

Cheasty Greenspace North Loop Trail Project

SEPA Checklist

APRIL 2023

PREPARED FOR:

CITY OF SEATTLE DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION, PLANNING AND CAPITAL
DEVELOPMENT BRANCH
300 ELLIOTT AVENUE WEST, SUITE 100
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98119

PREPARED BY:

ESA
2801 ALASKAN WAY, SUITE 200
SEATTLE, WA 98121

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST..... 1

A. BACKGROUND 1

B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS 4

 1. Earth..... 4

 2. Air..... 7

 3. Water..... 7

 4. Plants..... 10

 5. Animals..... 13

 6. Energy and Natural Resources..... 13

 7. Environmental Health..... 14

 8. Land and Shoreline Use..... 15

 9. Housing..... 18

 10. Aesthetics..... 18

 11. Light and Glare..... 18

 12. Recreation..... 19

 13. Historic and Cultural Preservation..... 19

 14. Transportation..... 22

 15. Public Services..... 23

 16. Utilities..... 24

C. SIGNATURE..... 25

References..... 27

Figure 1. Project Vicinity

Figure 2. Wetland Delineation and North Loop Trail Design

Figure 3. Geologic Hazard Areas

Attachment 1. Cheasty Greenspace North Loop Trail Design

Attachment 2. Geotechnical Engineering Report

Attachment 3. Cheasty Greenspace Trail – Critical Areas Study and Conceptual Mitigation Plan

Attachment 4. Inadvertent Discovery Plan

Attachment 5. Upper Luther Burbank Park Bike Skills Area Assessment

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

A. BACKGROUND

1. Name of the proposed project, if applicable:

Cheasty Greenspace North Loop Trail Project

2. Name of Applicant:

Seattle Department of Parks and Recreation, Planning and Development Division

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

Seattle Parks and Recreation Project Contact:
Mike Schwindeller, Senior Capital Projects Coordinator
300 Elliott Avenue West, Suite 100
Seattle, WA 98119
(206) 615-1165
mike.schwindeller@seattle.gov

4. Date checklist prepared:

April 2023

5. Agency requesting checklist:

Lead Agency - Seattle Parks and Recreation

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

Trail design and permitting completed – April 2023
Trail construction – Spring – Winter 2023

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

The use of the trail by mountain bikes is a 3-year pilot project; if deemed unsuccessful, the trail will become pedestrian only (and maintained as pedestrian only) or decommissioned altogether and the trail will be restored to native forest.

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

Attached to this Environmental Checklist are:

- Attachment 1. Cheasty Greenspace North Loop Trail Design
- Attachment 2. Geotechnical Engineering Report
- Attachment 3. Cheasty Greenspace Trail – Critical Areas Study and Conceptual Mitigation Plan
- Attachment 4. Inadvertent Discovery Plan

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.

No applications are pending that directly affect the Cheasty Greenspace.

10. List any government approvals or permits that will be needed for your proposal, if known:

Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections (SDCI) – Grading Permit (which includes critical areas review and drainage review) and a Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) - Hydraulic Project Approval (HPA) permit for the watercourse crossing

11. 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.

Cheasty Greenspace is 28.4 acres in size and owned by Seattle Parks and Recreation (SPR). This project proposes constructing a 1.0-mile, one-way bike trail, a 0.4-mile multi-use trail, and a 0.1-mile pedestrian-only connector trail in the northern portion of Cheasty Greenspace in the Beacon Hill neighborhood of Seattle (see Figure 1, Project Vicinity and Figure 2, Wetland Delineation and Trail Design).

In 2012, a group of neighbors proposed the development of pedestrian and mountain bike trails at Cheasty Greenspace as a project through the Parks and Green Spaces Levy Opportunity Fund process. The Opportunity Fund is funded through the 2008 Parks and Green Spaces Levy approved by voters and allows the community to initiate park projects in neighborhoods. The project was contrary to Seattle Parks and Recreation (SPR)'s existing bicycle policy dating from the 1990s, and thus the original project was not successful in the Opportunity Fund process. However, there was significant community interest for the trails project, with the North Beacon Hill Community Council voting to support it. Additionally, the North Beacon Hill Neighborhood Plan, in the Comprehensive Plan (City of Seattle, 2020a), includes policy NBH-P34: Consider the development of pedestrian and bicycle trails through publicly owned greenbelts throughout North Beacon Hill. In 2013, the group Friends of Cheasty Greenspace at Mountain View secured funding through the Department of Neighborhoods. The group used this funding to hire a landscape architect to develop a preliminary trail design.

The Board of Park Commissioners discussed and deliberated on the 2013 proposal at public meetings on November 14, 2013, and January 9, 2014. Their final recommendation to the SPR Superintendent was that SPR should initiate a pilot project to allow soft-surface mountain bike trails to be built at Cheasty Greenspace, in conjunction with restoration and pedestrian trails. On May 28, 2015, the Board of Park Commissioners approved a pilot project for a pedestrian and bicycle trail. The SEPA Official issued a Determination of Non-Significance (DNS) on August 3, 2015. The SEPA decision was successfully appealed, with a decision made by the Hearing Examiner on

January 26, 2016. Following the decision, SPR retained a consultant to delineate wetlands, conduct additional wildlife surveys at the site, conduct a literature survey of potential impacts of biking on wildlife, and redesign the trail to minimize impacts to critical areas. The Cheasty Greenspace South Loop Trail construction began in Spring of 2020 with the completion of the SEPA and permitting processes.

