

SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Purpose of checklist:

Governmental agencies use this checklist to help determine whether the environmental impacts of your proposal are significant. This information is also helpful to determine if available avoidance, minimization or compensatory mitigation measures will address the probable significant impacts or if an environmental impact statement will be prepared to further analyze the proposal.

Instructions for applicants:

This environmental checklist asks you to describe some basic information about your proposal. Please answer each question accurately and carefully, to the best of your knowledge. You may need to consult with an agency specialist or private consultant for some questions. You may use "not applicable" or "does not apply" only when you can explain why it does not apply and not when the answer is unknown. You may also attach or incorporate by reference additional studies reports. Complete and accurate answers to these questions often avoid delays with the SEPA process as well as later in the decision-making process.

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

Instructions for Lead Agencies:

Please adjust the format of this template as needed. Additional information may be necessary to evaluate the existing environment, all interrelated aspects of the proposal and an analysis of adverse impacts. The checklist is considered the first but not necessarily the only source of information needed to make an adequate threshold determination. Once a threshold determination is made, the lead agency is responsible for the completeness and accuracy of the checklist and other supporting documents.

Use of checklist for nonproject proposals:

For nonproject proposals (such as ordinances, regulations, plans and programs), complete the applicable parts of sections A and B plus the [SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS \(part D\)](#). Please completely answer all questions that apply and note that the words "project," "applicant," and "property or site" should be read as "proposal," "proponent," and "affected geographic area," respectively. The lead agency may exclude (for non-projects) questions in Part B - Environmental Elements –that do not contribute meaningfully to the analysis of the proposal.¹

¹ Please note: This version contains underline and ~~strikeout~~ notations made by Gordon Clowers, the SEPA reviewer and preparer of the threshold determination, which are annotations made reflecting his review of this SEPA checklist, and his supplemental addition of analysis on certain topics.

A. Background

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable:

2022 Permanent Home Occupations Regulations

2. Name of applicant:

Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections

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

Seattle City Council

Contact person: Mike Podowski

4. Date checklist prepared:

August - September, 2022 (annotated by reviewer, October/November 2022)

5. Agency requesting checklist:

Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections

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

Adoption proposed for early 2023.

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

No.

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

None except this environmental checklist.

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.

None.

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

Approval of the ordinance by the Mayor and City Council.

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. (Lead agencies may modify this form to include additional specific information on project description.)

Background Information

Prior to the current proposal, adoption of Council Bill 120001 as Ordinance 126293 was a non-project proposal that updated and amended various provisions of the Land Use Code addressing home

occupations, as an interim regulation and response to economic and operational difficulties caused by COVID-19 and related emergency proclamations.

Ordinance 126293 temporarily reduced requirements and conditions in Seattle's Land Use Code on the operation of home occupation businesses. Those interim regulations were subject to a SEPA analysis and Determination of Non-Significance in 2021. The interim regulations expired in November 2022.

Current Proposal

The current proposal originated with a request by Councilmember Strauss to evaluate and propose code amendments to achieve permanent home occupation regulations similar to the interim regulations. The intent is to create flexibility on a permanent basis for Seattle residents to operate businesses, referred to as home occupations in the Code, as an accessory use at their residence. The current proposal retains most of the flexibility enacted in Spring 2021 by Ordinance 126293, intended in part, as a response to COVID-19. The current proposal also makes a few other adjustments to the provisions to similarly achieve flexibility. Home occupation provisions are in Section 23.42.050 of the Land Use Code. The proposal would fulfill this intent through a limited number of clarifying adjustments to code language.

~~include:~~

Proposed amendments to Section 23.42.050 include:

1. Eliminate the requirement that customer visits are by appointment only;
2. Eliminate restrictions on the visibility of the home occupation from the exterior of a structure and allow interior and exterior alterations of structures that would accommodate home occupations so long as development standards are met;
3. Allow home occupations to be conducted in outdoor areas, while retaining provisions that prohibit spillover impacts such as noise, odor, dust, light and glare.
4. Eliminate a limit of two employees who are not residents;
5. Allow for increases in on-street parking congestion or traffic in the vicinity related to home occupation uses, except for automotive retail sales and services uses;
6. Clarify that a home occupation-related vehicle may park anywhere that parking is permitted on the lot, including required parking spaces;
7. Prohibit a home occupation from being a drive-in business;
8. Increase the limit of home-occupation-related vehicles that operate at the home occupation site from 2 to 6;
9. Clarify that the limit of number of vehicles associated with a home occupation refers to the number of vehicles operating at the home occupation site and not to other vehicles that are not at the site;
10. Eliminate a limit on the number of daily deliveries allowed to a site. The current limit is one per weekday and zero on weekends and holidays.

