

Addendum

City of Tacoma Tideflats and Industrial Land Use Regulations
SEPA Checklist and Determination of Non-Significance Issued February 22, 2021

Addendum Date April 14, 2021

INTRODUCTION AND REFINED OPTIONS

The City of Tacoma has prepared this Addendum to the Tideflats and Industrial Land Use Regulations SEPA Checklist and Determination of Non-Significance issued February 22, 2021. The environmental evaluation examined a range of three options:

- Option A: Proposal Alternative – Planning Commission Hearing Draft for February 3, 2021.
- Option B: Baseline – the “No Action” Pre-Interim Ordinance.
- Option C: Current Ordinance – the Interim Regulations that are in effect.

The Addendum describes modifications to Option A that are in the range of the studied options. Per WAC 197-11-706, this Addendum is an environmental document that provides additional information or analysis that does not substantially change the analysis of significant impacts and alternatives in the existing environmental document.

This Addendum describes the modifications to Option A, called Option A-1. Option A-1 refers to Planning Commission Recommended Regulations, dated April 7, 2021. Option A-1 builds on Option A and reflects responses to public comments; it includes several refinements:

- Clarify noticing of heavy industrial uses including a map illustrating notification distances.
- Provide building design standards for residential developments in NE Tacoma in addition to site development standards. Residential buildings would incorporate design elements to reduce impacts on occupants of light/noise of industrial uses.
- Treat High Impact Uses in the Port Maritime Industrial District (PMI) zone as a

conditional use permit (similar to M-2 Heavy Industrial and M-1 Light Industrial Zones).

- In PMI, M-1, and M-2 zones, allow repair, maintenance, and upgrade of existing fossil fuel facilities with a simpler review if baseline capacities are retained. For example, this could allow for fuel changes within existing facilities to meet customer needs and allow for incremental, near term changes that result in environmental benefits. Expansion beyond a defined baseline using available federal, state, and local data would be fully vetted as part of the permit review.
- Allow for renewable fuel production facilities without a conditional use permit if baseline capacities are retained. New and expanded facilities would continue to require a conditional use permits.

The proposed adjustments further advance the purpose and intent of the regulations to improve compatibility of industrial and non-industrial uses like Options A and C and offer simpler permit procedures for repair, maintenance, and upgrade of existing fossil fuel facilities and renewable fuel production facilities like Options B and C. It also refines notification procedures, residential design in NE Tacoma, and high impact use permit requirements in industrial zones to address use compatibility.

CHECKLIST CLARIFICATIONS

For each section of the checklist, the clarifications are noted with underline. The full original February 22, 2022 checklist is available at the SEPA Register.¹

A. Background

11) Give brief, complete description of your proposal...

Amend third paragraph of A.11): This SEPA Checklist has been prepared to evaluate alternatives illustrating a range of code allowances:

- Option A: Proposal Alternative – Planning Commission Hearing Draft for February 3, 2021.

¹ See: <https://apps.ecology.wa.gov/separ/Main/SEPA/Record.aspx?SEPANumber=202100905>.

- Option A-1 refers to Planning Commission Recommended Regulations, dated April 7, 2021. The recommendations build on Option A but respond to public comments and suggest refinements and revisions.
- Option B: Baseline – the “No Action” Pre-Interim Ordinance.
- Option C: Current Ordinance – the Interim Regulations that are in effect.

B. Environmental Elements

2. AIR

Add to 2.a between the descriptions of Options A and B (between paragraphs 3 and 4): Option A-1 would allow for renewable fuels like Option A but without a conditional use permit if baseline capacities are retained. Also, repair, maintenance, and upgrade of existing fossil fuel facilities would be allowed with a simpler review if baseline capacities are retained. Like Option A, GHG analysis would be conducted as part of new or expansion of Renewable Fuel Production Facilities beyond baseline capacities. Other federal and state standards would continue as well.

Add to 2.c in the last paragraph: Under Option A and Option A-1, the Proposal Alternative, the City would limit new Major Fossil Fuel Facilities and allow new or expanded Renewable Fuel Facilities with GHG impact analysis and mitigation offsets along with regular reporting.

3. WATER

Add to 3.b.2) third paragraph: Under Options A, A-1, and C, added restriction or regulation of mining, smelting, and chemical manufacturing as well as fossil fuel and renewable fuel facilities should further reduce risks to surface and groundwater quality.

4. PLANTS

Amend 4.b second paragraph: ... Options A, A-1, and C reduce residential densities in the Marine View Drive area, which would likely result in less vegetative clearing.

5. ANIMALS

Amend last paragraph of 5.d: In addition Options A, A-1, and C limit or further

regulate activities that could affect water quality and some priority or listed species, such as mining, smelting, chemical manufacturing, and fossil fuel and renewable fuel facilities. As well, reducing potential GHG emissions is intended to help avoid negative effects to streamflow, flooding, coastal habitats, and algal blooms to avoid negative impacts to fish and wildlife species as well as to the community as a whole. See [Staff Report Section D](#), regarding PSRC Climate Change Background Report.

6. ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Amend 6.a: Not applicable – not a site specific proposal. Future development could use electric, gas, oil, and solar energy. Major energy users in the city include industrial; transportation, residential, and commercial uses represent smaller shares of energy users. See [Staff Report Section D](#) regarding City GHG emission inventories. Option B would allow a greater range of industrial uses that could use more energy compared to Options A, [A-1](#), and C that would limit or further regulate industrial uses. Option A and [Option A-1](#) regulations would allow for existing fossil fuel uses and new renewable energy facilities provided there is GHG mitigation and offsets could include energy reductions among other strategies.

7. ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH

Amend 7.a.3): Not applicable – not a site specific proposal. The City has multiple existing chemical wholesale and distribution facilities. Options A, [A-1](#), and C would limit or further regulate new uses with chemical manufacturing, smelting, fossil fuel and renewable fuel handling, processing, and storage. Option B would allow a wider range of facilities that could store, use, or produce hazardous chemicals, or explosive materials. Option A-1 would allow for repair, maintenance, and upgrade of existing fossil fuel facilities with a simpler review if baseline capacities are retained, but all federal, state, and local laws would still apply.

8. LAND AND SHORELINE USE

Amend 8.j: The non-project action does not propose site specific development that would displace current uses. Under Option A and Option C, there is less likelihood of conversion from industrial uses to non-industrial uses compared to Option B since Options A, [A-1](#), and C fulfill City policies in the Container Port Element and Comprehensive Plan to protect industrial uses. As well, under Options A, [A-1](#), and C, there would be less residential density to the east along Marine View Drive improving

land use compatibility with industrial uses. Under all Options existing mine, smelter, chemical manufacturing, fossil fuel and renewable fuel can continue. Under Options B and C such uses could expand, whereas Option A would include more strict limits on expansions for fossil fuel facilities (no capacity additions). However, under Option C there is a potential to have new or expanded renewable fossil fuel industries with GHG mitigation. Option A-1 would allow for existing fossil fuel uses and switching to renewable fuel facilities with simpler permit procedures but parameters of keeping within baseline capacities; new and expanded renewable fuel facilities that exceed established baseline capacities would follow a conditional use permit. Thus, under all options including Options A, A-1, and C, the job mix could change over time with new industries such as those associated with renewable fuels, but the current jobs are anticipated to remain.

Amend 8.k: See 8.j above. For both the South Tacoma and Port M/IC there would be a reduction in non-industrial uses in industrial zones under Options A, A-1, and C. See Appendix A which compares proposed allowable uses in the industrial zones.

9. HOUSING

Amend 9a: Not applicable – not a site specific proposal. Under Options A, A-1, B, or C, housing is not a primary use in industrial zones. Housing would be more carefully permitted in the M-1 zone and prohibited in the M-2 and PMI zones under Options A, A-1, and C. Caretaker quarters would continue to be allowed as would Live/Work and Work/Live.

Under Options A, A-1, and C there would be limits on density along Marine View Drive. Option A and Option A-1 would limit residential development to one dwelling unit per acre, focusing uses on single-family residential. ...

Amend 9b: Not applicable – not a site specific proposal. In areas along Marine Drive there are environmental limitations, and Options A, A-1, and C would reduce housing densities accordingly to one per acre. Option A would not only limit densities but dwelling types too, to focus on detached single family housing. In addition, housing related uses would be limited in industrial zones under Options A, A-1, and C to improve land use compatibility with Port M/IC and South Tacoma M/IC and fulfill Comprehensive Plan policies, and for consistency with PSRC Centers criteria for M/IC areas. ...

Amend 9c: No significant impacts are identified for the non-project proposal. The City would continue to implement its Comprehensive Plan housing and mixed use

designations, and Land Use Regulatory Code, TMC Title 13. The limitation on residential uses in industrial zones and density reductions along Marine View Drive would improve housing compatibility with employment uses under Options A, A-1, and C. Option A-1 would also apply design standards to reduce light and noise impacts to residents.

10. AESTHETICS

Amend 10.b: View protection overlays along Marine View Drive would be retained under all Options. The density reductions along Marine View Drive under Options A, A-1, and C could help retain tree cover, which could limit the changes to views. ...

11. LIGHT AND GLARE

Amend 11.d: Land Use Regulatory Code, TMC Title 13 would be retained and applied including lighting standards and avoiding light and glare (e.g. signs). Option A-1 would also apply building design standards to reduce light impacts to residents.

12. RECREATION

Amend 12b: ...New High Intensity and Destination Park and Recreation facilities, which include stadiums, ballfields, and community centers, would change from a permitted use to a conditional use in the M-1 and M-2 zones under Option A and Option A-1. In the M-2 zone only indoor facilities are allowed.

High Intensity and Destination Park and Recreation facilities would become prohibited in the PMI zone under Option A and Option A-1. ...

Amend 12c: The City would continue to implement the Parks and Recreation Element of its Comprehensive Plan in partnership with MetroParks Tacoma. Existing parks could continue and may require additional permit procedures for conditionally permitted or nonconforming parks under Options A and A-1. Option B would continue to allow for Parks, Recreation, and Open Space without additional standards.

14. TRANSPORTATION

Amend 14.d: The nonproject proposals in Options A, A-1, and C do not alter the City's growth targets or the City's planned roadway and nonmotorized road improvements. ...

15. PUBLIC SERVICES

Amend 15a fourth paragraph: Options A, A-1, and C would limit land uses with greater potential for fire and emergency medical services in the Tideflats due to their use of hazardous and explosive materials: ...

D. Supplemental sheet for nonproject actions

Amend 7): Option A and Option A-1 would solidify code changes intended to increase consistency with federal, state, and city plans, policies, and strategies. See Exhibit 23. Option B is the least consistent. Option C is similar to Option A and Option A-1 though it is not as fully developed with regard to renewable fuels, and is interim in nature.