The North Loop Trail project is designed to avoid impacts to wetlands, and minimize impacts to steep slopes, wetland buffers, a watercourse, and the riparian management area (watercourse buffer). The proposed North Loop trail design provides a one-direction bicycle loop, multi-use connector trail, and pedestrian-only trail that connects to an existing pedestrian-only trail. A portion of the trail on the eastern side of the greenspace will be constructed on Seattle Housing Authority (SHA) property with their permission and support. It connects to two existing SHA park spaces and pathways and SPR and SHA have executed a Temporary Use Agreement to construct the trail on SHA property. Cheasty Greenspace North Loop provides two public pedestrian-only access points, two bicycle-only access points, and three multi-use access points. All proposed trails will be soft surface, on native mineral soils. The trails have been designed to minimize impacts to wetland and watercourse buffers. The bicycle trails are for beginner to intermediate riders and are not anticipated to be a mountain biking destination.

Attachment 1 contains the proposed Cheasty Greenspace North Loop Trail plans and trail designs for different types of trail design. Below are the corresponding approximate trail measurements proposed for the North Loop Trail.

| | Approximate Length (Linear Feet) | Approximate Area (Square Feet) |
|--|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 3-ft Wide Trail (1-way bike trail) | 4,061 | 12,199 |
| 4-ft Wide Trail (2-way multi-use trail, bike access trail and pedestrian-only trail) | 2,749 | 10,947 |
| Total | 6,810 | 23,146 |

The design adheres to International Mountain Bicycling Association (IMBA) trail guidelines and the principle of minimizing trail footprint within the site. The grade was kept at 10% or less on the trail and followed the “half-rule”: that a trail’s grade should never exceed half the grade of its side slope (see Attachment 1). The trail will be constructed using full bench-cut where possible, cutting from the existing slopes in order for rainfall to drain off the side of the trail rather than along it, partial bench cut will be used in other areas. In addition, flat areas will be avoided to prevent the creation of collection basins for water. Where possible, the trail will use pre-existing social trails on the site. The mountain bike trails are intended for beginners and have no technical trail features. Technical trail features are objects that have been introduced to add technical challenge (e.g., elevated bridges, logs, or jumps). Exceptional trees (as defined in Director’s Rule 16-2008) will not be removed within the wetland or watercourse buffer and will be avoided at all other locations.

Trail construction will be conducted by volunteer trail building crews, directed by SPR. Work will be both by hand and by small machines, due to accessibility. A diesel or gas-powered small engine, grader, tractor, excavator, or trencher will be used in areas (with tracks that can be narrowed to 4') and near the existing soldier pile wall. The trail may be constructed in phases.

The trail and greenspace will be open dawn to dusk, like other Seattle parks. After construction, SPR will monitor the success of the trail pilot project, including how trail construction and use are affecting drainage. After 3 years following the opening of the park trails, SPR will decide if they will continue to allow mountain bikes in Cheasty Greenspace.

The North Loop is the second part of the pilot proposal, the first part of which was designated the South Loop and construction was completed in October, 2022. The South Loop trails are currently open to the public and pilot monitoring is ongoing.

12. 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 applications related to this checklist.

See Figure 1, Project Vicinity, and Attachment 1, Cheasty Greenspace North Loop Trail Design, which includes location and topographic details.

Parcel #162404-9161

Site address: 1635 S Columbian Way, Seattle, WA 98108

Assessor Legal Description: POR OF W 1/2 OF SE 1/4 LY ELY OF CHEASTY BLVD NLY OF COLUMBIAN WAY & WLY OF LN BEG AT PT ON NLY MGN OF COLUMBIAN WAY 511.57 FT NELY OF S LN OF SUBD TH N 22-23-11 W 668.36 FT TH N 09-21-54 E 1745.96 FT TO N LN OF SUBD

B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS

1. Earth

a. **General description of the site (underline):**

Flat, rolling, hilly, steep slopes, mountainous, other _____

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

The steepest observed slopes were inclined at approximately 40% (2½H:1V) along a section of Cheasty Boulevard, including just west of Dakota Street and 29th Avenue S and northwest of S Nevada Street and other interspersed isolated

areas. The majority of the slopes in the area are between 10 and 30%. See Figure 3, Geologic Hazard Areas, and Attachment 2, Geotechnical Engineering Report (HWA, 2022), which shows mapped steep slopes on the site. The trail has been aligned to avoid the steepest slopes on the site.

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.

According to the Geotechnical Engineering Report (HWA, 2022) (Attachment 2), Cheasty Greenspace is underlain by the typical glacial sequence of the Vashon Stade of the Fraser Glaciation. Preliminary subsurface explorations in 2015 were focused on the three proposed structures on the Site and Exploration Plan. In 2018, two handholes were advanced in the northern portion of the site to assess typical soil conditions for the upper and lower slopes of that area. Soils encountered in the 2018 explorations and in existing geotechnical explorations are listed below, see Attachment 2 for details.

The surficial soils in the northern section of the Cheasty Greenspace as observed and probed predominantly consisted of medium dense, brown, silty, gravelly sand. Silt and clay soils were observed in the lower slope, particularly north of the large ravine, located approximately in the middle of the greenspace, to the north end of the site, which includes a 2003 slide area (New Rainier Vista Slide Area) retained by a soldier pile wall.

Surficial soils as observed and probed predominantly consisted of medium dense, brown, silty, fine or gravelly sand. Probing depths ranged from 1 to 3.5 feet on slopes in the northern portion of Cheasty Greenspace and 2 to 3 feet in wetland and riparian areas. The soil at the surface in most slope areas was not a rich topsoil, nor was much duff accumulated. This lack of organic accumulation and topsoil formation is indicative of persistent erosion or slope instability, which may date to logging before the 1930s. Soils encountered in geotechnical field explorations at the site are listed below and described in Attachment 2.

