



CHAPTER 1 Summary

1.1 Introduction

This chapter provides a summary of the Proposed Action for the City of Monroe 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update, Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (Draft SEIS), and Final Supplemental Environmental Impact (Final SEIS) processes. It describes the Proposed Action and location, project purpose, and State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) process. The non-project SEIS includes the development of alternatives, environmental analysis of those alternatives, and identification of impacts and mitigation measures.

This Final SEIS supplements the current (2015) City of Monroe Comprehensive Plan EIS and the 2024 Draft SEIS. The Draft SEIS and Final SEIS are companion documents and have been prepared in accordance with Washington’s Growth Management Act (GMA) and to comply with new regulations focused on sustainable and managed growth.

GMA requires periodic updates to Monroe’s Comprehensive Plan to ensure compliance with amendments to GMA and associated state laws and to extend the planning horizon with new 20-year population, housing, and employment forecasts. The Monroe Comprehensive Plan Update covers 2024 through 2044. The Draft SEIS analyzed two alternatives: the No Action Alternative and the Proposed Action. The Final SEIS is intended to clarify information, correct any errors, and address public, agency, and tribal comments on the Draft SEIS based on public feedback received during the comment period. The City of Monroe elected not to select a Preferred Alternative and, with the adoption of the Comprehensive

Plan Update, will implement land use changes at the same or less intensity than the Proposed Action described in this SEIS.

The Monroe 2024–2044 Comprehensive Plan Update sets the framework and describes actionable steps for making the City’s vision, *Imagine Monroe*, a reality (City of Monroe 2021b). The Comprehensive Plan is the City’s 20-year plan for land use and growth based on the community’s vision for the future. It guides City decisions about where housing and jobs should be located, and how public investments are made for things like transportation, utilities, parks, and other assets. Monroe’s Comprehensive Plan Update provides goals, policies, and strategies to work toward the City’s vision:

Imagine Monroe. A lively center surrounded by nature. A place of beauty and goodwill.

Our parks, waterways, and environment are healthy and accessible for everyone to enjoy. Our historic downtown and business districts are thriving and full of locally owned businesses and locally sourced products. We can find everything we need with regional connections and with a variety of choices for work, housing, dining, shopping, arts, and activities.

Friendly and responsive, we strengthen connections through gathering spaces, events, services, and community-centered infrastructure —creating a safe place for all.

In Monroe, everyone feels at home, and everyone feels they belong (City of Monroe 2021b).

Comments and feedback on the Draft SEIS are considered in the Final SEIS, as described in Section 1.4, *SEPA Process and Public Involvement*. A list of the comments received, the full text of the comments, and responses to each comment can be found in Chapter 6, *Responses to Comments*. None of the comments or responses warranted updates or changes to the Draft SEIS. Between the issuance of the Draft SEIS and Final SEIS, the City of Monroe completed the Transportation System Plan (City of Monroe 2024a), Trails Master Plan (City of Monroe 2024c), and the Utility Systems Plan (City of Monroe 2024b). The Monroe School District

Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) (MSD 2024) and the Snohomish School District CFP (SSD 2024) were also completed between the Draft SEIS and Final SEIS issue dates. Therefore, the Final SEIS updates, clarifies, and corrects information to incorporate the new Transportation System Plan, Trails Master Plan, Monroe School District CFP, Snohomish School District CFP, and Utility Systems Plan into the SEPA analysis. The Transportation System Plan, Trails Master Plan, and the Utility Systems Plan are included in the Monroe 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update.

This SEIS analyzes under SEPA the adoption of the Monroe 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update, including future land use changes shown in the Future Land Use Map (FLUM), the new Transportation System Plan, Trails Master Plan (City of Monroe 2024c), and the new Utility Systems Plan (City of Monroe 2024b). The City updated the Parks, Recreation, and Open Space (PROS) Plan in 2022 (City of Monroe 2022). These updated plans prioritize projects to work toward future development identified in the 2024–2044 Comprehensive Plan Update and the FLUM. The FLUM illustrates land use patterns over the next 20 years in Monroe.

As part of the Monroe 2024–2044 Comprehensive Plan Update, the City is preparing updates to its Development Code to implement new or support updated Comprehensive Plan policies. These policies meet regional and state requirements and dictate how and where development occurs in Monroe. In addition, the City updated the Shoreline Master Program and critical areas regulations in 2019 and plans to update the critical areas regulations again in 2025.

