## Part 1 - Project Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal Aid Project Number</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Intent of Submittal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I-90 Liberty Park IC</td>
<td>8/12/2015</td>
<td>Preliminary [x] Final [ ] Re-Evaluate [ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Agency**
City of Spokane

**Project Title**
CSO 33-1 (Liberty Park)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beginning MP</th>
<th>Township(s)</th>
<th>Ending MP</th>
<th>Range(s)</th>
<th>Miles</th>
<th>Section(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25N</td>
<td></td>
<td>43E</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**County**
Spokane

**Project Description** (Describe the proposed project, including the purpose and need for the project)
Construct underground 2 MG cast in place concrete combined sewer overflow (CSO) reduction storage tank on the south side of I-90 at the Liberty Park interchange. This tank is part of the City’s 20 year EPA mandated combined sewer overflow reduction program. The City is under a consent decree to complete the CSO program by 2017.

## Part 2 - Environmental Classification

### NEPA
- [ ] Class I - Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)
- [x] Class II - Categorically Excluded (CE)

#### CE Type (from 23 CFR 771.117) (c)(25)
- [ ] Projects Requiring Documentation (Documented CE) (LAG 24.22)
- [ ] Programmatic CE MOU
- [ ] Class III - Environmental Assessment (EA)

### SEPA
- [ ] Categorically exempt per WAC 197-11-800
- [x] Determination of Non-Significance (DNS)

#### NEPA Approval Signatures

- **Local Agency Approving Authority**
  - (Kyle Twombly)
  - Engineering Dept Director
  - 8/13/15

- **Regional Local Programs Engineer**
  - Eastern Region WSDOT Environmental Manager
  - Tammie Williams
  - 8/17/2015

- **Local Programs Environmental Engineer**
- **Federal Highway Administration**

---

**Completed By (Print Official’s Name)**

**Telephone (include area code)**

**Email Address**
SPOKANE ENVIRONMENTAL ORDINANCE

(WAC 197-11-970) Section 11.10.230(3) Determination of Non-Significance (DNS)

DETERMINATION OF NON-SIGNIFICANCE

Description of Proposal: CSO Basin 33-1 Control Facility (Liberty Park)

Proponent: City of Spokane

Location of proposal, including street address, if any: The Liberty Park Control Facility will be located southeast of the Hamilton Street and Interstate 90 interchange adjacent to Liberty Park. The facility will be located in the NE 1/4 of Section 20, Township 25N, Range 43E, W.M.

Lead agency: City of Spokane, Integrated Capital Management

The lead agency for this proposal has determined that it does not have a probable significant adverse impact on the environment. An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is not required under RCW 43.21C.030(2)(c). This decision was made after review of a completed Environmental Checklist and other information on file with the lead agency. This information is available to the public on request.

[ ] There is no comment period for this DNS.

[ ] This DNS is issued after using the optional DNS process in Section 197-11-355 WAC. There is no further comment period on the DNS.

[ X ] This DNS is issued under 197-11-340(2); the lead agency will not act on this proposal for 14 days from the date below. Comments must be submitted by May 4, 2015.

Responsible official: to P. Mike Taylor

Position/Title: Director, Integrated Capital Management Phone: (509) 625-6700

Address: 2nd Floor, City Hall, 808 W. Spokane Falls Blvd., Spokane, WA 99201-3343

Date: April 20, 2015 Signature:

You may appeal this determination to P. Mike Taylor, Director, Integrated Capital Management at (location): 2nd Floor, City Hall, Spokane, WA 99201-3343

no later than (date): May 4, 2015

by (method): written

You should be prepared to make specific factual objections.

