REQUEST FOR COMMENTS

Agency and City Department Review
FILE NO. Z20-209COMP, 1025 W Spofford
Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map Amendment Proposal

DATE: May 19, 2021

TO: Interested Parties, City Departments and Agencies with Jurisdiction
(Distribution List Attached)

FROM: Kevin Freibott, Assistant Planner II
808 W Spokane Falls Boulevard
Spokane, WA 99201
kfreibott@spokanecity.org or call (509) 625-6184

SUBJECT: Proposed amendment of the Land Use Plan Map designation for one parcel totaling 1.9 acres from “Residential 10-20” to “CC Core” and a concurrent change of zoning from “Residential Two-Family” to “Centers and Corridors Type 2 – District Center.”

APPLICANT/AGENT: Kandis Larsen, Integris Architecture

ADDRESSES: 1025 W Spofford Ave

PARCELS: 35076.3915

LOCATION: The entire block bounded by W Spofford Ave, N Monroe St, W Maxwell Ave, and N Madison St; SW 1/4 of Section 7 and NW 1/4 of Section 18, Township 25N, Range 43E.

COMMENT NEEDED BY 5 PM on June 2, 2021.

If additional information is required in order for your department or agency to comment on this proposal, please notify the Planning and Development Services Department as soon as possible so that the application processing can be suspended while the necessary information is being prepared. Under the procedures of SMC 17G.060, this referral to affected departments and agencies is for the following:

1) The determination of a complete application. If there are materials that the reviewing departments and agencies need to comment on this proposal, notice of such must be provided to the applicant;
2) Provides notice of application;
3) Concurrency Testing, please note one of the following:
   a) ( ) This application is subject to concurrency and agency is required to notify this department that applicant meets/fails currency; OR
   b) (X) This application is exempt from concurrency testing, but will use capacity of existing facilities.
The lack of comment including concurrency by any referral agency will be considered acceptance of this application as technically complete and meeting concurrency requirements.

Under the revised procedures of SMC 17G.060, this referral to affected Departments and Agencies is to provide notice of a pending application. **THIS WILL BE THE LAST NOTICE PROVIDED TO REFERRAL DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES UNLESS WARRANTED.** If there are materials that the reviewing Departments and Agencies need to comment on this proposal, notice of such must be provided to the Applicant. The lack of comment by any referral agency will be considered to be acceptance of this application as Technically Complete.

A map of the proposal is attached. Additional maps and materials can be found here:

https://my.spokanecity.org/projects/2020-2021-proposed-comprehensive-plan-amendments/

**ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW / SEPA:** The City of Spokane Planning and Development Services Department is the Lead Agency for this proposal; Louis Meuler, Director of Planning, is the responsible official. No determination has yet been made. This non-project proposal will be reviewed for compliance with SEPA Regulations, Spokane Municipal Code 17E.050. See attached SEPA Checklist.

**ATTACHMENTS**

1) Distribution List, Request for Comments
2) Reference Map, Land Use
3) SEPA Checklist
DISTRIBUTION LIST FOR COMMENTS

PROJECT NAME: W Spofford Ave
FILE No.: Z20-209COMP

E-mail Copies
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- Historic Preservation, Attn: Megan Duvall
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- Planning & Development, Attn: Dean Gunderson
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- Wastewater Management, Attn: Mike Morris**
- Wastewater Management, Attn: William Peacock**
- Wastewater AWVTP, Attn: Mike Coster**
- Water Department, Attn: Jim Sakamoto**
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- Spokane County Public Works, Attn: Barry Greene
- Spokane County Public Works, Attn: Lindsey Forward
- Spokane County Planning Department, Attn: John Pederson
- Spokane County Engineering Dept., Attn: Gary Nyberg
- Spokane Regional Health District, Attn: Jon Sherve
- Spokane Regional Health District, Attn: Paul Savage
- Spokane Regional Health District, Attn: Eric Meyer
- SRCAA, Attn: April Westby

Washington State Agencies

- Department of Natural Resources, Attn: Dave Harsh
- Department of Natural Resources Aquatics
- Department of Natural Resources, Attn: SEPA Center
- Department of Commerce, Attn: Dave Andersen
- Department of Archaeology & Historic Preservation, Attn: Gretchen Kaehler
- Department of Ecology, Attn: Environmental Review Section
- Department of Ecology, Attn: Jacob McCann
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- Department of Transportation, Attn: Char Kay
- Department of Transportation, Attn: Greg Figg
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- Avista Utilities, Attn: Larissa Pruitt
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Hard Copies

Other Agencies

- U.S. Postal Service, Attn: Postmaster
- Spokane Tribe of Indians, Attn: Randy Abrahamson (Section, Township, Range)
EXHIBIT A: Existing Land Use Plan Map

EXHIBIT B: Proposed Land Use Plan Map

Parcel(s): 35076.3915
Approximate Area: 1.9 acres

This is not a legal document.

The information shown on this map is compiled from various sources and is subject to constant revision. Information shown on this map should not be used to determine the location of facilities in relationship to property lines, section lines, streets, etc.
Purpose of Checklist:
The State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) chapter 43.21C RCW, requires all governmental agencies to consider the environmental impacts of a proposal before making decisions. An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) must be prepared for all proposals with probable significant adverse impacts on the quality of the environment. The purpose of this checklist is to provide information to help you and the agency identify impacts from your proposal (and to reduce or avoid impacts from the proposal, if it can be done) and to help the agency decide whether an EIS is required.