- Topsoil
- Colluvium
- Transitional beds

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

Landslide deposits were mapped from the northern end of the greenspace to the area north of the SPR maintenance yard, consisting of colluvium, and alluvium from small streams. Coarse-grained alluvial deposits were encountered in the middle of the greenspace, southern portion of the project, near the ravine. The majority of the surficial soils on-site appear to be medium dense colluvium, typically to depths of 1 to 3 feet. Colluvium was observed at the surface throughout the majority of the greenspace. Additionally, glacial till was

encountered northeast of the site along 25th Avenue S. Multiple areas of recent slope instability, including above the existing soldier pile wall just west of Dakota Street and 24th Avenue S (New Rainier Vista Slide Area), were observed; see Attachment 2 for details.

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

The project will limit any offsite fill as part of the project (small amounts of clean aggregate and small boulders from local quarries may be required for switchbacks and mineral aggregate will be required for the modified dispersion trenches). The majority of fill onsite to be used on the trail bed will be from onsite cut. Both types of trails (3-ft and 4-ft wide trails) will be exposed, natural mineral soil. Surface duff will be removed and there will be some grading for shaping of the trail, in particular at switchbacks to prevent erosion. See notes and drawings in Attachment 1 for details. The potential clearing/grading area is estimated at 23,000 square feet (sq ft), which is the total area of the trails including areas where existing trails will be used. The total maximum disturbed area is estimated at 50,200 sq ft, which is the total trail width plus 2 feet on either side. In areas where the existing trails would be used and where the trail bed is less than 10% side slope, grading would not be required. As such, the area of grading would be less than approximately 50,000 sq ft.

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

Trail construction could result in erosion. Standard erosion and sediment controls measures will be implemented during construction, such as silt fences, compost filter socks and sediment removal (City of Seattle, 2020b). The trails will be designed to minimize erosion including grade reversals at regular intervals (see notes and drawings in Attachment 1 for details, based on recommendations from Geotechnical Report, Attachment 2 and the IMBA Bike Trail Standards (IMBA, 2004, 2007)).

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

There will be no paved surfaces or buildings. The trail will be compacted native mineral soil with a total area of between 22,000 to 26,000 sq ft, or approximately 1.8 to 2.1% of Cheasty Greenspace.

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

The project will follow the Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington (Ecology, 2019) and the City of Seattle Stormwater Manual (2021) to

reduce and control erosion during construction and Parks intends to follow recommendations contained in the Geotechnical Report post-construction.

2. Air

- a. **What types 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 trail construction will be both by hand and by small machines. A diesel or gas-powered small engine, grader, tractor, excavator, or trencher will be used to help clear and grade portions of the trail. It is possible that the trails may need limited maintenance post-construction that could include work by hand. The use of diesel or gas-powered small machines during construction is unable to be quantified.

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

There are no potential off-site sources of emissions that are anticipated to affect the project construction.

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

Handheld tools will be used when feasible in place of diesel or gas-powered machines and machines will be turned off rather than run idle when not in use.

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.**

There are five (5) wetlands on-site; all five are Category IV wetlands with buffers of 0 to 50 feet depending on habitat score. Category IV wetlands smaller than 1,000 square feet do not require a buffer (see Attachment 3). All of the wetlands on-site are slope wetlands, where the slope is greater than two (2) to five (5) % except for Wetland 8, which is a depressional wetland. A watercourse (referred to as Watercourse 1) also crosses the width of the greenspace from west to east. See Attachment 3, Critical Areas Study and Conceptual Mitigation Plan (ESA, 2022) for details of the surface water features and their buffers.

- 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.**

The trail will cross Watercourse 1 and its buffer (see Figure 2 and Attachment 1). All other wetlands and their buffers will be avoided; the trail will not cross any wetlands.

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

There will be no filling or dredging of any wetlands or streams for this project. The trail will cross the watercourse and buffer, but will span the area with abutments so no filling or dredging will occur.

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

Stormwater generated from the proposed packed dirt trails will be dispersed on-site through sheet flow dispersion in most locations. In the historic slide area, any runoff will be collected, redirected through a buried tightline in accordance with geotechnical recommendations, and dispersed downslope of the existing soldier pile wall.

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

The project does not lie within the 100-year floodplain.

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

There will be no discharge of waste material to surface waters from the project.

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.**

There will be no withdrawal of groundwater for the project.

- 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.**

No waste material will be discharged into the ground from any source for the project.

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.**

Existing runoff flows into Cheasty Greenspace from residential areas and roadways to the west and exits through culverts and storm drains on the east. Culverts discharge into Cheasty Greenspace from a ditch that runs along Cheasty Boulevard S on the west edge of the park. The ditch collects stormwater from the adjacent residential area, golf course and roadway.

Stormwater generated from the proposed packed dirt trails will be dispersed on-site through sheet flow dispersion in most locations. In the 2003 historic slide area, any runoff will be collected, redirected through a buried tightline, and dispersed downslope of the existing soldier pile wall. Surface runoff in the lower portion of the 2003 slide will be tightlined to the storm system in front of the wall. There will be no additional runoff or changes to runoff as a result of the project.

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

No; waste materials will not enter the ground or surface water as part of the project.