Proposed amendments to sign regulations in Chapter 23.55 include:

11. Allow one sign up to 5 square feet (720 square inches) bearing the name of the home occupation, an increase from the prior limit of 64 square inches.

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.

The ordinance is a non-project action that will affect home occupations in residential uses in all zones in the city, including residential uses permitted outright and as conditional uses.

Section B. Environmental Elements

For the sake of brevity, and due to the similarity of the current proposal to the prior interim home occupations code proposal, Section B of the environmental checklist for that prior proposal is incorporated by reference. Its content remains comparable to what would be written for this current proposal, except for the following disclosures made for certain new proposal items:

Earth, Water

Would the proposal's elements result in an increased potential for adverse erosion or similar geologic hazard impacts, or adverse water-related impacts to future home occupations? No. The elements of the proposal described above are not expected to result in ~~different~~, greater adverse or significant adverse impacts of these kinds. To the extent that the proposal could lead to more home occupation uses conducting activities outdoors on their property, or receiving more deliveries or accommodating operation of more vehicles on the site on a daily basis, such activities could lead to additional depositing of debris or contaminants from oil leaks from vehicles. Such contaminants could be sent into stormwater runoff and add to overall pollutant loading in downstream locations. These added home occupation activities would not be likely to occur on all or even a majority of home occupation sites. See data in the Director's Report. Their incidence within the city would likely be scattered due to the wide geographic range of places where home occupations would be possible to occur. The nature of the added changes in this proposal do not suggest a particular physical implication that would affect earth or water resources in a probable substantive or significant adverse manner.

Energy, Natural Resources, Environmental Health, Utilities

Proposed provisions relating to larger signs, customer visits without appointments, and removing a limit on employee count would not result in probable adverse impact differences in relation to energy consumption, protection of natural resources, or in inducing greater use of hazardous materials or creating additional hazards at home occupations. While additional employees at a home occupation site could cause increases in total energy consumption, it is unlikely that the increases in energy use would be large in magnitude of change or would exceed a local energy system's ability to provide such energy. Also, simply adding employees to a home occupation would not necessarily increase energy consumption if, for example, the use's activity is a low-intensity activity such as using computers occurring in the same space that a smaller number of employees would use. This outlook would also apply to other typical utilities – water, sewer – provided at sites that might be engaged in home occupations. Accommodating more deliveries to a site, and potentially more operation of vehicles for a home occupation at a given site would incrementally increase the potential total energy consumption of fossil fuels. But such differences would be negligible in the context of energy consumption by all residents and daily users of properties within the city.

Land Use

The proposal would address home occupation uses that could occur within most zoning categories across the city. These areas are all designated as Urban land. It would not particularly affect farmlands or forest lands due to their scarcity in Seattle. The added components in this proposal would not be likely to increase the rate or attractiveness for buildings to be demolished or to displace individuals' residences because of a home occupation. A home occupation could be possible to occur in a Shoreline designated area; if so, it could be subject to additional shoreline-related code provisions that might have a bearing on how such an occupation could occur on a given property. Parts of this proposal would increase the flexibility to conduct home occupation uses, such as in outdoor places and with more associated vehicle movements. However, prohibitions against spillover impacts such as noise would remain in effect. See the evaluation in Section D of this checklist for more land use-related discussion.

Transportation

The non-project proposal includes amendments that would allow more employee vehicle trips, more delivery trips, more occupation-related-vehicle trips, and more customer vehicle trips. It would also limit narrow project-related parking and traffic impact interests to only those generated by automobile sales and service home occupation uses. For non-automobile-sales-and-service-related home occupations that could attract regular customer activity, these provisions could lead to higher transportation activity levels. Occupations (other than child care uses that are already allowed to have bigger operations) could have more employees, and attract more activity on adjacent streets and on property frontages through more customer visits. Potentially adverse differences in availability of parking and generation of localized traffic congestion could occur.