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

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

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

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

Use of checklist for nonproject proposals:
Complete this checklist for nonproject proposals, even though questions may be answered "does not apply."

IN ADDITION, complete the SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS (Part D).

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

1. Name of proposed project: Comprehensive Plan Change for The Community School

2. Applicant: Spokane School District No. 81 - Greg Forsyth, Director Capital Projects
   Address: 2815 E. Garland Avenue
   City/State/Zip: Spokane, WA 99207-5811 Phone: (509) 354-5900
   Email: gregoryf@spokaneschools.org

3. Agent or Primary Contact: Jim Kolva Associates, LLC, SEPA consultant
   Address: 115 South Adams Street, Suite 1
   City/State/Zip: Spokane, WA 99201-4603 Phone: (509) 458-5517
   Email: jim@jimkolvaassociates.com

   Architect: Kandis Larsen, Integrus Architecture
   Address: 10 S. Cedar Street
   City/State/Zip: Spokane, WA 99201 Phone: (509) 838-8681
   Email: klarsen@integrusarch.com

4. Location of Project:
   Address: 1025 West Spofford Avenue, 99205
   Section: 07 & 18 Quarter: SW07 & NW18 Township: 25N Range: 43E
   Tax Parcel Number(s): 35076.3915

5. Date checklist prepared: April 20, 2021

6. Agency requesting checklist: City of Spokane, Washington

7. Proposed timing or schedule (including phasing, if applicable):
   Comprehensive Plan change, 2021; construction project is not yet determined, pending bond issue in 2024.

8. a. Do you have any plans for future additions, expansion, or further activity related to or connected with this proposal? If yes, explain:
   The project constitutes only a comprehensive plan land use map change and rezone. A future project may involve the demolition of the existing buildings, clearing of the site, and building a
new classroom building, size and capacity to be determined. At this time, no permits or approvals of that potential future redevelopment are being sought or considered.

b. Do you own or have options on land nearby or adjacent to this proposal? If yes, explain:
   No

9. List any environmental information you know about that has been prepared, or will be prepared, directly related to this proposal:
   The following studies are likely to be completed at the time a construction project is proposed:
   - Survey for asbestos, lead, and other potentially hazardous substances prior to demolition of existing school building
   - Geotechnical Report
   - Noise Study
   - Traffic Report, pending coordination with city of Spokane
   - Schematic Design Report for new school building
   - Potential historic building inventory, submitted to WISAARD at DAHP

10. Do you know whether applications are pending for governmental approvals of other proposals directly affecting the property covered by your proposal? If yes, explain:
   None are pending at this time.

11. List any government approvals or permits that will be needed for your proposal, if known:
   No additional approvals or permits are required for the comprehensive plan amendment. Eventual redevelopment of the site may require:
   - Conditional Use Permit (potential)
   - Demolition
   - Land Disturbance Permit (Grading and drainage)
   - Right of Way Permit – Street use
   - Driveway approach
   - Building
   - Electrical
   - Plumbing/mechanical
   - Occupancy

12. Give brief, complete description of your proposal, including the proposed uses and the size of the project and site. There are several questions later in this checklist that ask you to describe certain aspects of your proposal. You do not need to repeat those answers on this page.
The proposed project is a comprehensive plan and zone change for the existing block occupied by the Spokane School District Community School (originally Bancroft Elementary School). The property contains approximately 82,980 square feet (Spokane County Assessor) and is used as the campus for the school which includes classroom and multipurpose buildings, asphalt driveway and parking lot, and landscaping. The classroom building is one-story and the multi-purpose building is one-story with high walls.

The purpose of the comprehensive plan and zone change is to provide greater flexibility than provided by the current residential zone. Although the future school building has not yet been designed, a two-to-three story masonry building containing 16 classrooms (10 in existing school) and support spaces with a size of approximately 66,000 square feet is being contemplated.

Redevelopment of the site is not a part of this checklist, nor are permits for such an action being sought at this time.

13. Location of the proposal: Give sufficient information for a person to understand the precise location of your proposed project, including a street address, if any, and section, township and range, if known. If a proposal would occur over a range of area, provide the range or boundaries of the site(s). Provide a legal description, site plan, vicinity map, and topographic map, if reasonably available. While you should submit any plans required by the agency, you are not required to duplicate maps or detailed plans submitted with any permit application related to this checklist.

The proposed project site is in the northwest quadrant of the city of Spokane, within the West Central neighborhood, and along the Monroe Street corridor with a street address of 1025 West Spofford Avenue. The parcel number is 35076.3915, in sections 7SW and 18NW, township 25N, range 43E.

The property now houses Spokane School District Community School -- the former Bancroft Elementary School has occupied the since the 1880s. The campus occupies the entire block bounded by Spofford Avenue on the north, Monroe Street on the east, Maxwell Avenue on the south and Madison Street on the west.