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

No; the trail has been designed to minimize potential changes to drainage within Cheasty Greenspace. There will be no change to drainage off-site. Stormwater generated by the new trails will be dispersed on-site through sheet flow dispersion in most locations except in the lower portion of the 2003 historic slide area, where any runoff will be collected, redirected through a buried tightline to the storm system in front of the wall, and dispersed downslope of the existing soldier pile wall (shown in Attachment 1). The increased runoff into the storm system is anticipated to be negligible.

d. Proposed measures to reduce or control surface, ground, and runoff water, and drainage pattern impacts, if any:

The trail will be constructed using a full bench-cut in places, cutting from the existing slopes in order for rainfall to drain off the side of the trail rather than along it. A partial bench-cut will be used in other areas along the trail. The trail will be constructed with a minimum 2% cross slope, so that rainfall drains off the side of the trail and onto the adjacent vegetated transition zone rather than along it. In addition, flat areas will be avoided to prevent creating collection basins for water and grade reversals will be installed at a regular interval. The project has been designed to avoid the watercourse and wetlands to the greatest extent practical. The trail has been designed to avoid crossing any wetlands. Where the proposed trail alignment will cross the 2003 slide area, stormwater will be tight lined in accordance with geotechnical recommendations to discharge outside of the slide area, so as to not increase pore pressure or pressure on the pile wall. Additionally, no exceptional trees will be removed (all surveyed trees are larger than 6 inches in diameter at breast height (DBH)) which will help reduce or control surface, ground or runoff water. After construction, SPR will monitor the success of the trail pilot project, including how trail construction and use are affecting drainage. After 3 years, SPR will decide if they will continue to allow mountain bikes in Cheasty Greenspace.

4. Plants

a. Check the types of vegetation found on the site:

- deciduous tree: alder, maple, aspen, other
 evergreen tree: fir, cedar, pine, other
 shrubs
 grass
 pasture
 crop or grain
 orchards, vineyards, or other permanent crops.
 wet soil plants: cattail, buttercup, bulrush, skunk cabbage, other
 water plants: water lily, eelgrass, milfoil, other
 other types of vegetation

An exceptional tree is a tree or group of trees that because of its size and/or unique historical, ecological, or aesthetic value constitutes an important community resource (as defined in Director's Rule 16-2008 and SMC 25.11). In Cheasty Greenspace, trees are exceptional based on species, size, condition and/or if it contributes to part of a grove. Table 1 lists exceptional trees near the proposed trail, and they are shown in Figure 2. ESA surveyed trees greater than 6 inches in diameter within 6 feet on either side of the center line of the north trail (12 feet total). See also Attachment 3, Critical Areas Study and Conceptual Mitigation Plan (ESA, 2022), for more information.

Table 1. Summary of Number of Exceptional Trees near the Trail

| | Exceptional Based on Size (DBH) or Location (Grove) | | |
|--|---|--------------|--------------|
| 2018 Inventory | | | |
| Species | Size | Grove | Total |
| Bigleaf Maple (<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>) | 33 | 61 | 94 |
| Red alder (<i>Alnus rubra</i>) | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| Apple species (<i>Malus sp.</i>) | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Black cottonwood (<i>Populus balsamifera ssp. Trichocarpa</i>) | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| Bitter cherry (<i>Prunus emarginata</i>) | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 2022 Inventory (North) | | | |
| Species | Size | Grove | Total |
| Bigleaf Maple (<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>) | 75 | 170 | 245 |
| Red alder (<i>Alnus rubra</i>) | 12 | 0 | 12 |
| Pacific madrone (<i>Arbutus menziesii</i>) | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| European hawthorn (<i>Crataegus monogyna</i>) | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Oregon ash (<i>Fraxinus latifolia</i>) | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Black cottonwood (<i>Populus balsamifera</i>) | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Willows (<i>Salix sp.</i>) | 8 | 0 | 8 |
| Western red cedar (<i>Thuja plicata</i>) | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| Total | 140 | 241 | 381 |

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

Understory vegetation (shrubs, herbs, invasive species, and small trees) will be removed along the trail alignment and up to one foot on either side if needed. Tree branches which may overhang the proposed trail will be removed for safety up to a height of 8 feet above the trail. Trees larger than 6 inches at diameter breast height (DBH) along the proposed north loop trail alignment were surveyed. No exceptional trees (as defined in Director's Rule 16-2008) will be removed. See the Critical Areas Study and Conceptual Mitigation Plan for more information (ESA, 2022) (Attachment 3) and see Figure 2 and Attachment 1 for the proposed trail alignment. The area of trails will be up to 22,000 to 26,000 sq ft, but some existing trails will be utilized. Conservatively, up to 22,000 to 26,000 sq ft of understory vegetation will be removed as part of the trail construction. Disturbed areas beyond the trail footprint will be replanted with native vegetation. Invasive species will also be removed within wetland and stream buffers as part of the mitigation plan in coordination with the Green Seattle Partnership (GSP).

Some soil compaction will occur with trail construction and use. The response of trees to added disturbance will depend on plant health, age, soil moisture and the presence of native decay organisms. Soil compaction caused by bikes is no more damaging than soil compaction caused by foot traffic, horses or other types of trail usage. Plant roots are damaged by soil compaction when the pore space in the soil is compressed to the point where air and water cannot be

retained in the soil for the tree to use or when soils are compressed, and tree root growth is restricted.

There are approximately 125 miles of trails in SPR parks, many are adjacent to large (including exceptional) trees. Soil compaction on adjacent trails has not contributed to tree mortality or poor health. A large portion of this greenspace has already been impacted by people recreating through the area, illegal activities, and forest restoration efforts.

c. List threatened or endangered species known to be on or near the site.

No listed threatened or endangered plant species are known within or adjacent to Cheasty Greenspace.

d. Proposed landscaping, use of native plants, or other measures to preserve or enhance vegetation on the site, if any:

Impacts to the wetland and stream buffers will be mitigated at a 1:1 ratio (see Table 2), pending approval from SDCI. There will be no direct impacts to wetlands or the watercourse. The trails will impact up to approximately 3,111 sq ft of the watercourse buffer (see Table 2). Mitigation will follow Seattle Municipal Code (SMC) 25.09. All replacement vegetation will be native plants. Buffer enhancement will also include the removal of invasive species from Cheasty Greenspace. The buffer mitigation plan is described in the Critical Areas Study and Conceptual Mitigation Plan (ESA, 2022) (Attachment 3). Mitigation will be coordinated with ongoing enhancement work in the greenspace being conducted independently by SPR.