Contact John Halsey at (509) 625-6300 to read or ask about the procedures for SEPA appeals.
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ENVIRONMENTAL

CHECKLIST

SPOKANE
ENVIRONMENTAL
ORDINANCE

SECTION 11.10.230(1)
A. BACKGROUND

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable:

   Liberty Park Control Facility for CSO Basin

2. Name of Applicant: City of Spokane

3. Address and phone number of applicant and contact person:

   Marcia Davis, P.E.
   808 W. Spokane Falls Blvd
   Spokane, WA 99201-3343
   509-625-6398

4. Date checklist prepared: March 11, 2015

5. Agency requesting checklist:

   City of Spokane, Washington; Integrated Capital Management Department

6. Proposed timing or schedule (including phasing, if applicable):

   Construction of the Liberty Park Main Avenue Control Facility is anticipated to begin in 2016. The project is currently in the planning stages.

7. Do you have any plans for future additions, expansion, or further activity related to or connected with this proposal? If yes, explain.

   There are no plans for future additions or expansions.

8. List any environmental information you know about that has been prepared, or will be prepared, directly related to this proposal.

   A draft cultural resource assessment was completed in March 2015. Geotechnical Studies have been completed and are on-going. A NEPA is currently being prepared.

9. Do you know whether applications are pending for governmental approvals of other proposals directly affecting the property covered by your proposal? If yes, explain.

   The City is acquiring property from WSDOT that will require FHWA approval.
12. Location of the proposal. Give sufficient information to 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 Liberty Park Control Facility will be located southeast of the Hamilton Street and Interstate 90 interchange adjacent to Liberty Park. The property is currently owned by WSDOT; the City is in the process of acquiring an easement for this property. The facility will be located in the NE ¼ of Section 20, Township 25N, Range 43E, W.M.

13. Does the proposed action lie within the Aquifer Sensitive Area (ASA)? The General Sewer Service Area? The Priority Sewer Service Area? The City of Spokane? (See: Spokane County’s ASA Overlay Zone Atlas for boundaries).

ASA; GSSA; PSSA; City of Spokane

14. 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

(2) 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 chemicals will be stored
example, clay, sand, gravel, peat, muck)? If you know the classification of agricultural soils, specify them and note any prime farmland.

Soils were classified by Budinger & Associates during site investigation Soil types at the site, as illustrated by the USDA Web Soil Survey, consist Opportunity very gravelly ashy loam, 0 to 3 percent slopes. Coarse grained soils including silty sand, gravelly sand, and clayey gravel were encountered overlying weathered basalt. Fill consisted of mixtures of gravel and sand with cobbles, boulders, and debris was encountered in 2 bore holes extending to 35 and 25 feet below ground surface, respectively.

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

No surface indication. A portion of the site is the old lake within Liberty Park that was filled in the 1950.

e. Describe the purpose, type, and approximate quantities of any filling or grading proposed. Indicate source of fill.

The proposed facility will be constructed below ground. Some rock excavation may be necessary because of the tight fit between rock bluffs on 3 sides. Approximately 22,000 cubic yards of material will be excavated for the construction of the control facility. We anticipate reusing the existing soil to cover the control facility, but fill soil may need to be sorted and separated to remove debris. After the control facility is constructed, the site will be re-graded to match existing ground adjacent to the construction. The use of the excess material has not been identified at this time. No fill material will be necessary.

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

The construction area will be stabilized with
3. WATER

a. Surface:

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

no

(2) Will the project require any work over, in, or adjacent to (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.

None

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

None required.

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

No. A portion of the project is located in the
facilities will be designed to manage the stormwater runoff. Any runoff that cannot be managed in bio-retention facilities will be collected and conveyed to the combined sewer system.

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

Combined sewage currently discharges to the Spokane River during heavy storm events. This project will reduce those discharges by providing storage for the storm surge and metering the sewage back into the system. During heavy rain storms or rain on frozen ground, combined sewage could overflow to the Spokane River, but the number of overflows will be reduced to less than one per year based on a 20 year average.

d. Proposed measures to reduce or control surface, ground, and runoff water impacts, if any (if the proposed action lies within the Aquifer Sensitive Area be especially clear on explanations relating to facility concerning Sections 3b(4), 3b(5), and 3c(2) of this checklist).