14. Does the proposed action lie within the Aquifer Sensitive Area (ASA)? ☒ Yes ☐ No

The General Sewer Service Area? ☒ Yes ☐ No
The Priority Sewer Service Area? ☒ Yes ☐ No
The City of Spokane? ☒ Yes ☐ No

15. The following questions supplement Part A.

a. Critical Aquifer Recharge Area (CARA) / Aquifer Sensitive Area (ASA)

(1) Describe any systems, other than those designed for the disposal of sanitary waste installed for the purpose of discharging fluids below the ground surface (includes systems such as those for the disposal of stormwater or drainage from floor drains). Describe the type of system, the amount of material to be disposed of through the system and the types of material likely to be disposed of (including materials which may enter the system inadvertently through spills or as a result of firefighting activities).

None, the school is connected to the City of Spokane sewer system, as would be any redeveloped uses in the future. Stormwater would be managed in accordance with the Spokane Storm Water Management guidelines.

Will any chemicals (especially organic solvents or petroleum fuels) be stored in aboveground or underground storage tanks? If so, what types and quantities of material will be stored?

No

(2) What protective measures will be taken to ensure that leaks or spills of any chemicals stored or used on site will not be allowed to percolate to groundwater. This includes measures to keep chemicals out of disposal systems.

A management plan is in place for storage and proper handling of chemicals used for facilities and landscape maintenance. This also includes a spill management plan. The use of herbicides, pesticides, and fertilizers for grounds maintenance is managed in accordance with a District management plan.

(3) Will any chemicals be stored, handled or used on the site in a location where a spill or leak will drain to surface or groundwater or to a stormwater disposal system discharging to surface or groundwater?

The District has a management plan for storage and proper handling of chemicals used for facilities and landscape maintenance. This also includes a spill management plan.

The use of herbicides, pesticides, and fertilizers for grounds maintenance is managed with a low possibility of spill and migration to ground or surface water.

The District will provide a Critical Materials List.
b. Stormwater

(1) What are the depths on the site to groundwater and to bedrock (if known)?

*Not known specifically for this property, but generally greater than 100 feet.*

(2) Will stormwater be discharged into the ground? If so, describe any potential impacts.

*As a non-project action, no change to the current condition is expected as part of the current proposal. Future redevelopment of the site would include a drainage system designed in accordance with the Spokane Regional Stormwater Manual (April 2008), pursuant to Spokane Municipal Code (SMC) standards.*

---

B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS

1. Earth

a. General description of the site (check one):

- Flat
- Rolling
- Hilly
- Steep slopes
- Mountainous

Other: n/a

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

*The site is essentially flat.*

c. What general types of soils are found on the site (for example, clay, sand, gravel, peat, muck)?

If you know the classification of agricultural soils, specify them and note any agricultural land of long-term commercial significance and whether the proposal results in removing any of these soils.

*With the exception of the planting strip along the perimeter of the site, and the grass swale in the middle of the parking lot, the site is developed and covered by rooftops, concrete sidewalks, and asphalt driveways and parking lots. The site’s soils have been totally disturbed as reflected in the NRCS soil survey. The soil comprising the site is classified by NRCS as Urban land, gravelly substratum, 0 to 15 percent slopes. Because of the soil disturbance, it is not rated in the survey. In the 1968 Soil Conservation Service Survey, the soils of the area are Garrison gravelly loam, 0 to 5 percent slopes (GgA). The deep gravelly soil is somewhat excessively drained and has moderately rapid permeability. Other than high permeability which allows...*
contaminants to potentially reach groundwater, the soil has few constraints for development. Regardless, prior to site planning and development a geotechnical survey and report that provides site preparation and building specifications will be prepared.

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

No

e. Describe the purpose, type, total area, and approximate quantities and total affected area of any filling, excavation, and grading proposed. Indicate source of fill.

The entire 82,930-square-foot site is developed with buildings, concrete sidewalks, asphalt driveways and parking lot, and landscaping. Although no development plan is yet developed, it is expected that the buildings and hard surfaces would be demolished and, the landscaping materials, will be removed. Depending on the design of the new building(s), soil may be excavated and removed from the site, but it is not expected that fill will be required. But, if so, it will be approved as to source and composition and applied in accordance with geotechnical engineering specifications. Note that these future actions are not a part of the current non-project proposal.

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

Since the site is flat and within an urban setting, it is not expected that erosion will be an issue. The base soil, garrison gravelly loam has a slight hazard of erosion.

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

The current site is covered with buildings, concrete sidewalks, and asphalt driveways and parking lot, and landscaping. Approximately 61,000 square feet of the total 82,930 square feet of the site is presently covered with impervious material, or 74 percent. It is likely that the future redevelopment of the site would be similar or greater in impervious coverage.

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

Standard erosion control measures will be used if and when the site is redeveloped, pursuant to SMC requirements. Site grading and landscaping will be designed to control runoff so that it complies with city of Spokane storm drainage requirements. A geotechnical report will be completed and will provide guidance on soil and runoff characteristics and appropriate design criteria.
2. Air 
   a. What type of emissions to the air would result from the proposal during construction, operation, 
      and maintenance when the project is completed? If any, generally describe and give 
      approximate quantities if known. 

      The current non-project proposal does not include any change to the current use of the site or 
      emissions to the air. If the site is redeveloped in the future, SCAPCA dust control regulations 
      would be followed during demolition and construction (a asbestos, lead paint, and hazardous 
      material survey will be completed prior to demolition). Typical pollution sources include building 
      demolition, site grading with removal of asphalt and concrete, use of diesel and gasoline-powered 
      equipment, and application of coatings and asphalt paving. Quantities generated are unknown 
      but expected to be nominal. 