Table 2. Approximate Watercourse Buffer Impacts and Mitigation

| | Impact (square feet) | Mitigation (square feet) |
|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|
| Watercourse 1 buffer | 3,111 | 3,111 |

e. List all noxious weeds and invasive species known to be on or near the site.

- Himalayan blackberry
- English ivy
- English holly
- Cherry laurel
- Bull thistle
- Scotch broom
- Herb Robert
- English hawthorn
- Poison hemlock
- Hedge bindweed

5. Animals

- a. **List and underline any birds and other animals which have been observed on or near the site or are known to be on or near the site.**

Examples include:

birds: hawk, heron, eagle, songbirds, other _____

mammals: deer, bear, elk, beaver, other: rodents, coyote _____

fish: bass, salmon, trout, herring, shellfish, other _____

Wildlife habitat and wildlife species use in the Cheasty Greenspace and vicinity were evaluated in the field for 3 days. See the Critical Areas Study and Conceptual Mitigation Plan (ESA, 2022) (Attachment 3) for results of the wildlife surveys.

- b. **List any threatened or endangered species known to be on near the site.**

No listed threatened or endangered species are known within or adjacent to Cheasty Greenspace (ESA, 2022).

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

Yes, the west coast of north America is on the Pacific flyway migration route.

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

Removal of invasive plant species and planting of native species as part of the mitigation will contribute to ongoing restoration within the greenspace which is helping to enhance wildlife. See the literature review in the Critical Areas Study and Conceptual Mitigation Plan (ESA, 2022) (Attachment 3).

- e. **List any invasive animal species known to be on or near the site.**

Eastern gray squirrel, domestic cats, and European starling are known to be present on the site.

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.**

A diesel or gas-powered small engine, grader, tractor, excavator, or trencher will be used for some trail construction and some will be by hand. Machine work will be limited to small equipment (with 4' wide tracks) minimizing impacts to vegetation along the trail. There will be no energy needs associated with the completed trail project.

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

No; there will be no change in the potential use of solar energy by 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 trail construction work will be both by hand and by small machines. Trucks will be used to transport materials. The completed trail project will not require energy; thus, no energy conservation is proposed.

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.

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

There are no known contaminants at the site from present or past uses. However, the site has a history of illegal dumping of household items and of homeless encampments. There are currently no known encampments.

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.

There are no known hazardous chemical/conditions on-site.

3. Describe any toxic or hazardous chemicals 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.

Trail construction work will be both by hand and by small machines. Diesel or gas will be used to power a small engine, grader, tractor, excavator, or trencher used for trail construction. No toxic or hazardous chemicals will be used during or after construction of the trail other than diesel or gas to power small machines during construction.

4. Describe special emergency services that might be required.

No special emergency services will be required.

5. Proposed measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards, if any:

The City of Seattle (City) will work with the community to discourage illegal dumping of household items. The City is developing strategies to address encampments in parks, as part of a larger effort to address homelessness.

b. Noise:

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

The greenspace is in an urban area, and traffic noise can be heard throughout the park. The trail is intended in part to provide respite from the adjacent urban area.

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

Some noise will temporarily be associated with a diesel or gas-powered small engine, grader, tractor, excavator, or trencher if used for trail construction. There will be noise (i.e., voices) associated with people using the trail.

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

Trail construction will occur during daylight hours, approximately 7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. which will be within the times allowed under SMC 25.08.425: between 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m., weekdays, and between 9:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. on weekends and legal holidays. No additional measures are needed to reduce or control construction noise. No measures will be needed during operation as the project is not expected to generate levels of noise above that allowed under SMC Chapter 25.08 including SMC 25.08.500.

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.

Cheasty Greenspace is largely an undeveloped greenspace used as a park with some informal trails and the recently completed South Loop Trail in the Beacon Hill Neighborhood. The greenspace is part of the Cheasty Greenbelt, which extends to the north and south, and was rezoned as Neighborhood Residential (NR) 3 in June of 2022 and remains NR 3 as of April 2023. The site is currently undergoing restoration through the Green Seattle Partnership program. The site

is adjacent to Cheasty Boulevard S and residential development to the south and a golf course to the southwest, and Seattle Housing Authority property (the Rainier Vista development) to the east. S Columbian Way runs along the southern boundary, but the greenspace continues to the south on the other side of S Columbian Way (Cheasty Greenspace at Mt. View). To the north is a mix of a greenspace and residential development, see Attachment 3 for maps.

- 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?**

Cheasty Greenspace is not known to have been used as working farmland or forestlands. However, it was logged at one time during the development of this area of Seattle. There will be no conversion of farmland or forestland of commercial significance to another use. The greenspace is included in the City's urban forest restoration efforts through the Green Seattle Partnership.

- 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:**

There are no working farms or forest lands near the greenspace.

- c. Describe any structures on the site.**
- There are no structures on the site.
- d. Will any structures be demolished? If so, what?**
- No structures will be demolished.
- e. What is the current zoning classification of the site?**
- The site is currently zoned Neighborhood Residential (NR) 3.
- f. What is the current comprehensive plan designation of the site?**
- Cheasty Greenspace is designated as City-owned Open Space in the comprehensive plan (City of Seattle, 2020a).
- g. If applicable, what is the current shoreline master program designation of the site?**

Cheasty Greenspace is not within a designated shoreline area.

h. Has any part of the site been classified as a critical area by the city or county? If so, specify.

