates to sensitive areas, thereby increasing the protection of those areas.

- **Public Services** – Provide for all needed school facilities, at Enumclaw School District’s preferred school site size, on-site.

- **Economy** – Provide commercial and retail square footage commensurate with reduced residential units.

- **Water Resources (surface water, stormwater, groundwater)** – Employ low impact development techniques as described in EIS mitigating strategies.

**Alternative 4 – Fiscally Balanced MPD**

Alternative 4 was developed as a case study to achieve a positive fiscal performance, as required by the City’s MPD Ordinance. As such, it includes the same land acreages as Alternative 2, but with fewer residential units. The primary purpose of this alternative was to explore the residential unit and commercial/retail mix necessary to result in a fiscally balanced economic condition. It is not analyzed in depth for built and environmental impacts in this EIS, as it is intended solely to address the fiscal benefit element of the City’s MPD Ordinance.

**4 How do the alternatives compare?**

The purpose of this EIS is to compare development alternatives and their impacts for the Lawson Hills area. Exhibit 1-3 provides a summary comparison of land uses of the four alternatives.
Exhibit 1-3
Land Use by Alternative at Year 2025

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Type</th>
<th>Alternative 1 (No Action)</th>
<th>Alternative 2 (MPD)</th>
<th>Alternative 3 (Mitigated MPD)</th>
<th>Alternative 4 (Fiscally Balanced MPD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Dwelling Units (du) | 1,330 single-family units on 259 acres | 1,250 du on 165 acres:  
- 930 single-family  
- 320 multi-family | 938 du on 151 acres:  
- 698 single-family  
- 240 multi-family | 1,075 du on 198 acres:  
- 806 single-family  
- 269 multi-family |
| Commercial/Office   | None | 35 acres  
- 190,000 sf retail space  
- 200,000 sf office space | 20 acres  
- 150,000 sf retail space  
- 75,000 sf office space | 35 acres  
- 190,000 sf retail space  
- 200,000 sf office space |
| Open Space          | 112 acres | 138 acres | 185 acres | 138 acres |
| Schools             | Not provided on-site | 10 acres | 15 acres | Not provided on-site |
| New Roads           | Included in residential and commercial lands | 23 acres | Included in residential and commercial lands | Included in residential and commercial lands |

Total Acres: 371  
Total Population: 3,591

Alternative 1 – No Action
Alternative 1 assumes that individual properties would develop separately and incrementally over time, without an overall master plan to guide the development. This alternative includes more residential units than any of the other alternatives, with residential units assumed to be single-family. It does not include any commercial or office use, nor does it have specific provisions for on-site schools. Rather than having a master planned road network, Alternative 1 assumes that roads will be built incrementally to serve residential and commercial development as it occurs. This alternative protects 112 acres of sensitive areas and their buffers, the lowest acreage of open space of any alternative.

Alternative 2 – MPD Proposal
Alternative 2 represents the Applicant’s proposal for developing the Lawson Hills area as a comprehensive, mixed-use Master Planned Development, subject to the requirements of the City’s MPD Ordinance (Ch 18.98 of the City Municipal Code). This alternative has a substantial amount of commercial and office square footage, provides for 138 acres of open space, an on-site elementary school facility, and a planned roadway network that
reflects the City’s Comprehensive Plan 2025 transportation system. The analysis indicates a need for school facilities off-site. This will be resolved during the MPD approval process.

**Alternative 3 – Mitigated MPD**
Alternative 3 assumes an MPD process and requirements, but mitigates impacts by lowering residential and commercial units. This alternative provides a full 50 percent (185 acres) of open space, more than any other alternative. It also includes a 15-acre on-site elementary school facility, and a planned roadway network that reflects the City’s Comprehensive Plan 2025 transportation system.

**Alternative 4 – Fiscally Balanced MPD**
Alternative 4 includes a balance of uses that achieves the “fiscally balanced” goal of the City’s MPD Ordinance. This alternative includes a substantially smaller amount of residential units, but the same amount of retail and office square footage and open space as Alternative 2. This alternative does not include any on-site schools, but would locate proposed school facilities within The Villages proposed MPD (see Chapter 5, Indirect Affects and Cumulative Impacts). This assumption was made because Lawson alone does not generate the student population to require an elementary school site; however, when added to the Villages student population, two elementary schools would be needed. Since the demand comes later with Villages, it made sense to locate the school sites there.

