STUDY QUESTION 1

What private- and public-sector benefits have been realized in eight differently situated communities across the state using and not using SEPA integrated actions since 1996?

STUDY QUESTION 2

How did these SEPA actions interact with other efforts, programs or policies contributing to the stimulation of development?

Vancouver’s downtown re-development
Esther Short Subarea planned land uses include commercial, live/work and parking.
What is a Case Study?

- A description of a real organization, program, project or system in detail.

- A case study contains a description of the “environment” surrounding the case so that the reader has an opportunity to evaluate how many parallels the case has to other situations.

CASE STUDY FOCUS

- Builds on case study work done on integration of SEPA and GMA by:
  - Growth Management Services in 1996
  - David Evans for Growth Management Services in 2002
  - Deborah Munkberg of Blumen Consulting Group in 2008

- Focused on outcomes and lessons that could be learned

- Conducted on-site structured interviews in each community

INTERVIEW TOPICS

- Key facts
- SEPA experience citywide
- Case area development
- Case area SEPA experience
- SEPA strengths and challenges

COMMUNITY SELECTION

- Selected a cross-section of communities in the state
- Six communities had a history with the use of plan-level SEPA alternatives to reduce time-to-permit in areas targeted for growth and two used traditional tools to predefined mitigation.

Eight case study communities throughout Washington State were selected for on-site, structured interviews.
What is the State Environmental Policy Act?
How does it fit into regulation of development?

How The State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Works

SEPA requires that potential impacts of public and private proposals on the built and natural environment be considered by public officials prior to approval of development.

Public officials can use the impact information to eliminate or reduce likely impacts by:
- requiring changes
- adding approval conditions
- denying approval.

SEPA REVIEW
Identify specific probable adverse environmental impacts to the built or natural environment
Apply adopted standards in development regulations or GMA comprehensive plan
Use SEPA authority only for impacts not adequately addressed in development regulations, plan or other laws

Development Permit Application
Consistency Determination
Any Required Public Process
Approval or Disapproval (with or without conditions)
Appeal Period (if applicable)

CONSISTENCY DETERMINATION
- Permitted land use
- Permitted density and other characteristics
- Meets building and development standards
- Meets any special conditions already adopted

INTRODUCTION
Methods of Defining SEPA Mitigation
Four Alternatives at the Comprehensive or Subarea Plan Level

1. INTEGRATED GMA PLAN/SEPA DOCUMENT
- Combined environmental review (EIS, supplemental EIS or expanded checklist) and growth management Comprehensive or Subarea Plan in one document/process
- Satisfies requirements of both GMA and SEPA
- Environmental review evaluates environmental consequences of the proposed land use plan compared to alternatives
- Adopted document used as a basis for requiring identified mitigation for projects that implement the plan

2. PLAN-LEVEL ‘NON-PROJECT’ SEPA DOCUMENT
- Separate document containing an environmental review and mitigation for a Comprehensive or Subarea Plan
- Adopted document used as a basis for requiring identified mitigation for projects that implement the plan

SEPA REVIEW DEFINITIONS

EIS (Environmental Impact Statement)
Impartial discussion of significant environmental impacts, reasonable alternatives, and mitigation measures that would avoid or minimize adverse impacts.

DNS (Determination of Non-Significance)
Documents the responsible official’s decision that a proposal is not likely to have significant adverse environmental impacts.

MDNS (Mitigated Determination of Non-Significance)
A DNS that contains mitigation or conditions that reduce likely significant adverse environmental impact(s) to a non-significant level.

Architectural rendering of a redevelopment concept for part of Spokane’s University District.
3: PLANNED ACTION

- Area-wide development plan with a SEPA environmental review
- Identifies probable impacts, appropriate mitigation and up-front development conditions
- Subsequent projects in the area are reviewed for consistency with the development conditions
- If consistent, projects are considered “planned actions” that do not need individual SEPA review

4: 2010 ESHB 2538 SUBAREA PLAN

- Allows for review of qualifying Comprehensive Plan element or Subarea Plan through a SEPA environmental review, that leads to up-front development conditions and mitigation requirements
- For 10 years, developments in the area that are consistent do not need additional SEPA review
- Developments are also exempt from administrative or judicial appeals for noncompliance with SEPA.