Yes; the City has mapped the following environmentally critical areas (ECAs) in the greenspace (City of Seattle, 2022):

- Steep slopes
- Potential and known slide areas
- Wetlands
- Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas

The Critical Areas Study and Conceptual Mitigation Plan (Attachment 3) as part of the updated site work performed by ESA listed the following ECAs in the greenspace vicinity (ESA, 2022):

- Steep slopes
- Potential and known slide areas
- Wetlands
- Watercourse
- Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas

i. Approximately how many people would reside or work in the completed project?

No people will reside or work in the completed project.

j. Approximately how many people would the completed project displace?

No people will be displaced by the completed project.

k. Proposed measures to avoid or reduce displacement impacts, if any:

No people will be displaced by the project; therefore, mitigation measures have not been developed.

l. Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with existing and projected land uses and plans, if any:

The proposed trail project is compatible with the existing urban forested parkland and will comply with critical areas regulations. The project meets and follows the Parks Design and Construction Standards (City of Seattle, 2021), and will also follow the IMBA Bike Trail Standards (IMBA, 2004, 2007). Cycling is not currently permitted on unpaved trails in Seattle parks. However, the Board of Park Commissioners reviewed and accepted this pilot project for a pedestrian and bicycle trail in May 2015. SPR internal design review process approved the schematic design proposal in August 2022. A subsequent SPR technical review is pending in Q1 2023.

m. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts to agricultural and forest lands of long-term commercial significance, if any:

There are no nearby agriculture or forestry operations. The trail will be constructed to avoid the removal of exceptional trees.

9. Housing

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

No housing will be provided as part of the project.

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

No housing will be eliminated as part of the project.

c. Describe proposed measures to reduce or control housing impacts, if any.

There will be no impacts to housing.

10. Aesthetics

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

The design and construction guidelines will follow Seattle Parks Specifications (City of Seattle, 2022). Signs will be erected for directional purposes. Signs will be 12"x18" on 4"x 4" wooden posts and will not exceed 6' in height. Signs will be placed near each trailhead and at every trail intersection.

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

No views in the vicinity will be altered or obstructed as a result of the project.

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

Trails and signage will be designed to be appealing and natural in appearance. The design and construction will follow the guidelines outlined in the Seattle Parks Specifications (City of Seattle, 2022).

11. Light and Glare

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

No lighting is associated with the project, and thus the project will produce no new no light or glare.

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

No lighting is associated with the project, and thus there will be no new light or glare.

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

Light or glare from adjacent residential properties will be minimal and will have no effect on the project.

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

No measures will be needed to reduce or control light or glare.

12. Recreation

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

Cheasty Greenspace is largely an undeveloped park with informal recreation trails that are used by some members of the public and for passive recreation activities. The South Loop Trail construction is recently completed and provides pedestrian and mountain bike access to a part of the greenspace. There is also a golf course and walking path to the southwest of the project site.

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

There will be no displacement of existing recreational uses.

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

The project will not negatively impact recreation. Rather, the project will increase recreational opportunities by providing pedestrian and mountain bike trails to the neighborhood. The trails will include a 1.0-mile, one-way bike trail (single track), a 0.4-mile multi-use trail, and a 0.1-mile pedestrian-only connector trail. The mountain bike trail is intended for beginners and will have no special mountain bike trail features.

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.

Cheasty Boulevard is a designated City of Seattle Landmark. The Boulevard was designated in 2003 based on meeting four criteria for listing (Gordon, 2003). Its

historical significance is derived from its association with Seattle's Olmsted Boulevard System, which was designed to connect Jefferson Park and Beacon Avenue South with Mount Baker Boulevard and the Lake Washington Boulevard System. The Seattle Boulevard System was designed by the Olmsted brothers, notable landscape architects, in 1903.

The Landmark designation report identifies the features of the Landmark to be preserved as the following: the roadway and the original SPR right-of-way as described in City of Seattle Ordinance 25148 and Superior Court Case 83253, including all site and landscape features.

No other buildings, structures, or sites are located in or near Cheasty Greenspace that are listed in or eligible for listing in national, state, or local preservation registers.

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.

As mentioned in 13(a) above, Cheasty Boulevard is a designated City of Seattle Landmark.

There are no recorded cemeteries, archaeological sites, register-eligible properties, or traditional cultural places within or abutting Cheasty Greenspace. No recorded ethnographic places are located in or abutting Cheasty Greenspace (Thrush, 2007). Cheasty Greenspace is within the traditional territory of the Duwamish, whose descendants are members of the federally recognized Muckleshoot Indian Tribe and Suquamish Tribe.

No cultural resources assessments have been conducted within Cheasty Greenspace. In 2002, a landscape inventory was conducted in the Jefferson Park Golf Course, which abuts a portion of Cheasty Greenspace (Schnaiberg and Caywood, 2002). This inventory did not include any subsurface investigation. Assessments conducted within 1 mile of the greenspace were completed in advance of the proposed installation of a telecommunications tower approximately 0.4 mile to the west (Buehner, 2013), and proposed light rail construction along Martin Luther King Jr. Way S and Rainier Avenue S, which are over 0.3 mile to the east (Courtois et al., 1999a, 1999b). None of these assessments included subsurface investigation.

The Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation's Statewide Predictive Model classifies Cheasty Greenspace as having a range of Low to High Risk for containing precontact archaeological resources. The model is a tool used by archaeologists and planners to evaluate potential archaeological risks on a broad scale. It was developed to statistically evaluate multiple environmental factors (e.g., elevation, slope percent, aspect, distance to water, soils, and landforms) in order to predict where archaeological

resources might be found (Kauhi, 2013). The model, however, is not a substitute for conducting site-specific subsurface investigations.