These could lead to an additional increment of street traffic, on-street and off-street parking volumes, and increased congestion across a wide variety of local and arterial streets. It is not possible to narrowly identify which specific parts of the transportation network might be tangibly impacted by this non-project proposal applicable throughout the city. Home occupations would likely continue to occur in a dispersed geographical pattern, with great variety in how many transportation trips any given home occupation might generate. It is likely that a great majority of home occupations would generate relatively low numbers of trips ranging from perhaps 2 to 20 vehicle trips per day; and could include home occupations generating a regular flow of greater than 20 customer vehicle trips over the course of a day; and could include occasional instances of popular home occupations that could generate higher levels of visitation either temporarily or over sustained periods of time. Although these varying levels of additional home occupation related trips could generate adverse congestion on local streets, it is unlikely that any particular street improvement needs would occur as a direct result. This relates to a probable temporary and highly variable demand generation for any given home occupation use over the long-term. Street improvement projects tend to be diagnosed, planned, and funded on the basis of long-term needs and demonstrable patterns of traffic volumes and circulation. It is unlikely that the effects of any given home occupation use or combination of nearby home occupation uses would necessitate lane expansion or turning lane or signalization improvement needs. This is interpreted based on the responsible official's knowledge of traffic impact analysis and City transportation planning practices.

See Section D of this checklist for additional discussion of transportation-related impacts from this non-project proposal.

C. Signature [\[HELP\]](#)

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: _____ /s/_____
Name of signee Mike Podowski
Position and Agency/Organization Manager, SDCI
Date Submitted: September 19, 2022 (Ver. 7, last annotated Nov. 18, 2022)

Section D. Supplemental sheet for nonproject actions

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

~~Removing date limitations from the existing code, clarifying limits on vehicles' use at the site, and changing the sign size limit to allow a 5 square foot sign~~ The contents of the proposal would not generate meaningful adverse impact differences in future outcomes related to environmental elements of water, air, noise, or in relation to toxic or hazardous substances.

A number of the proposal's elements related to customer visits, vehicle use, and number of deliveries could conceivably increase volumes of customer visits and accommodate more total volumes of vehicle trips to and from a home occupation site. Also, accommodating home occupation uses in outdoor locations to a greater degree could increase the potential for depositing of oils or other debris in places where stormwater runoff could wash it off the site. Because automobile trips can lead to added increments of pollutant emissions onto surfaces (rubber, oil deposits on roads) and into the air (exhaust, dust), and additional instances of noise generation, the proposal could generate adverse impacts upon stormwater runoff into natural systems, additional emissions that could degrade local air quality, and additions to local noise levels.

No additional environmental impact implications are identified for the conversion of the interim regulations to permanent regulations; these were previously discussed in the 2021 SEPA analysis. Aspects of the code such as ~~23.42.050.K~~ spillover impact prohibitions would continue to not allow noise, odor, smoke, dust, light and glare, and electrical interference and other similar impacts to be detectable by sensory perception at or beyond the property line of the lot where the home occupation is located.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are:

None proposed.

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

~~Removing date limitations from the existing code, clarifying limits on vehicles' use at the site, and changing the sign size limit from square inches to the equivalent in square feet~~ The contents of the proposal would not generate differences in future outcomes related to environmental elements of plants, animals, fish, or marine life. Aspects such as those described above would tend to contribute to a minimal potential to disturb these environmental resources.

Related to the disclosure of potential adverse impacts to water and air and noise due to elements of the proposal, the additional pollutants generated could contribute to degradation of quality of plant, animal, and fisheries habitats in nearby and downstream areas. Assuming a probable “slight” magnitude of difference as a result of future home occupations dispersed in many places across the city, the probable magnitude of adverse impacts of these kinds on these habitats would be minor. This also partly relates to the likelihood that a great majority of home occupations, due to their being conducted within structures, would not generate meaningful potential for added pollution or disturbance in outdoor areas.

No additional environmental impact implications are identified for the conversion of the interim regulations to permanent regulations; these were previously discussed in the 2021 SEPA analysis.

Proposed measures to protect or conserve plants, animals, fish, or marine life are:
None proposed.

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

~~Removing date limitations from the existing code, clarifying limits on vehicles’ use at the site, and changing the sign size limit from square inches to the equivalent in square feet~~ The contents of the proposal would not generate differences in future outcomes related to environmental elements of energy or natural resources.

Please see the response in Section B of this checklist for discussion of the potential for different, incremental impacts to be generated by certain elements of the proposal, including those that would accommodate more on-site employees, more deliveries, and potentially more customer visits.