In summary, the Comprehensive Plan Update addresses:

- Population, housing, and employment allocations through 2044, consistent with the Puget Sound Regional Council’s (PSRC) VISION 2050 (PSRC 2020) and as adopted in the Snohomish Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) (Snohomish County 2023).
- Updates to the City’s Capital Facilities Plan (MPWD 2023).
- Updates to the City’s Transportation System Plan (City of Monroe 2024a).
- Adoption of a Trails Master Plan (City of Monroe 2024c).
- Inclusion of the updated Monroe School District CFP (MSD 2024) and Snohomish School District CFP (SSD 2024).
- Updates to the City’s Utility Systems Plan (City of Monroe 2024b).
- Any changes required by state and federal laws or requirements.

The 2024–2044 Comprehensive Plan Update plans to accommodate Monroe’s growth allocations of an additional 5,010 people, 2,423

housing units, and 2,400 jobs in the Urban Growth Area (UGA) by the year 2044.

The Draft SEIS process included the development of alternatives, environmental analysis of those alternatives, and identification of potential impacts and mitigation measures. The No Action Alternative represents the adopted 2015 Comprehensive Plan and its eight goals. The eight goals include safety and security; environment and natural resources; regional growth alongside a resilient and stable economy; development that ensures land use compatibility, neighborhood character, and long-term sustainability; a range of housing types; utilities and transportation infrastructure; parks, civic facilities, and cultural activities; and a thriving Downtown Monroe.

The Proposed Action alternative was defined to represent the most intense development of several scenarios the City is considering to meet future housing and employment allocations set for Monroe in Snohomish County's CPPs and PSRC's Multicounty Planning Policies (MPPs). The Proposed Action consists of the following proposals for land uses in the City, consistent with the 2024–2044 Comprehensive Plan Update:

- Change zoning along US 2 to allow high-density (R25) residential development within the General Commercial zone. This change would protect commercial development along US 2 and its side streets and allow residential uses behind the commercial development or as part of mixed-use development.
- Increase residential densities or shift residential densities between areas not previously (2015) considered for residential development. Higher residential densities south of US 2 may be moved to areas north of US 2 or allowed in certain commercial zones.
- Convert selected residential areas to Mixed Use, allowing for a mix of higher-density residential and commercial uses. These areas include properties along Roosevelt Road (the City's northwest corporate limits), south of the hospital, along Chain Lake Road south of Rainer View Rd SE, and along 179th Avenue SE between SR 522 and Main Street.

The Draft SEIS analyzed the impacts of the two alternatives on five elements of the environment including: Land Use, Aesthetics, and Parks, Recreation, and Open Space; Shorelines and Natural Environment; Population, Employment, and Housing; Capital Facilities and Utilities; and Transportation. The purpose of the analysis is to estimate the nature, severity, and duration of impacts that might occur and to compare the impacts of the Proposed Action and the No Action Alternative. More information on the alternatives is presented in Draft SEIS Chapter 2 and summarized in



Section 1.5, *Significant Areas of Controversy and Uncertainty*, of this chapter. Draft SEIS Chapters 3 through 7 presented an analysis of the five elements of the environment.

The Draft SEIS laid the foundation for the initial environmental analysis that was conducted and is a companion document to this Final SEIS and is incorporated by reference in accordance with Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 197-11-635.

Final SEIS Chapters 1 and 2 are the updated *Summary and Alternatives* chapters, respectively. Final SEIS Chapter 3 is the updated *Capital Facilities and Utilities* chapter. Note that in the Draft SEIS, *Capital Facilities and Utilities* was Chapter 6. Final SEIS Chapter 4 is the updated *Transportation* chapter. Note that in the Draft SEIS, *Transportation* was Chapter 7. Final SEIS Chapter 5, *Corrections and Clarifications*, presents updates to the *Land Use, Aesthetics, Parks & Recreation, and Open Space* chapter and the *Population, Employment, & Housing* chapter. Note that in the Draft SEIS, *Land Use, Aesthetics, Parks & Recreation, and Open Space* was Chapter 3, and *Population, Employment, & Housing* was Chapter 5. Final SEIS Chapter 6, *Response to Comments*, includes comments received on the Draft SEIS and responses to those comments. Final SEIS Chapter 6 is the Distribution List. Final SEIS Chapter 8, *References*, contains references for the Final SEIS.