      Dust would be generated during site grading and final site preparation. Diesel and gasoline 
      exhaust emissions from generators, automobiles, trucks, earthmoving and lifting equipment will 
      be generated during construction. Finally, asphalt paving and application of coatings such as 
      paints, wood finishes, and other weather coatings will generate emissions that may create short 
      term odors. 

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

      No 

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

      Other than following SCAPCA regulations, no additional measures are recommended. If the site 
      is redeveloped in the future, exposed soil will be controlled by water sprays, ground covers, and 
      other means to reduce erosion by wind or water. Travel routes used by trucks and other vehicles 
      that will exit the site should be cleaned regularly and during muddy conditions, it may be 
      necessary to wash vehicles before exiting the site to reduce potential for entrained soil. 

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. 

          No, The US Fish and Wildlife National Wetlands Inventory map shows no wetlands on the 

      (2) Will the project require any work over, in, or adjacent to (within 200 feet) the described 
          waters? If yes, please describe and attach available plans.
No

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

NA

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

No

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

No, according to FIRM Map Number 5303CC0541D, 7/6/2010. the site and vicinity are in Zone X, outside a 100-year flood zone (reviewed 3/31/21).

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

No

b. GROUNDWATER:

(1) Will groundwater be withdrawn from a well for drinking water or other purposes? If so, give a general description of the well, proposed uses and approximate quantities withdrawn from the well. Will water be discharged to groundwater? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.

The existing building is connected to the city of Spokane water system, as will any future buildings on the site.

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

The existing building is connected to the city of Spokane sewer system, as will any future buildings on the site.
c. WATER RUNOFF (INCLUDING STORMWATER):

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

The existing school campus includes rooftops, concrete walkways and asphalt driveways and parking lots from which runoff is generated. Most is retained on-site and directed to lawn areas and a grass swale in the middle of the parking lot. Some runoff from the edges of the site enters the adjacent streets and flows to catchbasins in those streets.

The future school campus would include the same materials as existing and have the same potential for generating stormwater runoff. Stormwater generated by rooftops, concrete walkways and asphalt driveways and parking lots will be contained on-site in accordance with city of Spokane Stormwater Management guidelines. These guidelines would follow the recommendations of a geotechnical evaluation of the site’s soils.

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

Potential for such occurrence is low and is not expected. A management plan is in place for storage and proper handling of chemicals used for facilities and landscape maintenance. This also includes a spill management plan. The use of herbicides, pesticides, and fertilizers for grounds maintenance is managed with a low possibility of spill and migration to ground or surface water.

(3) Does the proposal alter or otherwise affect drainage patterns in the vicinity of the site? If so, describe.

No

d. PROPOSED MEASURES to reduce or control surface, ground, and runoff water, and drainage pattern impacts, if any.

The current proposal does not include any additional measures for runoff and drainage. If the site is redeveloped in the future, the project civil engineers will design the management system to handle the stormwater runoff, peak rate and volume, in accordance with city of Spokane Stormwater Management guidelines.
4. Plants
   a. Check the type(s) of vegetation found on the site:

      Deciduous trees: ☐ alder  ☒ maple  ☐ aspen
      Other: Answer

      Evergreen trees: ☒ fir  ☐ cedar  ☒ pine
      Other: Answer

      ☒ shrubs  ☒ grass  ☐ pasture  ☐ crop or grain

      ☐ orchards, vineyards or other permanent crops

      Wet soil plants: ☐ cattail  ☐ buttercup  ☐ bullrush  ☐ skunk cabbage
      Other: Answer

      Water plants: ☐ water lily  ☐ eelgrass  ☐ milfoil
      Other: n/a

      Any other types of vegetation:
      None

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

      No removal of vegetation is expected under the current non-project proposal. If redevelopment occurs in the future, it is likely that all landscaping plant materials will be removed during site preparation. It is possible that two mature maple trees near the northeast corner can be retained. They will be evaluated for condition and location during site design.

   c. List threatened and endangered species known to be on or near the site:
      None

   d. Proposed landscaping, use of native plants, or other measures to preserve or enhance vegetation on the site, if any:
      The site will be landscaped in accordance with a site landscaping plan approved by the city. Native plants will be used to the degree possible.

   e. List all noxious weeds and invasive species known to be on or near the site:
      None
5. **Animals**
   a. Check and List any birds and other animals which have been observed on or near the site or are known to be on or near the site:
      - **Birds:**
        - ☐ hawk
        - ☐ heron
        - ☐ eagle
        - ☒ songbirds
      - **Other:**
      - **Mammals:**
        - ☐ deer
        - ☐ bear
        - ☐ elk
        - ☐ beaver
      - **Other:**
      - **Fish:**
        - ☐ bass
        - ☐ salmon
        - ☐ trout
        - ☐ herring
        - ☐ shellfish
      - **Other:**
      - Any other animals (not listed in above categories): **None**

   b. List any threatened or endangered animal species known to be on or near the site.
      **None**

   c. Is the site part of a migration route? If so, explain.
      **No**

   d. Proposed measures to preserve or enhance wildlife, if any:
      **None**

   e. List any invasive animal species known to be on or near the site.
      **None**