The timeline below shows the type of SEPA process used in each of the eight case study communities and the date that each plan was adopted by the community. The five communities above the line chose to implement planned actions. The remaining three used other methods. Spokane adopted a non-GMA Strategic Plan for their sub-area and did not use SEPA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Plan Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Everett</td>
<td>Paine Field Subarea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Colville</td>
<td>Integrated EIS/Comprehensive Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Mill Creek</td>
<td>527 Corridor Subarea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td>Esther Short Subarea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>Kent Station Subarea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Spokane</td>
<td>University District Strategic Plan (non-GMA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wenatchee</td>
<td>Riverfront Subarea Plan DNS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OTHER CASE STUDIES

INTRODUCTION

Methods of Defining SEPA Mitigation
Four Alternatives at the Comprehensive or Subarea Plan Level
Overview
SEPA Integrated Actions a Valuable Planning Tool Despite Cost

KEY FINDINGS

Predefined mitigation or development permit conditions and reduced SEPA appeals were cited in all case studies as one of a package of tools used to promote development.

Plan-level SEPA processes were one among the planning tools used to achieve predefined mitigation. All cities reported using at least one (and in some cases several) plan-level SEPA process options.

OUTCOMES & OBSERVATIONS

- Subareas experienced 60% to 107% of planned development
- Predefined mitigation resulted in:
  - Increased certainty and predictability
  - Time and cost savings for developers and cities
  - Increased revenues, when used with other economic development tools
- Coordinated subarea planning allowed for greater community engagement
- Cities that adopted planned actions already have done so again, or would if funding were available
- Biggest barrier to expanded usage has been up-front costs to cities and “first-in” developers
- Overall, the number of EISs and MDNSs dropped sharply since the
STUDY QUESTION 1: What private- and public-sector benefits have been realized in the case study cities using and not using SEPA integrated actions since 1996?

**KEY FINDINGS**

### Subareas experienced 60% to 107% of planned development

- All case study subareas experienced development, ranging from $47.8 million to $1.2 billion. Sixty to 107 percent of planned building or employment has occurred in all of the subareas created since the 1990s.

### Predefined mitigation resulted in greater certainty and predictability

- All case study cities reported an increase in certainty and predictability for developers, especially when potential appeal processes are complete and mitigation “triggers” are defined.
- All developers reported certainty as translating into reduction in operating and/or facility investment risk.
- All cities reported decreases in the number and scale of required environmental assessments and technical studies.

### Time and cost savings reported for developers and cities

- Time savings ranged from five weeks to four months. Reductions translated into decreases in either pre- or post-development application time and cost to complete environmental reviews and technical studies. *(See sidebar next page.)*
- All cities reported decreases in public costs to process applications due to the decreased scope of required studies. For example, traffic studies tended to be limited to confirming traffic volume or safety issues, instead of a full traffic analysis with intersection impact modeling.
**Study Question 1 Sidebar**

**Opportunity Cost Exercise**

**Wide range of potential savings from reduced permitting time**

- For all eight subareas, predefined mitigation is estimated to have saved private developers from $8.8 million to $35.2 million, and public developers from $2.8 million to $11 million in opportunity costs.

- These estimates are based on the total value of private and public development from the case study subareas, assuming an opportunity cost of 5 percent and reduced SEPA permitting times of one to four months.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study Subarea</th>
<th>Private-Sector Development Projects: Range of Opportunity Cost Savings in Permit Processing Time</th>
<th>Public-Sector Development Projects: Range of Opportunity Cost Savings in Permit Processing Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private Investment</td>
<td>One month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everett</td>
<td>$390,000,000</td>
<td>$1,625,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redmond</td>
<td>$1,200,000,000</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colville</td>
<td>$47,800,000</td>
<td>$199,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Creek</td>
<td>$100,000,000</td>
<td>$416,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>$40,000,000</td>
<td>$166,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td>$225,000,000</td>
<td>$937,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane</td>
<td>$110,900,000</td>
<td>$458,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wenatchee</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$2,113,700,000</td>
<td>$8,803,331</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE NOTES:**

1) Opportunity cost — The financial benefit that can be gained from the next best opportunity for the use of an asset. A key concept in economics and business decision analysis.

2) Assumed the same funds could be invested at a 5% per year return on investment (ROI) elsewhere.

3) Additional cost of delay in private sector investment may result from construction cost inflation and delayed or forgone public tax collections by the state and local government.