Updates to the Draft SEIS were necessary because between the Draft SEIS and the Final SEIS, the Transportation System Plan, Trails Master Plan, Monroe School District CFP, Snohomish School District CFP, and the Utility Systems Plan were completed and were therefore considered in the Final SEIS analysis. Information was also updated to correctly reflect adopted housing and employment allocations in the CPPs. No responses to public comments resulted in updates or revisions to the Draft SEIS analysis.

1.2 Project Purpose, Desired Outcomes, and Exclusions

The Draft and Final SEIS together provide a qualitative and quantitative analysis of environmental impacts associated with the City of Monroe 2024–2044 Comprehensive Plan Update. The purpose of this SEIS is to inform and assist the public and City of Monroe decision-makers in considering future growth and policy/code proposals appropriate throughout the City.

The City’s desired outcome is a SEPA SEIS that can be relied upon over the next 20 years to guide development and planning and streamline project-level SEPA evaluations.

The City chose to exclude the certain SEPA elements listed in WAC 197-11-444 because: (1) the alternatives analyzed in this SEIS are not expected to result in significant impacts related to the excluded element; or (2) impacts to the excluded element cannot be fully evaluated at the programmatic level. SEPA elements excluded from the SEIS include earth, geology, topography, air, runoff, groundwater, environmental health, historical and cultural preservation, and agriculture.

1.3 Study Area

The study area for the Draft and Final SEIS analysis is the Monroe UGA (see **Figure 1-1**), which includes areas within the City limits and some areas of unincorporated Snohomish County. Depending on the resource, information is presented in the SEIS for additional areas such as school districts, police and fire service areas, or areas served by capital facilities or utility providers.

1.4 SEPA Process and Public Involvement

1.4.1 Environmental Review Process

PROCESS

The State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) (Chapter 43.21C Revised Code of Washington [RCW]) is a Washington law that helps agency decision-makers, applicants, and the public understand how a proposal would affect the environment. The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process analyzes and informs decision-makers and the public about probable adverse environmental impacts, reasonable alternatives, and potential mitigation.

Preparation of an EIS is required for actions that have the potential for significant impacts. This document is a programmatic (non-project) EIS that analyzes the proposals and alternatives broadly across the study area and a Supplemental EIS (SEIS) because it supplements the current (2015) City of Monroe Comprehensive Plan EIS. The City of Monroe has determined that this periodic update to the Comprehensive Plan may have significant adverse impacts on the environment in addition to those analyzed in the 2015 City of Monroe Comprehensive Plan EIS, and is therefore required under WAC 197-11-330 to prepare an SEIS.



FIGURE 1-1 City and Urban Growth Area Boundaries

WAC 197-11-442(1-4) states that the SEPA lead agency (City of Monroe, in this case) shall have more flexibility in preparing EISs or SEISs on non-project proposals because less-detailed information is typically available on environmental impacts and on subsequent project proposals when compared to a project proposal. The EIS or SEIS may be combined with other planning documents and should address impacts and alternatives at the level of detail appropriate for the scope of the non-project proposal and to the level of planning for the proposal. In an EIS or SEIS, the discussion of alternatives for a comprehensive plan should be limited to a general discussion of the impacts of alternate proposals for policies and implementation measures contained in the comprehensive plan. SEPA does not require the lead agency to evaluate every alternative iteration. Selecting alternatives that represent the range of options provides an effective method to evaluate and compare the merits of different choices (WAC 197-11-442(4)). The final action chosen by City of Monroe decision-makers need not be identical to any single alternative in the SEIS but must be within the range of alternatives discussed. WAC 197-11-440 does not require decision-makers to select a preferred alternative.

WAC 197-11-444 categorizes the elements of the environment into the natural environment (earth, air, water, plants and animals, and energy and natural resources) and built environment (environmental health, land and shoreline use, transportation, and public services and utilities). To simplify the EIS or SEIS, reduce paperwork and duplication, improve readability, and focus on the significant issues, some or all of the elements of the environment in WAC 197-11-444 may be combined. The City of Monroe combined the SEPA elements into the following categories in the Draft SEIS: land use, aesthetics, and parks, recreation, and open space; shorelines and natural environment; population, employment, & housing; capital facilities and utilities; and transportation.