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

   *Currently, electricity is used for power, and natural gas for heating. Petroleum-based fuels are used for bus and automobile transportation of faculty, support staff, students, parents, and visitors. It is expected that the future school will use the same energy sources.*

   *While the current non-project proposal would not change the current energy uses of the site, if future redevelopment on the site occurs, gasoline and diesel fuels would be used by construction vehicles during the completion of the additional and remodel project.*
b. Would your project affect the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties? If so, generally describe:

*It is not expected to affect solar potential for adjacent properties.*

c. What kinds of energy conservation features are included in the plans of this proposal? List other proposed measures to reduce or control energy impacts, if any:

*The current non-project proposal would not result in any changes to the current energy uses or conservation on site. If redeveloped in the future, the project would be built in accordance with the Washington State Energy Code. Interior lighting will conform to the 2018 Washington Non-Residential State Energy Code—or applicable standards at the time of construction. The project designers will evaluate a variety of strategies to use natural light, other sources of energy, and building construction to reduce energy consumption.*

7. Environmental health

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

*The site has been used as an elementary school for over 60 years. The current non-project proposal would not result in any environmental health exposure. If redevelopment occurs in the future, a hazardous materials survey will be conducted prior to demolition. Demolition will follow the recommendations of that report.*

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

*None known*

(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.

*None known*

(3) Describe any toxic or hazardous chemicals/conditions that might be stored, used, or produced during the project's development or construction, or at any time during the operating life of the project.

*If the site is redeveloped in the future, petroleum-based fuels, hydraulic fluid, and other materials used by construction. During construction petroleum-based fuels, hydraulic fluid, and other materials used by construction vehicles and equipment, and in the construction process would be used on the site. No such action is included in the current proposal.*
During the operation of the school, typical materials used for building and landscape maintenance will be used on the site.

(4) Describe special emergency services that might be required.
   
   None

(5) Proposed measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards, if any:
   
   None

b. NOISE:

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

   Bancroft Elementary/The Community School have occupied the site since the 1880s and have been part of, and experienced, the existing noise environment of the neighborhood and Monroe Street corridor.

   The primary noise source in the site vicinity is vehicular traffic along Monroe Street and Maxwell Avenue, both arterial streets. A stop light is at the intersection and thus accelerating traffic would be present. The neighborhood is predominantly single-family dwellings with commercial uses along Monroe Street east, south, and north of the site. During the project planning process for a future redevelopment of the site, the School District would engage a noise consultant to take noise readings at the site and evaluate the recorded noise levels pursuant to WAC guidelines for school locations.

(2) What types and levels of noise would be created by or associated with the project on a short-term or a long-term basis (for example: traffic, construction, operation, other)?

   Under the current non-project proposal, no change to the current on-site noise environment would occur. Noise would be generated by construction equipment such as trucks, trenchers, front-end loaders, backhoes, compressors, etc. during demolition, site preparation and building construction.

   Over the life of the project, noise will also continue to be generated by vehicular traffic along the surrounding streets. Currently school buses and private automobiles use Madison Street for off-loading students in the morning at the start of school, and loading students in the afternoon at the close of school. Buses and parent vehicles also load and offload along Spofford Avenue.

   It is not expected that traffic or noise levels will change significantly as a result of the proposed project or future development. The location of driveways, parking lots and the buildings
themselves may shift in the design of a new school campus, but Madison and Spofford are likely to remain entry points for buses and parent vehicles.

Additionally, human activity on the site will generate noise of the same type, duration, and timeframes as at the existing Community School. The sound of students coming and leaving school, and on the playgrounds, and gathering area before and after class and during class breaks would continue. The use of power equipment for landscape and building maintenance, snow removal, site maintenance, etc. would also continue. In much the same way as presently occurs, children and other neighborhood residents would use the outdoor facilities during summer months.

The school hours and evening activities will not be changed from historic operations. They will be typical of Spokane Public Schools. The range of noise is considered normal for the site and activities of the community. No new vehicular traffic is expected as a result of the modernization and expansion.

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

None are proposed at this time, but the project team will with appropriate agencies and the neighborhood to identify and, if possible, mitigate potential noise impacts.

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 nearby or adjacent properties? If so, describe.

The Community School campus occupies the entire site and has been at this location since 1960. Previous to the construction of the existing school, the original Bancroft school was constructed on the site ca. 1886, and the gymnasium added in 1953. The original school was razed in order to build the 1960 building—integrating the gymnasium—and campus.

The school is surrounded by the following uses:

**East across Monroe Street:** one-to-three-story commercial buildings fronting along Monroe;

**North across Spofford Avenue:** from Monroe to Madison — vacant lot at corner, and single-family houses west to Madison and beyond;

**West across Madison Street:** single-family houses and six-unit apartment building;

**South across Maxwell Avenue:** from Madison to Monroe — single-family houses, and at the corner of Monroe an asphalt parking lot and two-story commercial building.

b. Has the project site been used as working farmlands or working forest lands? If so, describe. How much agricultural or forest land of long-term commercial significance will be converted to other uses as a result of the proposal, if any? If resource lands have not been designated, how many acres in farmland or forest land tax status will be converted to nonfarm or nonforest use?
1) Will the proposal affect or be affected by surrounding working farm or forest land normal business operations, such as oversize equipment access, the application of pesticides, tilling, and harvesting? If so, how:

No

c. Describe any structures on the site.