In 1861, a trail bisected what is now Cheasty Greenspace in a northwest/southeast trajectory, connecting today's Seward Park neighborhood with the main road known as the Steilacoom to Seattle Wagon Road (U.S. Surveyor General, 1861). Cheasty Greenspace appears to have remained unplatted until at least 1890 and undeveloped into the 20th century (Anderson Map Company, 1890; Baist Map Company, 1912; USGS 1903, 1909). The greenspace was officially condemned in 1910 for the purposes of a park, drive, and boulevard (Sherwood, 1977). Historic aerial photographs from 1936 do not show any developed features (HistoricAerials.com, 2017).

- 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 archeology and historic preservation, archaeological surveys, historic maps, GIS data, etc.**

Professional archaeologists conducted a review of the Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation's (DAHP) secure database (Washington Information System for Architectural and Archaeological Records Data [WISAARD]) and Statewide Predictive Model (DAHP, 2010, 2017) for known and potential archaeological resources; published ethnographic studies; and historical park records, maps, and aerials.

- 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.**

Since the trail entrances along Cheasty Boulevard S are in the right-of-way of a designated landmark (Cheasty Boulevard S), SPR is consulting with the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board Staff to determine if a Certificate of Approval will be required. Previous conversations with Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board staff related to the South Loop have indicated that the trail entrance(s) and trail marker(s) will not have an adverse impact on the historic character of Cheasty Boulevard. SPR will work with Landmarks Preservation Board Staff to ensure that the signage for the North Loop will not have an adverse impact on the historic character.

Three access points to the trail are proposed along the east side of Cheasty Boulevard S. Signage is proposed at the entrance of the Cheasty Greenspace (so it is not proposed within the Cheasty Right-of-Way (ROW) or on any portion of the designated ROW). No changes to the west side of Cheasty Boulevard S or the sidewalk are proposed as part of this project (see Figure 2 and Attachment 1, Cheasty Greenspace North Loop Trail Design). Users may walk or cycle along Cheasty Boulevard S between the S Andover Street (access point E) and 24th Place entries (A1 and A2 access points) to join the loop.

There will be minimal excavation for trail construction within the Cheasty Boulevard S. right of way, and construction will be a combination of hand work and small machine work. If cultural resources are inadvertently identified during project construction, SPR will comply with state laws requiring the protection of cultural resources and human remains (Revised Code of Washington [RCW] 27.53, RCW 27.44, RCW 68.50, and RCW 68.60). SPR will temporarily halt work in the immediate vicinity of the identified potential resources and notify DAHP and affected Tribes to negotiate mitigation and/or avoidance measures (see the Inadvertent Discovery Plan in Attachment 4).

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.**

Cheasty Boulevard South is located to the west of Cheasty Greenspace, with residential streets to the east, and Martin Luther King Jr. Way South, a little farther to the east. South Columbian Way is to the south of the greenspace, and residential streets continue north of the greenspace. The trail will be accessible from six locations, three on Cheasty Boulevard S (one pedestrian only access, one bicycle access and one multi-use access) and three from the residential streets to the east (all multi-use access) (see Figure 2 and Attachment 1).

- b. **Is the 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?**

Buses run along S Columbian Way, Beacon Avenue S, and Martin Luther King Jr. Way S. Additionally, light rail runs along Martin Luther King Jr. Way S. The Columbia City Light Rail Station is approximately 0.3 mile southeast of Cheasty Greenspace.

- c. **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).**

The project will not require new roads or improvements to existing roads, sidewalks, or existing bicycle facilities. The project itself is a new public 1.0-mile, one-way bike trail, a 0.4-mile multi-use trail, and a 0.1-mile pedestrian-only connector trail in Cheasty Greenspace.

- d. 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 nonpassenger vehicles). What data or transportation models were used to make these estimates?**

The project is not expected to generate vehicular trips. Park users are mostly expected to walk or bike to the trails and primarily be users from the neighborhood. Some individuals may drive to the greenspace; however, the expected volume of trips is not anticipated to generate any appreciable additional vehicular trips much beyond existing conditions. The City of Mercer Island performed an assessment in March 2022 related to the Luther Burbank Park Bike Skills Area and found that 18.9% of users typically got to the bike park by vehicle (Attachment 5). Luther Burbank is a neighborhood park of similar size but with a more advanced skills area not present at Cheasty, so the additional vehicle trips for Cheasty North Loop can be expected to be less than that generated for Luther Burbank because the Cheasty North Loop Trail does not include any medium/advanced bike features which would be expected to draw more users from further away.

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

The project will not use (or occur in the immediate vicinity of) water, rail, or air transportation.

- f. 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; the project will not interfere with, affect or be affected by the movement of agricultural or forestry products on roads or streets in the area.

- g. Proposed measures to reduce or control transportation impacts, if any:**

Additional vehicular trips to the site are not anticipated from the project; thus, no measures to control transportation impacts are proposed.

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.**

No; the project will not increase the need for public services. Although the trail will support walkers, runners and bikers, the mountain bike trail is intended for beginner bikers and does not include any advanced features, so it is not expected that there will be an increased need for public services.

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

The project will not increase the need for public services; thus, no measures are proposed to reduce or control direct impacts on public services.

16. Utilities

a. Underline utilities currently available at the site:

electricity, natural gas, water, refuse service, telephone, sanitary sewer, septic system, other _____.

No utilities are available within the greenspace. At the northern end of Cheasty Greenspace, a transmission line runs along the S Andover St right-of-way.

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.

No utilities are proposed as part of the project.

C. SIGNATURE

The above answers are true and complete to the best of my knowledge. I understand that the lead agency is relying on them to make its decision.