The SEIS process involves the following steps: (1) initial research, issuing a Determination of Significance; (2) preparing a Draft SEIS with a comment period; (3) responding to comments and developing a Preferred Alternative (if desired); and (4) issuing the Final SEIS to inform development of legislation.

The SEIS provides information about the Comprehensive Plan Update to agencies, tribes, and all interested groups and community members. The SEIS includes information on alternatives, existing environmental conditions, potential significant impacts, and potential measures to mitigate impacts. The process of developing the SEIS provides opportunities for the public, agencies, and tribal governments to participate in developing and analyzing information.

Preparation of the SEIS will assist with the development of the Comprehensive Plan Update and the decision-making process.

Community members were provided the opportunity to comment at the Draft SEIS stage. The Draft SEIS was made available on the City website to the public for review and comment. Comments received discussed a range of topics, including, but not limited to, transportation, land use, and housing impacts; the UGA; and the natural environment.

The City published the Final SEIS on October 18, 2024. The Comprehensive Plan Update process will be completed in 2024.

PROGRAMMATIC EIS

A programmatic (or non-project) EIS does not evaluate the impacts associated with a specific development project. Rather, a programmatic EIS (or SEIS) contains broader, planning-level analyses that emphasize cumulative impacts, impacts from policy changes, and program-level mitigation measures. A programmatic EIS studies and compares a range of alternatives to support the consideration of plans, policies, or programs ([WAC 197-11-442](#)). The City of Monroe Comprehensive Plan Update SEIS contains programmatic analyses of potential significant impacts associated with adoption of the Comprehensive Plan Update alternatives. Individual development projects proposed in the future consistent with the policies of the updated Comprehensive Plan will still be subject to SEPA review and state, county, and City regulations. Future review could occur in the form of additional supplemental EISs, SEPA addenda, or determinations of non-significance.

SUPPLEMENTAL EIS

A supplemental EIS adds information and analysis to supplement the information in a previous EIS. It may address new alternatives, new areas of likely significant adverse impact, or add additional analysis to areas not adequately addressed in the original document. A supplemental EIS includes a draft (with comment period) and a final document, and essentially follows the same requirements as a Draft EIS and Final EIS. In this case, the update is a change to the Comprehensive Plan and is likely to cause new or increased significant adverse environmental impacts that were not evaluated in the original EIS.

A supplemental EIS is used when an existing EIS addresses some, but not all, of a new proposal's probable significant adverse environmental impacts. The existing EIS (the 2015 Comprehensive Plan EIS, in this case) is used as the basis for a supplemental EIS.

PRIOR ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

RCW 43.21C.034 allows use of existing documents and describes incorporation by reference as similar to directly adopting a previous SEPA document because all or part of the incorporated document becomes part of the agency environmental documentation for a proposal. The 2015 City of Monroe Comprehensive Plan EIS is the only prior SEPA document considered in this SEIS and is incorporated by reference.

DOCUMENTS SUPPLEMENTED OR ADOPTED

This City of Monroe Comprehensive Plan Update SEIS supplements the 2015 City of Monroe Comprehensive Plan EIS. The 2015 City of Monroe Comprehensive Plan EIS is adopted per WAC 197-11-630.

1.4.2 Scoping

The scoping process is intended to identify the range of potential significant impacts on the built and natural environment that should be considered and evaluated in an EIS. The City published a Scoping Notice in combination with the Determination of Significance (DS) on February 2, 2024, with a 30-day public comment period that ran through March 6, 2024. Agencies, affected tribes (Tulalip Tribes, Snoqualmie Tribe, Stillaguamish Tribe of Indians), and members of the public were invited to comment on the scope of the SEIS, including the alternatives, mitigation measures, probable significant adverse impacts, and licenses or other approvals that may be required.

The City received one comment on February 15, 2024, in response to the DS and Scoping Notice. The comment, from the Snoqualmie Tribe, stated that based on the information provided and the Tribe's understanding of the project and its Area of Potential Effects, the Tribe had no substantive comments. The Tribe requested that if the scope of the project or the parameters for defining an Area of Potential Effects change, they reserve the right to modify their current position.