The former 1960 Bancroft Elementary school and 1953 Multi-purpose building occupy the site.

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

No structures would be demolished as part of the current non-project proposal. However, if the site were to redevelop in the future, all structures, landscaping, sidewalks, and paving would be removed from the site in preparation for a future new school.

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

The Community School campus is currently zoned RTF, Residential Two Family. The blocks to the west, northwest, and southwest are also zone RTF, as are the westerly four lots of the block to the north across Spofford Avenue, and the westerly four lots of the block to the south across Maxwell Avenue.

The land across Monroe Street to the east, and the two-lot-wide strip along the west side of Monroe Street to the north, south is zoned CC2-DC, Pedestrian Enhanced/Auto Accommodating-District Corridor. The Type 2 center and corridor zone promotes new development and redevelopment that is pedestrian oriented while accommodating the automobile. The zone Permits “Government, Public Service or Utility Structures, Social Services and Education. Projects within this zone are required to follow Section 17C.122.060 Design Standards and Guidelines for Centers and Corridors.

The allowable floor area ratio (FAR) is 0.2 for non-residential structures, or 16,596 square feet for the 82,980 square foot lot (assessor land area). With added public amenities, which the project designers intend to incorporate, the maximum FAR can reach 0.8, or 66,884 square feet. The allowable building height in the CC2, District Corridor is 55 feet, but there is a required height transition for all development with 150 feet of any single-family or two-family residential zone the maximum building height begins at 30 feet. Additional building height may be added at a ratio of 1 foot vertical for 2 feet horizontal distance from the closest single or two-family residential zone. Setbacks from RTF zoned lots are 10 feet, with zero feet from the street lot line.

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

The site is designated in the Land Use plan for residential 10-20 dwelling units per acre.
With the exception of the block occupied by the school campus, the properties along Monroe Street for a depth of two lots (typically 100 feet) along the entire stretch between Sinto and Nora avenues are designated for General Commercial use.

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

h. Has any part of the site been classified as a critical area by the city or the county? If so, specify.
   No

i. Approximately how many people would reside or work in the completed project?
   *There are approximately 15 teachers, administrators and support staff at the existing Community School. The current enrollment in eight classrooms with eight teachers is about 160 students in grades 9 to 12.*

   *The staffing at the new school has not yet been determined. If developed, it is likely that the future school would have sixteen or so classrooms; at 25 students per classroom total enrollment could reach 400 students. At that enrollment, the number of potential teachers, administrators, and support staff could reach 25-30 persons.*

j. Approximately how many people would the completed project displace?
   None

k. Proposed measures to avoid or reduce displacement impacts, if any:
   None

l. Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with existing and projected land uses and plans, if any:
   *The current proposal is to change the existing land use and zoning—a process allowed under SMC 17G.020. As such, the compatibility of the proposal with existing land uses and plans will be determined during application processing, in coordination with City staff and local agencies, and is required under SMC 17G.020.030 prior to approval of the proposal.*

   *If the project site is redeveloped in the future, the project design team will coordinate with the city and its design review committee as well as the neighborhood and district patrons to comply with the zoning code and design guidelines. The project will replace an existing school campus within an existing neighborhood. It is likely that the future classroom building will be located along the Monroe frontage so as to maximize the distance from smaller-scale residential uses and to fill the street frontage in conformity with the historic buildings facing Monroe Street.*
m. Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with nearby agricultural and forest lands of long-term commercial significance, if any:

NA

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

None

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

None

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

None

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

The multipurpose building is the tallest structure on the site, approximately 22 feet in height. Under the current non-project proposal, no change to the existing buildings would occur. Regarding future redevelopment of the site, the building area, height, dimensions or materials have not yet been designed. The height will not exceed the allowable height within the zone per SMC requirements. Materials are typically masonry—brick and CMU, with glass/aluminum storefront windows with flat roofs.

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

There are no designated view corridors along Monroe Street or within the surrounding neighborhood. The houses across the streets from the existing one-story brick school building (and two-story multi-purpose building) have had these buildings in their views since 1960.

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

If the site is redeveloped, the future project design team would work with the city’s design review committee and the neighborhood through the design process to create a well-designed, functional, and quality building. Redevelopment of the site is not a part of the current proposal.

11. Light and Glare
a. What type of light or glare will the proposal produce? What time of day would it mainly occur?

The existing school produces light that is emitted through glass windows and doors, and building mounted external security lighting. Pole-mounted lighting is on the corners of the intersections.
Light and glare produced by a future school would be similar to that produced by the existing school. The building will have both internal (light emitted through glass windows) and external lighting at entries and selected areas. No atypical light or glare is expected.

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

The site is not changing under the current non-project proposal. It is also not expected that the future building glazing or the lighting system, either interior or exterior, would create adverse light or glare.

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

The existing school has co-existed with the commercial uses along Monroe Street and the residential neighbors to the north, west, and south since the 1960s. It is expected that the same would be true of a future school that would replace the existing.

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

No measures are proposed for the current non-project proposal. If redeveloped in the future, new external lighting would be designed to reduce the horizontal dispersion of light to adjacent off-site properties. Site lighting should be minimized during non-use hours to that required for security so as to minimize impacts to across-the-street off-site residential properties. Exterior and interior lighting will be turned off during non-use hours with occupancy sensors and energy management systems.