5 How would the proposed action affect the Built Environment (people and community resources)?

The Built Environment includes the social, economic, and cultural elements of the environment. Exhibit 1-4 summarizes the elements and expected impacts the alternatives would have on the Built Environment. Detailed information about each element is included in Chapter 3, Built Environment.
### Exhibit 1-4

**Summary of Impacts – Built Environment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Alternative 1</th>
<th>Alternative 2</th>
<th>Alternative 3</th>
<th>Alternative 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use</strong></td>
<td>• 1,330 single-family units</td>
<td>• 1,250 dwelling units</td>
<td>• 938 dwelling units</td>
<td>• 1,187 dwelling units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 3,591 residents</td>
<td>• 3,103 residents</td>
<td>• Most multi-family units</td>
<td>• 2,674 residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Incremental Development</td>
<td>• Mixed Use (live/work)</td>
<td>• Less commercial than Alternative 2</td>
<td>• Same commercial as Alternative 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation</strong></td>
<td>• 8 study intersections require improvements</td>
<td>• 12 study intersections require improvements</td>
<td>• 28% fewer trips are generated compared to Alternative 2; improvements may not</td>
<td>Similar to Alternative 2; not specifically analyzed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No planned network</td>
<td>• Assumes completion of new alignments, connections, and other improvements as</td>
<td>be required at all 12 intersection locations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>planned in the 2025 Transportation Element</td>
<td>• Assumes completion of new alignments, connections, and other improvements as</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>planned in the 2025 Transportation Element</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Noise</strong></td>
<td>Greatest impacts due to highest traffic volumes</td>
<td>Lesser impacts than Alternative 1</td>
<td>Least Impacts</td>
<td>Similar to Alternative 2; not specifically analyzed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Utilities</strong></td>
<td>• Greatest impacts due to highest population and resulting impacts on infrastructure</td>
<td>• Lesser impacts than Alternative 1</td>
<td>• Least impacts due to lowest population generation</td>
<td>Similar to Alternative 2; not specifically analyzed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(water, wastewater, stormwater)</td>
<td>• Impacts occur incrementally</td>
<td>• Assumes construction of all planned water, sewer, and stormwater projects as</td>
<td>• Assumes construction of all planned water, sewer, and stormwater projects as</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>planned in the respective utility comprehensive plans</td>
<td>planned in the respective utility comprehensive plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visual</strong></td>
<td>Impacts are incremental in nature, less likely to be comprehensively mitigated</td>
<td>Master Plan allows for preservation of views where possible, use of open space as buffers</td>
<td>Master Plan allows for preservation of views where possible, use of open space as buffers</td>
<td>Master Plan allows for preservation of views where possible, use of open space as buffers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Historic and Cultural Resources</strong></td>
<td>No impacts</td>
<td>No impacts</td>
<td>No impacts</td>
<td>No impacts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exhibit 1-4
Summary of Impacts – Built Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Alternative 1</th>
<th>Alternative 2</th>
<th>Alternative 3</th>
<th>Alternative 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Public Services (parks, schools, public safety) | • Greatest impacts due to highest population and resulting demand on parks, schools, police, and fire  
• Impacts occur incrementally | • Lesser impacts than Alternative 1  
• Population will generate need for 4.34 on-duty firefighters  
• Population will generate need for no additional police staff  
• Population generates need for 1 new community park site, 2 neighborhood park sites, and 2 pocket park sites  
• Population generates need for 1 elementary school, and partial need for 1 middle school and 1 high school | • Least impacts due to lowest population generation  
• Population will generate need for 3.1 on-duty firefighters  
• Population will generate need for no additional police staff  
• Population generates need for 1 new community park site, 2 neighborhood park sites, and 2 pocket park sites  
• Population generates need for 1 elementary school and partial need for 1 middle school and 1 high school | Similar to Alternative 2; not specifically analyzed |

Fiscal Analysis | Not fiscally balanced | May be fiscally balanced | Not fiscally balanced | Fiscally balanced |

6 How would the proposed action affect the Natural Environment (ecosystems and natural resources)?

The Natural Environment includes the geology, water resources, habitat, air quality, and climate change elements of the environment. Exhibit 1-5 summarizes the elements and expected impacts the alternatives would have on the Natural Environment. Detailed information about each element is included in Chapter 4, Natural Environment.
### Exhibit 1-5