1.4.3 Draft SEIS Comment Process

Public and agency comments were invited on the Draft SEIS during the 30-day public comment period following issuance of the Draft SEIS, which lasted from May 14, 2024, to June 14, 2024. Parties of interest (see Draft SEIS Chapter 9, *Distribution List*) were notified of the Draft SEIS issuance. The City held an in-person public engagement event on June 5, 2024, during the comment period to inform the public about the Comprehensive Plan Update and the SEPA process and to gather written and verbal comments. Written

or emailed comments were received and no verbal comments were received. Comments have been addressed in Final SEIS Chapter 6.

1.4.4 Draft and Final SEIS

After considering comments on the Draft SEIS, the City of Monroe as the lead agency issued this Final SEIS.

Adoption of the FLUM and Comprehensive Plan Update will be the subject of public meetings by the Planning Commission and City Council in fall of 2024.

SEPA requires a 7-day waiting period after the Final SEIS is issued before the City can take any action related to the alternatives. Parties of interest (see Final SEIS Chapter 7) will be notified of the Final SEIS issuance.

1.5 Significant Areas of Controversy and Uncertainty

A potential area of controversy may be the Proposed Action’s expected significant impact on transportation and traffic volumes and operations due to the additional economic activity related to more jobs and housing by 2044.

1.6 Issues to Be Resolved

No issues remain to be resolved.

1.7 Summary of Description of Alternatives

Alternatives are different ways of achieving a project’s purpose and need and serve as the basis for environmental analysis relative to elements of the environment. The two alternatives are described in greater detail in Draft SEIS Chapter 2.

Environmental analysis is the process of studying each alternative and forecasting impacts on different elements of the environment such as capital facilities, shorelines, or transportation.

Environmental Impact Statements must include an alternative that represents “no action” and one or more alternatives that include changes in land use or policies, called the “action alternatives.” Action alternatives allow the City to understand the impacts of a range of growth scenarios and test ideas, implications, benefits, and



impacts and compare them to the impacts of the No Action Alternative.

The City of Monroe identified two alternatives to be analyzed in the SEIS (see below for brief descriptions of these alternatives): the No Action Alternative and one action alternative (the Proposed Action). The No Action Alternative represents a continuation of development in Monroe similar to existing trends and as defined in the 2015–2035 Comprehensive Plan. The Proposed Action focuses on higher density and middle housing development north of US 2 and increasing job capacity along Main Street, near North Kelsey Street, along Roosevelt Road at the northwest corner of the City limits, along 179th Avenue SE between SR 522 and Main Street, and along Chain Lake Road. The Proposed Action may increase the intensity of development, which would also increase connectivity between neighborhoods and communities, offering higher densities and services in proximity to affordable housing, compared to the No Action Alternative.

The Proposed Action was developed to:

- Respond to population, housing, and job allocations for the City of Monroe and its UGA through 2044.
- Comply with new regulations related to housing types and affordability.
- Develop goals, policies, and actions to work toward the implementation of Monroe’s 2021 vision, Imagine Monroe (City of Monroe 2021b).

The Proposed Action reflects changing needs to accommodate expected future residents and employees and will plan for and accommodate housing that is affordable to all.

Both alternatives center on the intensity, character, and location of future development. Neither alternative includes an expansion of the City’s UGA. Analyzing different alternatives, and especially the differences between them, allows decision-makers and the public to compare the effects of different options and ultimately to guide future growth.



1.8 Summary of Key Findings, Impacts, and Potential Mitigation Measures

One of the most important functions of an EIS is to identify potential impacts associated with a proposal and identify appropriate mitigation measures. The Draft SEIS describes how the alternatives differ from one another, how the SEIS analyzed each element of the environment, what impacts have been identified, and what measures are proposed to mitigate impacts. The analysis contained in the SEIS will be used to guide City of Monroe decision-makers on decisions related to the Comprehensive Plan Update.

Table 1-1 summarizes the results of the environmental evaluation of alternatives in the Draft SEIS and Final SEIS. The alternatives are further detailed in Draft SEIS in Chapter 2, *Alternatives*. Where impacts are identified, even with compliance with regulations and standards, mitigation measures are provided. The reader is encouraged to review this summary section to find areas of interest and to read the more-detailed analysis in the Draft SEIS and Final SEIS for the full context of the affected environment, impact analysis, mitigation measures, and overall findings.