4) Additional cost of delay in public investment may result from construction cost inflation and the resulting increase in public borrowing cost to finance public infrastructure over 20 to 30 years.
Study Question 1
Summary of Key Findings

More effective planning and greater community engagement

- Six cities reported more meaningful community engagement, including two examples of the use of planned actions to address significant concerns by residents about increases in density.
- Four cities reported that predefined mitigation provided a vehicle for improving planning, uniformity in impact mitigation, and inter-jurisdictional relationships.
- Several cities phased in additional mitigation over time as pre-specified development or impact thresholds were exceeded.

Predefined mitigation spurred development, increasing tax revenues

- All cities reported using predefined mitigation as part of a package of marketing tools to encourage development or redevelopment (see Page 12).
- In all cases, property, sales, B&O and/or real estate tax revenue increased for local and state government from new development.
- Two cities used predefined development conditions as an incentive for redevelopment or development of “marginal” or “higher risk” areas by a wider range of companies or developers.
Study Question 1
Predefined Mitigation Building Blocks Used in Case Subareas

As predefined mitigation conditions increase and extensive project-level SEPA review declines; time-to-permit, cost, and risk for developers were reported to decrease

STUDY QUESTION 1:
What private- and public-sector benefits have been realized in the case study cities using and not using SEPA integrated actions since 1996?
Study Question 2
Summary of Key Findings

Predefined mitigation used to leverage other development incentives

Predefined mitigation resulting from plan-level SEPA analysis was used uniformly in the case studies as part of a set of economic development tools to leverage development that included one or all of the following:

- Public infrastructure improvements that reduce or control mitigation costs
- Expedited permitting and land use incentives such as bonus density, floor area ratios and reduced parking requirements
- Tax increment or local improvement district financing for required public infrastructure
- Brownfield site clean up and land consolidation
- Development project financing incentives.
What Has Changed Since 2002 Review?

Summary of Key Findings

Cities expect to use SEPA planned actions again but cost is a barrier

- Cities and major or “first in” developers often bore all or much of the cost of determining predefined mitigation.
- Six cities that used planned actions or integrated EIS and GMA plan documents have used them again or wish to use them again. The primary stated barrier to expanded use is up-front planning cost.

Number of EISs and MDNSs dropped sharply

In all case study cities since the mid-1990’s, the number of EISs and MDNSs required of development at the project level citywide has significantly decreased.

- All cities reported currently requiring on average, one EIS every three years.
- All cities reported requiring at least a few MDNSs.
- Cities with more predefined mitigation required fewer SEPA conditions than cities with less predefined mitigation.
- Public development projects more frequently required expanded environmental documents than private development since predefined mitigation was not always extended to public projects.

All cities established a significant level of predetermined mitigation in their target subarea. It is unclear whether the city’s development goals will be achieved in the two subareas not using plan-level SEPA alternatives.
The Eight Subareas in Context

Development Goals

INDUSTRIAL OR EMPLOYMENT CENTER
- Everett
- Redmond

STIMULATE DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT
- Colville
- Mill Creek

EXPAND DOWNTOWN URBAN RE-DEVELOPMENT
- Kent
- Vancouver
- Spokane
- Wenatchee

A sketch of Wenatchee Riverfront Subarea depicting an expanded park and a mixed-use private development with residential over restaurants and other commercial spaces.
Southwest Everett / Paine Field Subarea

Planned Action — 1996

**CASE OVERVIEW**

- Expanded citizen involvement process beyond SEPA requirements.
- Non-project Subarea Plan EIS was completed prior to planned action ordinance.
- Water, sewer and road improvements built in the subarea prior to planned action through a large local improvement district.
- $400 million in transportation mitigation was built using $49 million provided by Boeing, impact fees from other property owners, state, federal, transit agency and local government funding.
- Planned action provides for approval without appeal of development proposals that are consistent with the adopted plan and do not exceed total employment threshold of 50,000 for subarea.