The control facility site will be vegetated using native and adaptive species. Use of permeable pavement will be evaluated during design. Any runoff that cannot be managed by bioretention facilities will be conveyed to the existing combined sewer.

4. PLANTS

a. Check or circle type of vegetation found on the site:
   
   X    deciduous tree: alder, maple, aspen, other.
   
   X    evergreen tree: fir, cedar, pine, other.
   
   X    shrubs.
   
   X    grass.
b. List any threatened or endangered species known to be on or near the site.

None known

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

The Spokane Region is part of the North American Pacific Flyway migration route. This project will not have an impact on this route.

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

The vegetation will create natural buffers and natural nesting habitat for the native animal species.

6. ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

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

This project will require electricity for lighting, odor control fans, heating for the control room, and instrumentation controls.

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

No.

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 storage facility and flush tanks will fill and
associated streets: 3rd Avenue, 5th Avenue, and I90. These noises aren’t anticipated to impact the project in any way.

(2) What type 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? Indicate what hours noise would come from the site.

These projects will create short term noise due to construction including equipment and vehicles. This project will not generate any long-term noise.

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

Work will be performed during workday hours and construction will be confined to localized areas to minimize disruption.

Maintenance work will be performed during the workday hours.

8. LAND AND SHORELINE USE

a. What is the current use of the site and adjacent properties?

The site is currently used by WSDOT as landscaping and for maintenance and storage. The adjacent land uses are a City park and single family residents.

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

No.

c. Describe any structures on the site.

None
None

9. HOUSING

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

N/A

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 control facility will be constructed below ground.

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

None

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

Landscaping will be designed by a professional landscape architect to reflect the character of the site.

11. LIGHT AND GLARE
13. HISTORIC AND CULTURAL PRESERVATION

a. Are there any places or objects listed on, or proposed for national, state, or local preservation registers known to be on or next to the site? If so, generally describe.

A cultural resource survey was conducted by the Historic Research Associates in March 2015. One probe uncovered broken glass and ceramic fragment, but was recommended ineligible for listing. The report will be submitted to DAHP for an official determination of the site’s NRHP eligibility. Due to its proximity to the project footprint, direct impacts to the site may occur. If DAHP determines the site eligible, the City will implement a monitoring plan during construction and have a professional archaeologist monitor ground-disturbing activities associated with the Project. Whether eligible or not, an inadvertent discovery plan will be in place and included with the construction document for the project.

b. Generally describe any landmarks or evidence of historic archaeological, scientific or cultural importance known to be on or next to the site.

Liberty Park was designed by the Olmsted Brothers and constructed in the 1920s. The lake was a natural feature in the park. As the area degraded, the lake was filled in. In the 1960s, Interstate I90 was constructed through the park. Ruins from the original park are located northwest of the site, on the north side of the freeway. Several stacked basalt retaining are located adjacent to the project area and will be protected during construction by fencing.

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

The City of Spokane will have Archaeological
transportation impacts, if any:

None – no impacts.

15. PUBLIC SERVICES

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

No.

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

None

16. UTILITIES

a. Circle utilities currently available at the site:

- electric, natural gas, water, refuse service, telephone, sanitary sewer

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.

The project proposes adjustments to the sanitary sewer system. This system is owned and maintained by the City of Spokane. Avista Power, Century Link telephone, and City of Spokane Water service will be needed.
FOR STAFF USE ONLY

Staff Member(s) Reviewing Checklist:

Signature: ____________________________

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

A. [ ] Concludes that there are no probable significant adverse impacts and recommends a determination of nonsignificance.

B. [ ] Concludes that probable significant adverse environmental impacts do exist for the current proposal and recommends a mitigated determination of nonsignificance with conditions.

C. [ ] Concludes that there are probable significant adverse environmental impacts and recommends a determination of significance.

FILING FEE - $75.00