Signature: <<signature on Final with Exhibits>>
Name of Signee: Mike Schwindeller
Position and Agency/Organization: Interim Deputy Superintendent, Planning & Capital Development (PCD) Branch
Date Submitted: 04/20/2023

References

- Anderson Map Company. 1890. *Anderson's New Guide Map to the City of Seattle and Environs, Washington*. On file at Seattle Municipal Archives, Seattle.
- Baist Map Company. 1912. *Surveys of Seattle*. Baist Map Company, Seattle, WA. On file at Seattle Public Library, Seattle.
- Buehner, Chanel. 2013. *Beacon Hill #SE03XC461*. Prepared for Adapt Engineering by Historic Preservation Northwest, Albany, OR. On file at Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation, Olympia.
- City of Seattle. 2020a. Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan: Managing Growth to Become an Equitable and Sustainable City (2015 – 2035). November 2020. Available at: <https://www.seattle.gov/opcd/ongoing-initiatives/seattle-2035-comprehensive-plan#projectdocuments>.
- City of Seattle. 2020b. City of Seattle Standard Specifications for Road, Bridge, and Municipal Construction, 2020 Edition. February 2020. Available at: https://www.seattle.gov/documents/departments/spu/engineering/2020_standard_specifications.pdf.
- City of Seattle. 2021. City of Seattle Stormwater Manual. July 2021. Available at: <https://www.seattle.gov/documents/Departments/SDCI/Codes/ChangesToCodes/UpdatingStormwaterRegulations/2021SWCodeFinalClean.pdf>.
- City of Seattle. 2022. Seattle Parks and Recreation Planning and Policy Document Library. Available at: <https://www.seattle.gov/parks/about-us/policies-and-plans/planning-and-policy-document-library>.
- Courtois, Shirley, Katheryn H. Krafft, Catherine Wickwire, James C. Bard, and Robin McClintock. 1999a. *Central Link Rail Transit Project Historic and Prehistoric Archaeological Sites Historic Resources Native American Traditional Cultural Properties Paleontological Sites*. Prepared for Central Puget Sound Regional Transit Authority by Courtois & Associates, Seattle and CH2M Hill, Bothell. On file at Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation, Olympia.
- Courtois, Shirley, Katheryn H. Krafft, Catherine Wickwire, James C. Bard, and Robin McClintock. 1999b. *Sound Transit Central Link Light Rail EIS Historic and Archaeological Resources Technical Report*. Prepared for Central Puget Sound Regional Transit Authority by Courtois & Associates, Seattle and CH2M Hill, Bothell. On file at Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation, Olympia.
- DAHP (Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation). 2010. Statewide Predictive Model. Last updated 2010. Electronic database, accessed at: <http://www.dahp.wa.gov/>; accessed September 2022.

- DAHP (Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation). 2017. Washington Information System for Architectural and Archaeological Records Data (WISAARD). Secure database, <http://www.dahp.wa.gov/>; accessed September 2022.
- Ecology (Washington State Department of Ecology). 2019. 2019 Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington. Publication 19-10-021. July 2019. Available at: <https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/ezshare/wq/Permits/Flare/2019SWMMWW/2019SWMMWW.htm>.
- ESA (Environmental Science Associates). 2022. Cheasty Greenspace Trail – Critical Area Study and Conceptual Mitigation Plan. Prepared for the City of Seattle Parks and Recreation. December 2022.
- Gordon, Karen. 2003. *City of Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board Report on Designation: Cheasty Boulevard South*. On file, Seattle of City Historic Preservation Program, Seattle.
- HistoricAerials.com. 2017. 1936, 1968 Aerial Coverage. Available at www.HistoricAerials.com; accessed September 2022.
- HWA (HWA Geosciences). 2022. Draft Geotechnical Engineering Report Cheasty Greenspace Mountain Bike Trail - Prepared for ESA on behalf of City of Seattle Parks and Recreation. December 2022.
- IMBA (International Mountain Bicycling Association). 2004. *Trail Solutions: IMBA's Guide to Building Sweet Singletrack*. 272 pages.
- IMBA (International Mountain Bicycling Association). 2007. *Managing Mountain Biking: IMBA's Guide to Providing Great Riding*. Peter Webber (editor). 256 pages.
- Kauhi, Tonya C. 2013. *Statewide Predictive Model*. Prepared for the Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation by GeoEngineers, Tacoma. On file at Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation, Olympia.
- NAIP (National Agriculture Imagery Program). 2021. NAIP Imagery website. Available at: <https://naip-image-dates-usdaonline.hub.arcgis.com/>.
- OSM (OpenStreetMap). 2014, 2016. Map data copyrighted OpenStreetMap contributors. Available: <https://www.openstreetmap.org>.
- City of Seattle. 2022. Seattle Department of Construction & Inspections GIS Map Application. Retrieved from: <https://seattlecitygis.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=f822b2c6498c4163b0cf908e2241e9c2>.
- Schnaiberg, Jill, and Janene Caywood. 2002. *Landscape Inventory of Jefferson Park*. Prepared for Jefferson Park Alliance by Historical Research Associates, Seattle. On file at Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation, Olympia.

- Sherwood, Donald N. 1977. Cheasty Boulevard. Sherwood Park History Files. Electronic document, http://clerk.seattle.gov/~F_archives/sherwood/CheastyBlvd.pdf; accessed September 2022.
- Thrush, Coll P. 2007. Native Seattle: Histories from the Crossing-Over Place. University of Washington Press, Seattle, WA.
- USGS (U.S. Geological Survey). 1903. *Seattle, WA*. 15' Series Quadrangle. U.S. Geological Survey, Reston, VA.
- USGS (U.S. Geological Survey). 1909. *Seattle, WA*. 15' Series Quadrangle. U.S. Geological Survey, Reston, VA
- U.S. Surveyor General. 1861. Township 24 North, Range 4 East Survey Map. Electronic document, https://www.blm.gov/or/landrecords/survey/yPlatView1_2.php?path=PWA&name=t240n040e_001.jpg; accessed September 2022.

Figures

Attachments