**Subarea Development**

- 3.9 million sq. ft. of space
- 71 projects
- 90% of buildable land in subarea has been developed
- Total employment 44,000

**City Characteristics**

- 103,500 population, 34 sq. mile city
- 3,039 persons per sq. mile
- 2,466 jobs per sq. mile
- 83,900 total jobs

**Land-Use Characteristics**

- Paine Field Airport
- Boeing airplane manufacturing facility on 1,000 acres
- Manufacturing
- Office
- Warehouse

**Subarea Characteristics**

- 4,000 acres in Puget Sound
- Planned action to create industrial employment center

Boeing Company airplane manufacturing plant in the southwest Everett Paine Field Subarea.
Southwest Everett / Paine Field Subarea
 Planned Action — 1996

CASE OUTCOMES

- 90 percent of buildable land has been developed.
- Approximately 300 acres remain, primarily consisting of topographically challenged land including critical areas.
- Total estimated assessed value of investment at $100 per square foot of floor area is $390 million, increasing tax base.
- City has attracted developers with short permit turn around time and certainty created by planned action.
- Converted mitigation determinations made on a project-by-project basis to one area-wide determination administered as development occurs.
- Improved intergovernmental relationships with Snohomish County and the City of Mukilteo.
- Developed and adopted a specific form and process for planned action consistency that replaces the standard SEPA process.

Private investment
- $390 million assessed value

EIS and Planned Action Ordinance - PERF Cost
- $530,000 (1995)

SEPA Actions
- 70 planned action consistency approvals
- 30 days or less for each, reduced from three months to one year if an MDNS or EIS had been required

Other Economic Dev. Tools
- Expedited permitting
- Local Improvement District
- Built Public Infrastructure
- Transportation Impact Fees
- Boeing Master Plan
- Rinker-Cemex Planned Development Overlay

STATE ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT CASE STUDIES — 16
SUBAREA CHARACTERISTICS
- 1,200 acres in Puget Sound
- Planned action to create mixed-use urban center with Microsoft headquarters campus

LAND-USE CHARACTERISTICS
- Business Park: 40%
- Single-family residential: 25%
- Office, retail, multi-family: 35%
- Urban Center designation under GMA
- Designated for Sound Transit light rail station

CITY CHARACTERISTICS
- 51,890 pop., 17 sq. mile city
- 3,046 persons per sq. mile
- 5,336 jobs per sq. mile
- 90,700 total jobs

SUBAREA DEVELOPMENT
- 6 million sq. ft. of non-residential floor area
- 300 dwelling units
- 99% of 2012 permitted sq. footage built by 2009

CASE OVERVIEW
- Expanded citizen involvement effort beyond what is required by SEPA.
- Integrated EIS and neighborhood plan were done prior to planned action ordinance and supplemented for update in 2007-2009.
- Planned action ordinance is administered using standard SEPA checklist to determine consistency.
- Mitigation is tied to non-residential floor area thresholds.
- Microsoft constructed some of the public transportation mitigation projects in order to meet timing requirements.
- Initial mitigation costs to Microsoft were roughly $1 per square foot; more recent costs are $15 per square foot.

Microsoft Headquarters Campus.

Redmond has more recently pre-defined many mitigation requirements citywide in its integrated development regulations, which include impact fees programs and area-based regulations and incentives.
CASE OUTCOMES

- Resolved project-level SEPA appeals that began in the 1980s.
- Reduced processing time by approximately five weeks per application.
- Created greater certainty and predictability for Microsoft while allowing flexibility within defined parameters in umbrella development agreement.
- Matured intergovernmental relationship with Bellevue.
- 22 out of 45 transportation mitigation projects in area have been or are being constructed. Some are being reevaluated due to planned light rail station/service in area.
- No development appeals in the Overlake neighborhood.
- Designated area as “urban center” and sited light rail station.
- Monitored through citywide “mobility report card” and “community indicators” report that tracks Overlake separately on key indicators including environmental indicators.

**Private Investment**
- $1.2 billion at $200 per sq. ft.

**Planned Action Cost**
- $480,000 plus 2007-2009 update

**SEPA Actions**
- 17 approvals under Planned Action Ordinance
- Historically avoided one EIS and at least six MDNS at estimated cost of $500,000
- Reduces time-to-permit by about five weeks

**Other Economic Dev. Tools**
- Transportation infrastructure including light rail
- Regional stormwater facilities
- Detailed Microsoft umbrella development agreement
- Interlocal agreement with Bellevue

REDMOND

Overlake Neighborhood Plan
Planned Action — 1999

STATE ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT CASE STUDIES — 18
City of Colville
*Integrated EIS and Comprehensive Plan — 1997*

**Subarea — Full City**
- 1,900 acres in central region
- Integrated EIS and Comprehensive Plan including industrial and downtown development