TABLE 1-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Element of the Environment	No Action Alternative	Proposed Action	Mitigation
<p>Land Use, Aesthetics, and Parks, Recreation, and Open Space</p>	<p>The No Action Alternative would result in significant impacts on land use planning. The lack of increased density would work against the CPPs and Monroe’s visions of community connectivity. The proposed development pattern would not entirely align with the MPPs. The No Action Alternative does not fully align with the PSRC VISION 2050.</p> <p>Under the No Action Alternative, less-than-significant impacts on land use compatibility are expected. The No Action Alternative would allow some parcels to be redeveloped to use the allowed building envelope more fully based on existing standards that would continue to apply to siting, massing, design, and orientation of new development, resulting in a less-than-significant impact on visual character. Existing development regulations would minimize risk of view obstruction in areas of Monroe where taller or more dense development is already permitted, resulting in a less-than-significant impact on scenic viewsheds. Development consistent with the No Action Alternative would comply with Chapter 15.15 Monroe Municipal Code (MMC) standards for exterior lighting of buildings and parking lots, which would ensure that increases in light and glare from future development would be less-than-significant.</p>	<p>Development patterns under the Proposed Action would be consistent with VISION 2050, GMA requirements, the MPPs, and the CPPs. Although future development could result in higher housing densities and more varied land uses near each other, housing types, closely spaced housing, and urban uses bordering the UGA boundary, development would comply with existing development regulations, resulting in a less-than-significant impact on land use compatibility. Existing standards would continue to apply to new development relating to siting, massing, design, and orientation, resulting in a less-than-significant impact on visual character. Maximum height restrictions and standards for exterior lighting of buildings and parking lots would minimize potential changes to views from taller buildings permitted under existing regulations and increases in light and glare, resulting in a less-than-significant impact on scenic viewsheds and light & glare.</p> <p>Under the Proposed Action, the current level of service (LOS) deficit for both neighborhood and community parks would be remedied with acquisition of lands identified on the 2022 PROS Plan. Implementation of mitigation measures in the 2022 PROS Plan would mitigate the</p>	<p>PROS Plan updates.</p>



Element of the Environment	No Action Alternative	Proposed Action	Mitigation
	<p>The 2024 Trails Master Plan would be updated to support the PROS Plan, which is itself updated at least every 6 years. Impacts on trails would be less-than-significant.</p>	<p>LOS and walkability impacts to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Impacts on trails would be the same as under the No Action Alternative. The 2024 Trails Master Plan would be updated to support the PROS Plan, which is itself updated at least every 6 years. Impacts on trails would be less-than-significant.</p>	
<p>Shorelines & Natural Environment</p>	<p>The majority of land adjacent to shorelines is within designated park lands. Growth areas are already highly developed, and the City’s critical areas regulations would reduce impacts from geologic hazards and on public health and safety, resulting in less-than-significant impacts on earth resources.</p> <p>Growth is expected to result in permitted wetland, stream, and buffer impacts with mitigation resulting from development. With Critical Areas Ordinance (CAO) compliance, less-than-significant impacts on wetlands and streams would occur.</p> <p>Development and new jobs are proposed in already largely developed industrial zones in the floodplain adjacent to Lake Tye. Future development in the floodplain would comply with Chapter 14.01 MMC, Flood Hazard Area Regulations and would not result in a greatly elevated chance of risk to humans and the natural and built environment where a substantial change in the way flood hazards are currently mitigated would be required. The impact on floodplains would be less-than-significant.</p>	<p>Impacts would be similar to the No Action Alternative. More development would occur under the Proposed Action but would occur in already-developed areas. Impacts on shorelines and the natural environment would be less-than-significant.</p>	<p>Use Best Available Science (BAS) as required in the City’s critical areas regulations, which will be updated in 2025.</p> <p>Implement Comprehensive Plan goals, objectives, policies, and actions designed to mitigate earth-related impacts, impacts on wetlands and streams, flooding impacts, and impacts on the floodplain and shoreline.</p> <p>Continue to invest in the stormwater management system by installing, maintaining, and repairing pipes, catch basins, ditch lines, and stormwater ponds.</p> <p>Continue to educate residents, students, and businesses on ways they can prevent pollutants from</p>