12. Recreation

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

The campus has three basketball hoops and three picnic tables in the area south and east of the classroom building and multi-purpose room. The Community School students typically use the YMCA and YWCA at 930 North Monroe Street, 0.5 miles south (10-minute walk). The Monroe 4 bus route also provides access.

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

The current non-project proposal would have no impact on the current recreational opportunities offered on site. If redeveloped in the future, the existing facilities would be removed and replaced with new recreational facilities in the future building and campus.

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

No measures are proposed for the current non-project proposal. The future school campus and building would include recreational facilities and opportunities for students, and per school district policy, use by the local neighborhood.
13. Historic and cultural preservation

a. Are there any buildings, structures, or sites, located on or near the site that are over 45 years old listed in or eligible for listing in national, state, or local preservation registers located on or near the site? If so, specifically describe.

*The first elementary school north of the Spokane River, Bancroft Elementary school has occupied the site since 1886 and was expanded through the early 1900s. The multi-purpose room was constructed in 1953, and in 1960, the existing school buildings replaced the original building and additions. The campus block is surrounded by numerous buildings constructed between 1894 and 1973. Of note is the three-story brick St. Cloud apartment building (1502 N. Monroe – 1910) and the two-story brick King apartment building (1427 N. Monroe - 1907) on the southwest corner of Maxwell and Monroe. Kiddy-cornered on the southeast corner of Maxwell and Monroe is Hoffman Music (1967-R1997), a one-story concrete block building. The single-family houses surrounding the site to the south, west and north were built between 1894 and 1906, with one 1973 duplex.*

b. Are there any landmarks, features, or other evidence of Indian or historic use or occupation?

This may include human burials or old cemeteries. Are there any material evidence, artifacts, or areas of cultural importance on or near the site? Please list any professional studies conducted at the site to identify such resources.

*The site is within an established residential district and within the Monroe Street commercial corridor. As stated above, the site first housed a school in the 1880s and was totally redeveloped in the 1950s through the 1960s. The existing school is a good example of mid-century elementary school design and construction. Although a determination of eligibility has not been completed at this time, it is possible that the building will be inventoried and documented on the DAHP WISAARD website.*

c. Describe the methods used to assess the potential impacts to cultural and historic resources on or near the project site. Examples include consultation with tribes and the department of archaeology and historic preservation, archaeological surveys, historic maps, GIS data, etc.

*Spokane County Assessor’s website was consulted to determine ages of buildings in project proximity. Observation by author determined condition and significance of buildings.*

d. Proposed measures to avoid, minimize, or compensate for loss, changes to, and disturbance to resources. Please include plans for the above and any permits that may be required.

*No measures are proposed for the current non-project proposal. The future school would not adversely affect surrounding historic properties. The school itself, if during the site planning process is determined to be demolished, will be inventoried and documented prior to demolition. During the design and site planning process, the context of the site – particularly the scale, bulk and materials of the commercial buildings along the Monroe Street corridor - will be considered.*
14. Transportation
   a. Identify public streets and highways serving the site or affected geographic area and describe proposed access to the existing street system. Show on site plans, if any.

   *Monroe along the eastern boundary and Maxwell Avenue along the southern boundary are designated as Urban Principal Arterial streets. Madison Street, along the western boundary, and Spofford Avenue, along the northern boundary are local streets. Access to the existing school building and the parking lot is from Madison Street. Drop off access to the front of the school is along Spofford Avenue. It is expected that these two streets would be the primary vehicular and bus access for the future school building and campus if the site is redeveloped.*

   b. Is 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.

   *Spokane Transit route No. 4 Monroe has a stop at the corner of Monroe and Maxwell, across Monroe for northbound, and at the corner of the campus (with bus shelter) for southbound. The bus runs every fifteen minutes between around 0530 AM and 1109 PM.*

   c. How many additional parking spaces would the completed project or non-project proposal have? How many would the project or proposal eliminate?

   *The existing school has 59 parking stalls, including 3 designated for handi-capped drivers. If the site were redeveloped, these spaces will be removed in preparation for the new building site plan but would be replaced in accordance with SMC requirements for the new facility.*

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

   *No*

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

   *No*

   f. How many vehicular trips per day would be generated by the completed project or proposal? If known, indicate when peak volumes would occur and what percentage of the volume would be trucks (such as commercial and non-passenger vehicles). What data or transportation models were used to make these estimates? (Note: to assist in review and if known, indicate vehicle trips during PM peak, AM Peak, and Weekday (24 hours).

   *The current non-project proposal would not result in any change in trips generated by the existing school. As such a trip generation memo or traffic report has not been prepared for the current proposal.*
If the site is redeveloped in the future, a traffic engineer will prepare a trip generation memo and, if necessary, a traffic report. The Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip General Manual (10th Edition, 2018) will be used to calculate trip generation for the future school. The engineer would provide trip generation for weekday, AM peak hour (morning) and PM peak hour (afternoon). Based on an enrollment of 250 students, and based on a weekday trip rate of 2.03 trips per student, the total number of trips would be approximately 507 trips, with 130 peak morning trips (rate of 0.52) and 82 (rate of 0.33) in the afternoon. The afternoon trips would occur prior to the on-street peak PM hour.