**Land-Use Characteristics**
- Residential 40%
- Public 28%
- Commercial 18%
- Industrial 8%
- Vacant 8%

**City Characteristics**
- Small, 5,040 population, 3 sq. mile city
- 1,900 persons per sq. mile
- 1,367 jobs per sq. mile
- 4,100 total jobs

**City Development**
- 80 new private projects
- 39 private remodels or additions
- Exceeded 2010 job growth target, going from 2,246 to 4,100 jobs

**CASE OVERVIEW**
- Full city covered by integrated EIS and Comprehensive Plan.
- Developed integrated document as part of PERF grant to Stevens County six-city consortium.
- SEPA allowed city to begin to address stormwater, wetland and soil issues that created problems historically.
- City uses project-level SEPA review to ensure that site-specific issues are properly mitigated.
- Lag between first inquiry and filing of development application is often several years.

*The Colville 2000 Downtown Revitalization Plan has helped modernize the city, in part by stewarding the completion of roundabouts on U.S. 395 at the northern and southern interfaces.*
Private investment
- $47.8 million

Integrated EIS and Plan Cost for Colville - PERF
- $121,000 (1995)

SEPA Actions
- 0 EIS
- 3 MDNSs
- 49 DNSs

Other Economic Dev. Tools
- Downtown Improvement District
- Infrastructure investments downtown

CASE OUTCOMES
- Average of eight new private developments each year for the last decade.
- SEPA reviews help avoid new stormwater and wetland problems and mitigate past issues.
- Benefitted from citywide information; reduced the number of MDNSs.
- Able to parallel SEPA and development review to reduce time-to-permit in most cases.
- Improved relationship with Stevens County government and planned development adjacent to city limits.
- Redevelopment is occurring at higher intensity.
- Complements downtown revitalization efforts.
- Developing citywide pre-defined mitigation is not considered cost-effective for the level of development activity.
**MILL CREEK**

**Subarea Characteristics**
- 157 acres in Puget Sound region
- Planned action to create high-density residential adjacent to downtown of emerging suburb

**Land-Use Characteristics**
- High-density residential: 83%
- Business park and public: 17%
- City incorporated in 1983 from planned community
- Seven large rural properties adjacent to downtown core
- Bordered by creek and SR 527

**City Characteristics**
- 18,480 population, 5 sq. mile city
- 4,000 persons per sq. mile
- 950 jobs per sq. mile
- 4,700 total jobs

**Subarea Development**
- Residential area fully developed by 2006 with 1,000 units
- Five projects
- Public park and trail amenities

---

**CASE OVERVIEW**

- Extensive public involvement campaign beyond standard SEPA requirements.
- Complemented city’s efforts to develop a downtown in a primarily single-family residential community.
- Focused on working through community resistance to high-density residential.
- Allowed the city to address issues related to the adjacent protected creek and state highway.
- Certainty provided by design guidelines that are part of the planned action were instrumental in gaining public support.
- Unable to do additional desired planned actions due to financial constraints.

*Bill Trimm, Mill Creek Community Development Director, explains how the traffic plan connects Town Center.*
**MILL CREEK**

**Private Investment**
- More than $100 million

**Planned Action and Supplemental EIS Cost**
- $170,000 with PERF

**SEPA Actions**
- Certificates of consistency instead of four MDNS and one EIS
- One project was redesigned to be consistent with plan

**Other Economic Dev. Tools**
- Development of “Town Center” as city’s downtown
- Economic analysis
- Expansion of SR 527 adjacent to planned action area
- $8.5 million public park

---

**CASE OUTCOMES**

- Generated enough population to support build-out of downtown core.
- City was able to work with one of the developers to redesign project to be consistent with planned action.
- Monitored dwelling unit and trip generation thresholds.
- Partnered with developers to create public trail and easement through multiple properties adjoining North Creek.
- Obtained area-wide traffic circulation system that complemented downtown.
- Most significant savings were in permit processing time since critical areas studies were still required.
- Provided the incentive of increased certainty for developers.

---
Kent Station

**Planned Action — 2002**

### CASE OVERVIEW

- Phased traffic mitigation triggered by number of afternoon peak hour trips.
- Reduced developer risk by increasing certainty and predictability and reducing appeal risk.
- Public process for planned action was more satisfying to participants.
- Avoided project-level SEPA review which often frustrates the public due to 1) the number of entitlements that are set in development codes and 2) the comprehensive plan-level SEPA is often too abstract to connect with a person’s everyday experience.
- Kent is currently in the process of developing another planned action ordinance for the Midway subarea.