#### Summary of Impacts – Natural Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Alternative 1</th>
<th>Alternative 2</th>
<th>Alternative 3</th>
<th>Alternative 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Earth (geology, topography, and soils) | - Assumes that severe mine hazard areas would be preserved in open space  
- Low and moderate mine hazard areas would be developed with residential uses  
- Major roads and utility corridors may cross the mine hazard area | - Majority of areas mapped as potential severe hazard areas are designated as open space  
- Major roads and utility corridors cross the potential severe mine hazard area | - Assumes that severe mine hazard areas would be preserved in open space  
- Low (and to some extent) moderate mine hazard areas would be developed with residential uses  
- Major roads and utility corridors may cross the mine hazard area | Similar to Alternatives 2 and 3; not specifically analyzed |
| Hazardous Materials | None of the Alternatives is likely at risk of significant impacts from hazardous waste sites | | | |
| Water (surface water and groundwater resources) | - 140 acres impervious surface creation  
- Development of multiple small detention/treatment facilities may result in less displacement of water flows  
- Stream scouring and erosion from greater duration of flows and water quality impacts likely, would be similar to Alternative 2 | - 131 acres impervious surface creation  
- Greatest potential impact is on Ravensdale Creek from the North Triangle, where the majority of the site would be developed in commercial use with a high proportion of impervious surface  
- Medium and high density development on slopes draining to Jones Lake Creek is likely to have substantially greater impact on water resources than low density residential development  
- Greater impacts to Mud Lake Creek than Alternative 1  
- Proposes the use of large stormwater ponds, which may cause temperature elevation due to solar heating that could impact Mud Lake Creek | - 90 acres impervious surface creation  
- Development is concentrated away from sensitive areas  
- Potential impacts to Ravensdale Creek would be less in Alternative 3 given that there will be 15 less acres of commercial/office use  
- Proposed low impact development for stormwater management, including numerous small ponds and reduction of impervious surface area | Similar to Alternatives 2 and 3; not specifically analyzed |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Alternative 1</th>
<th>Alternative 2</th>
<th>Alternative 3</th>
<th>Alternative 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Plants and Animals (wetlands, habitat, fish and wildlife) | ● Wetlands and their standard (SAO-assigned) buffers will be preserved  
● No direct impacts to wetlands or their buffers  
● Incremental development could lead to fragmented open space corridors  
● Landowners could seek permits to individually impact wetlands and buffers, the likelihood or results of which cannot be estimated at this time  
● No direct impacts to fish or riparian habitat | ● Permanent filling of approximately 1 acre of wetland; filling is proposed for roads, home sites, and stormwater detention facilities  
● Wetland impacts are restricted to the Main Property  
● No direct wetland impacts proposed on the North Triangle  
● Approximately 4 acres of regulated wetland buffer will be permanently impacted  
● More open space provides less fragmented corridors, but corridor may not be appropriately located to provide meaningful habitat  
● Incremental future loss of wetlands and buffers is not expected  
● Direct impacts to streams due to proposed roadways and crossings  
● Direct impacts to streams due to stormwater outfalls | ● No direct impacts to wetlands and their buffers  
● Proximity impacts are less likely to occur (or at lesser magnitude) because development will be clustered further away from sensitive areas  
● Incremental future loss of wetlands and buffers is not expected  
● Direct impacts to streams due to stormwater outfalls  
● One stream crossing due to proposed roadways and crossings  
● Direct impacts to streams due to stormwater outfalls | Similar to Alternatives 2 and 3; not specifically analyzed |

| Climate Change (air quality, greenhouse gas emissions) | 2,194,858 metric tons of carbon dioxide (MTCO\textsubscript{2}e) | 2,491,728 MTCO\textsubscript{2}e | 1,806,189 MTCO\textsubscript{2}e | Similar to Alternatives 2 and 3; not specifically analyzed |

7 How have the public, agencies, and tribes been involved in development of the proposed action?

The City has engaged the public and potentially impacted stakeholders through a variety of outreach forums, in addition to following the specific procedures required by Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 197-11-960 and outlined in Chapter 43.21C of the Revised Code of Washington (RCW):

- A scoping announcement and public meeting (May 28, 2008);
- An agency scoping meeting (May 29, 2008);
• Transportation-specific scoping meetings (June 11, 2008; October 3, 2008; and April 2, 2009);
• A public open house (November 11, 2008);
• Several individual agency meetings;
• Pre-DEIS release open house (August 4, 2009);
• Preliminary Draft EIS stakeholder meetings (August 12, 2009, and August 19, 2009);
• Draft EIS Public Hearing (September 29, 2009); and
• Public Comment Period (September 1, 2009, through October 9, 2009).

In addition, the City has posted all relevant EIS materials, announcements, and a quarterly project update on their website (http://www.ci.blackdiamond.wa.us/).

All public comments received at the pre-release hearing, the public hearing (testimony was recorded and a transcript is included in Appendix R), and in response to the Draft EIS were added to the public record and responded to in accordance with SEPA regulations.

8 What is the decision-making process for the proposal?

The Final EIS was prepared using comments from the Draft EIS. Per WAC 197-11-460, the lead agency “shall not act on a proposal for which an EIS has been required prior to seven days after issuance of the FEIS.”

The City of Black Diamond MPD Ordinance requires the City’s Hearing Examiner to conduct a public hearing on the MPD applications and then issue a recommendation to the City Council. At this time, a date has not been established for the hearing before the Hearing Examiner, but it is anticipated to occur in the first quarter of 2010.

Following issuance of a recommendation from the Examiner, the City Council will conduct a closed record hearing. The Council has the final decision-making authority on the MPD applications.
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