Element of the Environment	No Action Alternative	Proposed Action	Mitigation
	<p>Substantial changes in allowed uses per the City’s existing Shoreline Master Program (SMP) are not proposed, nor is substantial development proposed in City shoreline jurisdiction. With SMP compliance, less-than-significant impacts on shorelines would occur.</p> <p>Impacts could include a loss or reduced function of plant communities, loss of vegetated land and wildlife habitat, declines in plant species diversity, infestations by invasive or non-native species, or loss of tree canopy and forest patch size. Most future development would occur in the already built environment. The likelihood of jeopardizing a plant population or species is minimal. Impacts on plants would be less-than-significant.</p> <p>Impacts could include lost, simplified, or degraded wildlife habitat. Reduced habitat could result in decreased species abundance and fragmented habitats. Most proposed development, especially dense development, would occur in already highly developed areas. Impacts on animals would be less-than-significant.</p>		<p>reaching Monroe’s waterbodies.</p> <p>Continue to engage community volunteer and stewardship groups in activities and events that support stormwater management and water quality.</p> <p>Continue to participate in the Snohomish Basin Salmon Recovery Forum.</p> <p>Continue the Monroe Parks Department’s relationship with the Stilly Snohomish Fisheries Enhancement Task Force, which is a member of the Woods Creek Coalition.</p>
<p>Population, Employment, & Housing</p>	<p>Displacement risk would remain due to less integration of Monroe’s 2021 Housing Action Plan strategies, fewer opportunities for homeownership, fewer affordable housing and living-wage jobs created near residences, and fewer policies that</p>	<p>The Proposed Action would accommodate increased affordable housing units that include provisions for all income levels and would provide middle housing opportunities. Although the risk of displacement would remain, policies and regulations that support anti-displacement practices would be in place</p>	<p>Implement policies to preserve existing affordable housing.</p> <p>Obtain public investment or transfer of development rights to encourage maintenance of and</p>



Element of the Environment	No Action Alternative	Proposed Action	Mitigation
	<p>encourage anti-displacement practices. The result is a significant impact on population.</p> <p>The No Action Alternative would not meet the Snohomish County CPP allocations for the UGA or fully align with VISION 2050, resulting in a significant impact on employment growth. The No Action Alternative would not comply with House Bill (HB) 1220 or statewide GMA requirements, resulting in a significant impact related to housing policy.</p> <p>The No Action Alternative would not comply with GMA housing requirements and would not have the capacity to provide sufficient housing for extremely low, very low, or low-income households, resulting in a significant impact with respect to housing supply and affordability.</p>	<p>under the Proposed Action, resulting in a less-than-significant impact on population.</p> <p>The Proposed Action would exceed the CPP employment allocation for Monroe and align with VISION 2050 in support of employment growth.</p> <p>The Proposed Action would allow for more housing types with increased density and ownership opportunities and would provide more than 900 housing units in the extremely low, very low, and low median income levels. It would exceed extremely low, very low, low, moderate, and above moderate income housing requirements set by GMA and HB 1220, supporting housing affordability and supply.</p> <p>The Proposed Action would provide more housing close to multimodal transportation options and would align more with VISION 2050’s focus of increased proximity to transit and connectivity compared to the No Action Alternative. The result would increase the number of dwelling units in proximity to transit. This alternative could bring homes and businesses closer to transit.</p>	<p>retention of current affordable housing structures at affordable rates to prevent displacement.</p> <p>Explore funding or community-owned land options like community land trusts to offer increased options for affordable homeownership.</p> <p>Implement protections against landlord-tenant issues, eviction, and income discrimination.</p> <p>Distribute community resources that help residents learn about affordable housing and protect their rights.</p> <p>Create a regular monitoring system to evaluate the effectiveness of housing programs and strategies.</p> <p>Align capital funding sources and maintenance funding sources to create motivation for neighborhood and Main Street revitalization.</p> <p>Update development standards and zoning</p>