---

**Subarea Characteristics**

- 25 acres in Puget Sound region
- Planned action for mixed-use downtown expansion at light rail station

**Land-Use Characteristics**

- Commercial: 46%
- Hotel/Conference: 15%
- Multi-family and parking: 33%
- Public: 5%
- 18 downtown redevelopment parcels including brownfield
- Part of Kent Urban Center
- Adjacent to light rail station

**City Characteristics**

- 88,380 population, 30 sq. miles
- 2,961 persons per sq. mile
- 2,016 jobs per sq. mile
- 60,500 total jobs

**Subarea Development**

- Private development:
  - Over $40 million to date
- Three of four phases complete:
  - 685,000 sq. ft. of retail, office and commercial
- Town Square Plaza city park

---

Mixed-use development has helped make Kent Station a vibrant part of downtown.
Private Investment
- Over $40 million to date

Cost for Supplemental EIS
- Approximately $200,000
- Outgrowth of downtown PERF grant

SEPA Actions
- Reduced time to permit by up to 3 to 4 months
- Planned action consistency review uses standard SEPA checklist
- Transportation mitigation appealed by business

Other Economic Dev. Tools
- City invested $25.5 million in former Borden Chemical site
- Downtown revitalization program
- Light rail station
- Adjacent event center construction

CASE OUTCOMES
- 760 jobs, of which approximately half are full-time.
- Provided greater certainty and consistency for developers, an asset in promoting redevelopment of industrial property.
- Helped to implement downtown revitalization plan by creating an 18-hour-a-day activity center next to rail station, creating an attractive public space, and expanding downtown into unused industrial area.
- City investment in environmental clean-up and infrastructure prior to development paid off in economic benefits.
- Increased tax base.
CASE OVERVIEW

- Planned action ordinance contains development standards and mitigation that apply to all projects in the planned urban high-density, mixed-use area.
- Development standards reduce risk to developer investment in redevelopment area.
- Planned action requires a SEPA checklist for items not covered in planned action EIS: archaeology, arborist report, soil contamination and small-scale traffic volume.
- Ninety-day turn around on permits: first development was 60 days.
- Time from first meeting with the city to permit was five months for first project.
- No appeals occurred, planned action did not allow separate SEPA appeal at project level, avoiding two to three months of additional permit time.
- City lacks financing for planned actions in two other subareas.

Heritage Place, a mixed-use development across the street from Ester Short Park, was one of the first projects to be built in the planned action area.
**CASE OUTCOMES**

- Significant redevelopment, private and public investment in downtown.
- Improved the atmosphere, including public safety, and activity level downtown.
- Increased certainty and predictability for developers.
- Increased tax base.
- Significant tool added to other city economic redevelopment efforts in area.
- Allowed city to be more effective in marketing publicly-purchased property for resale to private developers.
- Smaller scale success allowed the city to expand the planned action to include the entire downtown, which covers 4,551 dwelling units, 2.4 million sq. ft. of office, 401,000 sq. ft. of retail, hotel rooms and light manufacturing.
Subarea Characteristics
- 770 acres in Inland Empire region
- No SEPA for Strategic Plan extending downtown around WSU and Gonzaga campuses

Land-Use Characteristics
- Spokane Campus WSU: 7%
- Gonzaga University: 17%
- Older industrial/commercial properties, residential: 75%
- Part of urban center
- Designated to be bisected by light rail line

City Characteristics
- 205,500 population, 60 sq. mile
- 3,414 persons per sq. mile
- 1,867 jobs per sq. mile
- 112,000 total jobs

Subarea Development
- 52 projects
- 37 private projects
- 10 Gonzaga projects
- Five WSU projects

CASE OVERVIEW
- SEPA compliance generally does not add to time-to-permit since it is administered in parallel with the rest of permitting process.
- Required studies are identified prior to application and submitted as part of application process.
- City will be establishing a planned action ordinance for city owned property being redeveloped in downtown area as part of Ecology Integrated Planning Grant for brownfields.
- City is also completing a traffic baseline model which will reduce the number and/or size of traffic study requirements under their traffic impact fee ordinance.