Typically, the generator hours for the school are 8:45 to 9:15 AM and 2:45 to 3:30 PM and reflect the drop off and pickup timeframes in relation to the 9:00 AM start and afternoon 2:30 PM departure bells.

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.

No

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

None

15. Public services

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

The proposed action is a future Spokane Schools project.

Fire protection is provided by the city of Spokane Fire Department. The nearest station to the site is: Station 3 at the corner of Ash and Indiana, 0.8 miles northwest with a 3 minute drive time. The Spokane Police Department at the Public Safety Building, 1100 W. Mallon Avenue, is 0.6 miles south, a 2-3-minute drive time. No need for additional services is expected.

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

None

16. Utilities

a. Check utilities currently available at the site:

☒ electricity ☒ natural gas ☒ water ☒ refuse service

☒ telephone ☒ sanitary sewer ☐ septic system
b. Describe the utilities that are proposed for the project, the utility providing the service, and the general construction activities on the site or in the immediate vicinity which might be needed:

City of Spokane and Avista utilities are presently connected to the existing school building and would be connected to the future school building and campus. The existing building connects with a 6-inch water main in Spofford Avenue, and 4-inch gas main along the south side of Spofford. Underground power and telephone enter the building from Madison Street. Likewise, and 8-inch sewer main to which the building is connected is along Madison Street. A 6-inch water main is along Maxwell Avenue and supplies the fire hydrant on the southwest corner of the site (Maxwell and Madison). Gas mains are also along Maxwell Avenue and along Monroe Street.
C. SIGNATURE

I, the undersigned, swear under penalty of perjury that the above responses are made truthfully and to the best of my knowledge. I also understand that, should there be any willful misrepresentation or willful lack of full disclosure on my part, the agency must withdraw any determination of Nonsignificance that it might issue in reliance upon this checklist.

Date: April 20, 2021       Signature: 

Please Print or Type:

PROJECT PROPONENT:

Name: Spokane School District 81, Greg Forsyth, Director of Capital Projects

Address: 2815 East Garland, Avenue, Spokane, WA 99207

Phone: 509-354-5771       Email: GregoryF@spokaneschools.org

CHECKLIST PREPARER (If different from proponent):

Name: Jim Kolva

Address: 115 South Adams Street, Suite 1

Phone: (509) 458-5517       Spokane, WA 99201

FOR STAFF USE ONLY

Staff member(s) reviewing checklist: Staff Name

Based on this staff review of the environmental checklist and other pertinent information, staff concludes that:

☐ A. There are no probable significant adverse impacts and recommends a Determination of Nonsignificance.

☐ B. Probable significant adverse environmental impacts do exist for the current proposal and recommends a Mitigated Determination of Nonsignificance with conditions.

☐ C. There are probable significant adverse environmental impacts and recommends a Determination of Significance.
D. SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS

*(Do not use this sheet for project actions)*

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

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

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

   *The existing Community School currently generates nominal emissions to air, toxic materials pollution, or noise generation. The future school that would replace the existing 1960s-era school would be built with current energy and materials standards with technology that should reduce system impacts.*

   Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are:

   *Adherence to building codes and environmental regulations at time of building planning, construction and operations. The project team will work to incorporate state of the art construction and mechanical systems into the future building design and specifications.*

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

   *No impact is expected.*

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

   *Plant landscaping materials indigenous to the Spokane area.*

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

   *The current building (1960 standards) consumes electrical power and natural gas for lighting, air conditioning and heating. The future building will be designed in accordance with the energy standards at the time of approval. Thus, it is expected that the future building would be more resource efficient and reduce potential resource consumption.*

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

   *The future building will be designed in accordance with the energy standards at the time of approval.*

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

*There are no environmentally sensitive areas within the site vicinity. Several buildings across the streets bounding the school campus are potentially historic, but the school buildings and campus are not within the same construction era or historic period of these buildings thus do not contribute to a potential historic district. Likewise, the new future building would not contribute to such a district.*

Further, building placement on its block could separate it from the current proximity to the single-family houses and place it along the Monroe Street commercial corridor, thereby complementing the neighboring historic buildings.

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

*The proposed future school building and campus would not directly impact potential historic resources. The project designers will site the future building and use materials and design modes that would complement the existing neighbors. It is likely that the building would be oriented along Monroe Street and thus be nearest the two and three story brick apartment buildings across Monroe and Maxwell.*

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

*The future project is intended to replace the existing school with a more modern and efficient educational facility. The building and campus would be sited to minimize impacts to the adjacent single-family neighborhood and complement the historic Monroe corridor street scape.*

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

*The future school building would replace an existing school building built during the 1950s-1960s, which in turn replaced a complex of school buildings that had first occupied the site in 1886. Thus, the use will be a continuation of a century plus educational use of the site. Further, the design of the building and its campus will be coordinated with the city design review staff and committee as well as the West Central community council.*

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

*It is likely that the future project would reduce demands on public services and utilities because 1960s era mechanical, lighting, and heating/cooling systems would be replaced by more energy-efficient systems. Because student enrollment is expected to increase in the future school, demand for transportation would increase. The Monroe Street corridor is well-served by Spokane Transit and the School District will work with staff and students to facilitate transit use.*
Proposed measures to reduce or respond to such demand(s) are:

*The project design will comply with the applicable Washington State Energy Code guidelines, and the design team will evaluate systems that would maximize performance.*

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

*None are apparent.*
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