Element of the Environment	No Action Alternative	Proposed Action	Mitigation
			<p>regulations to permit and encourage middle housing.</p> <p>Adopt smaller minimum lot sizes and inclusionary zoning policies.</p> <p>Allow micro apartments.</p> <p>Provide incentives for constructing housing for incomes less than 80% Area Median Income (AMI).</p>
Capital Facilities & Utilities	<p>Periodic planning and capital budgeting processes would ensure that staffing, equipment, and infrastructure are adequate to serve additional development. Communications and data are market-driven and will respond to increased demand with more services. Increased demand for capital facilities and utilities would represent a less-than-significant impact.</p>	<p>Impacts would be similar to the No Action Alternative, except that the Proposed Action would result in higher housing, employment, and population growth by 2044. Increased demand for capital facilities and utilities would represent a less-than-significant impact.</p>	<p>Concentrate growth in areas with adequate capital facilities and utilities.</p> <p>Build additional population density into upcoming plans or service updates, such as conservation plans and other future utility planning documents.</p> <p>Invest in building and maintaining facilities for capital facilities and utilities.</p> <p>Require potable water, wastewater, and stormwater connections for all new development, unless otherwise allowed by state, county, or City regulations.</p>
Transportation	<p>The No Action Alternative would result in a 34% increase in weekday PM peak hour trips and 25% increase in vehicle miles</p>	<p>Under the Proposed Action, additional growth in land use would result in 3% more weekday PM peak hour trips and</p>	<p>Implement policies that address circulation system classification and design, and</p>



Element of the Environment	No Action Alternative	Proposed Action	Mitigation
	<p>traveled (VMT) compared to existing conditions. The PM peak-hour volumes at the study intersections would increase on average by approximately 30% compared to existing conditions. The No Action Alternative would result in a less-than-significant impact on traffic operations because LOS standards would be met across all arterial and collector roadways within the City.</p> <p>Safety issues would accompany increased traffic volumes and worsening LOS; goals and policies to improve safety for all travel users and modes would reduce the impacts on traffic safety to a less-than-significant level. The No Action Alternative would support working toward a yellow LOS for transit and Community Transit has identified increased transit frequency for Monroe. Although some corridors could continue to operate below the yellow LOS standard, the No Action Alternative is expected to result in a less-than-significant impact on transit service.</p> <p>The growth in housing and jobs under the No Action Alternative would not result in freight traffic increases; therefore, no impact on rail traffic would occur.</p> <p>Pedestrian and bicycle LOS standards would not be met, resulting in a significant impact on pedestrian and bicycle facilities.</p>	<p>1% more VMT compared to the No Action Alternative. The increase in intersection traffic volumes is similar to the No Action Alternative, except slightly higher volume increases. The Proposed Action results in reduced speeds along corridors in the City compared to the No Action Alternative. The roadway LOS standard is exceeded on US 2 (an arterial within the City) westbound from the western City limit to State Route (SR) 522. Speeds are forecast to decrease to LOS F without any improvements. The Proposed Action would result in a significant impact on traffic operations.</p> <p>Safety issues would accompany increased traffic volumes, similar to under the No Action Alternative, and goals and policies to improve safety for all travel users and modes would reduce the impacts on traffic safety to a less-than-significant level. Impacts on transit service and rail traffic under the Proposed Action would be the same as the No Action Alternative, resulting in a less-than-significant impact on transit service and no impact on rail traffic.</p> <p>Impacts of the Proposed Action on the pedestrian and bicycle network would be less-than-significant due to adoption and implementation of the Transportation System Plan.</p>	<p>concurrency standards, transit coordination and improvements, non-motorized facilities, and financing, including transportation impact fees and joint transportation planning.</p> <p>Implement and continue demand management strategies.</p>



1.9 Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

The No Action Alternative would result in a significant unavoidable adverse impact on current land use plans, policies, and regulations. The lack of increased density under the No Action Alternative would work against the CPPs and visions of connectivity. The No Action Alternative would not fully align with the MPPs or the PSRC VISION 2050. The No Action Alternative does not support needed changes in land use to accommodate the anticipated growth in Monroe’s population or housing and employment needs.

Both the No Action Alternative and the Proposed Action are expected to result in significant unavoidable adverse impacts on transportation operations, including traffic LOS and volumes (Proposed Action) and pedestrian and bicycle LOS (No Action Alternative).

Mitigation would reduce other significant impacts listed in **Table 1-1** to less-than-significant levels.