Redevelopment of the Western Soap Building is a prime candidate for development in the subarea.
University District Strategic Master Plan
Non-GMA Plan, No SEPA Checklist at Plan Level — 2004

CASE OUTCOMES

- Increases in tax base from private development.
- Not-for-profit marketing group formed.
- Attractive package of economic development programs for developers.
- Federal and city funding of infrastructure and incentive programs.
- Much expanded citizen participation process.
- Reduced overall time-to-permit with addition of area-wide traffic studies and mitigation/transportation plan in place.

Investment
- Private development $25.9 million
- University projects $205 million

Cost
- Strategic Plan was not an adopted GMA Plan amendment so there was no SEPA checklist

SEPA Actions
- Only three private development EIS’s since mid 1990s
- MDNS required to implement transportation impact program

Other Economic Dev. Tools
- Significant public infrastructure
- Community Redevelopment Financing District
- Pre-application assistance and development code incentives
- City initiated study of urban re-zoning
- Subarea traffic study/model
- Subarea market study
- Subarea development incentives program: tax incentives and lending
WENATCHEE

Riverfront Subarea Plan
Non-project Declaration of Non-significance — 2004

CASE OVERVIEW

- City capitalized on a non-project EIS and SEIS that were completed for a GMA Comprehensive Plan by adopting predefined development mitigation and development thresholds to reduce use of project-level SEPA.

- Riverfront Subarea Plan had extensive citizen and developer involvement.

- City updates capital facility system plans and monitors use thresholds in order to facilitate effective detailed predefined mitigation conditions.

- City runs SEPA process in parallel with development permit process to reduce overall time-to-permit.

- County completed an additional integrated EIS/subarea plan in the urban growth boundary outside of city limits to assess impacts of various land use pattern alternatives; costs were too expensive for the city, leading to a city-county cooperative effort.

Subarea Characteristics
- 230 acres in central region
- Declaration of non-significance for plan to redevelop industrial to extend downtown to river

Land-Use Characteristics
- Public riverfront park and walkway along Columbia River
- Occupied and abandoned industrial uses
- Landfill, sanitary sewer treatment plant, public works shop
- Railroad

City Characteristics
- 30,960 population, 8 sq. mile city
- 3,986 persons per sq. mile
- 2,313 jobs per sq. mile
- 18,500 total jobs

Subarea Development
- $18 million public infrastructure and park expansion
- Historic landfill removal, Integrated Planning Grant from Ecology for cleanup
- Three projects

Subarea Characteristics
- Declaration of non-significance for plan to redevelop industrial to extend downtown to river

Land-Use Characteristics
- Public riverfront park and walkway along Columbia River
- Occupied and abandoned industrial uses
- Landfill, sanitary sewer treatment plant, public works shop
- Railroad

City Characteristics
- 30,960 population, 8 sq. mile city
- 3,986 persons per sq. mile
- 2,313 jobs per sq. mile
- 18,500 total jobs

Subarea Development
- $18 million public infrastructure and park expansion
- Historic landfill removal, Integrated Planning Grant from Ecology for cleanup
- Three projects

Concept simulation of the Pybus Market, a joint riverfront project between the city and port.
Riverfront Subarea Plan
Non-Project Declaration of Non-Significance — 2004

**Investment**
- 91-unit condo development
- Event center $52 million
- Port sponsored $20 million redevelopment of Pybus Market

**Subarea Plan DNS Cost**
- $15,000

**SEPA**
- Non-project declaration of non-significance for sub area plan based on non-project EIS for citywide Comprehensive Plan
- No project MDNS or EISs on private projects since 2003

**Other Economic Dev. Tools**
- Developer forum
- Expedited permitting
- Significant park and street public infrastructure investment
- Local Improvement District
- Local Revitalization Fin. District
- Event Center construction
- Removed or mitigated riverfront city waste and shop uses

**CASE OUTCOMES**
- Construction of Event Center, which created 150 jobs.
- Condo development prior to recession.
- Interest from regional developers as economy improves.
- Partnership with Port for Market redevelopment project.
- Partnership with Public Utility District and Port for waterfront park improvements.
- Partnership with state for Revitalization Financing District and brownfield clean up.
For More Information

APPENDIX

Additional information:
- Study Scope and Community Selection Criteria
- Structured Interview Questionnaire
- Individual Case Study Summaries
- Case Study Community Planning/SEPA Documentation
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