No additional environmental impact implications are identified for the conversion of the interim regulations to permanent regulations; these were previously discussed in the 2021 SEPA analysis.

Proposed measures to protect or conserve energy and natural resources are:
None proposed.

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

~~Removing date limitations from the existing code, clarifying limits on vehicles’ use at the site, and changing the sign size limit from square inches to the equivalent in square feet~~ The contents of the proposal would not likely generate differences in future outcomes related to these environmental elements.

To the extent that wetlands, floodplains, and habitats for fish are present in Seattle, elements of the proposal that would contribute incrementally to pollutant deposits in water and air would contribute slightly to potential adverse impacts of this kind. See also the responses to Questions D.1 and D.2 above. However, most of the resources asked about in this question (such as wild and scenic rivers, wilderness, and farmlands) are not present in Seattle.

No additional environmental impact implications are identified ~~for~~ due to the contents of the proposal conversion of the interim regulations to permanent regulations; these were previously discussed in the 2021 SEPA analysis. Such resources are relatively scarce in Seattle, but also the range of effects of the proposal over the long term, due to their minimal potential for causing damage in off-site locations, are not likely to significantly harm or damage features such as wetlands, floodplains or habitats.

With respect to historic or cultural sites, the ordinance would not increase the likelihood that existing historic buildings or cultural sites would be physically affected. Rather, decisions about proposals for historic buildings or cultural resource sites would continue to be made by the DON Director or boards tasked with reviewing and recommending actions on permit proposals. This includes potential for new uses within or adjacent to an existing historic building or cultural resource site, where impacts would be in the purview of the DON Director, boards and City permit reviewers to evaluate and decide if mitigating actions would be needed. It is also worth noting that the ordinance does not alter provisions for historic special review districts.

Proposed measures to protect such resources or to avoid or reduce impacts are:
None proposed.

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

The proposed ordinance is not likely to generate significant adverse impacts on land use and shoreline use patterns or result in probable significant land use incompatibilities, directly, indirectly, or cumulatively. ~~Regarding new specific changes in the current proposal: removing date limitations from the existing code, clarifying limits on vehicles' use at the site without increasing that limit, and changing the sign size limit from square inches to the equivalent in square feet~~ The contents of the proposal would not likely generate adverse differences in future outcomes related to the land use built environment.

The current proposal would make permanent many of the home occupation provisions that were interim standards. Doing this would continue an approach that has somewhat fewer limitations on how home occupations may be conducted on a site. This to some degree gives flexibility in operational aspects of the home occupation uses, compared to the standards in place prior to the interim provisions. This includes factors such as a higher number of employees that may be present at the site, maintaining the ability to make building alterations related to the home occupation, allowing outdoor operations, and a narrowing of parking and traffic impact generation interests to only automobile sales and service home occupation uses. In terms of land use restrictions, maintaining the interim standards as permanent standards would also prohibit home occupation uses from being drive-in businesses.

Compared to the capabilities in the interim home occupation provisions, no new levels of potential adverse land use-related impacts are identified. Aspects such as retaining the provisions of subsection 23.42.050.K that prevent spillover noise, odor, smoke, dust, light and glare impacts also would ~~contribute to limiting~~ continue to limit the potential for significant adverse impacts due to home occupation land uses over the long-term. ~~Also, the proposal retains provisions~~

~~indicating that interim uses that may have varied from development standards during the interim code's term do not establish a non-conformity that can be continued into the future; development standards applicable to the home-occupation use will apply going forward.~~

Compared to the home occupation provisions *preceding* the interim provisions, there are ~~three~~ a few differences that could lead to incrementally different activity levels under the proposal: 1) allowing customer visits without appointments; 2) allowing more than two employees on a home occupation site (except child care uses that already can have more); 3) allowing more deliveries to a home occupation, 4) raising limits on number of vehicles that can be used on the site, 5) allowing home occupation activities in outdoor locations to a greater degree, and 6) a narrowing of parking and traffic impact generation interests to only automobile sales and service home occupation uses. For non-automobile-sales-and-service-related home occupations that attract regular customer activity, these provisions could lead to higher activity levels on and near properties with home occupations. Occupations (other than child care uses that are already allowed to have bigger operations) could have more employees, and attract more activity on adjacent streets and on property frontages through more customer visits and more deliveries. Potentially adverse differences in availability of parking and generation of localized traffic congestion could occur. Allowing home occupation uses to occur outdoors to a greater degree could mean that certain activities in some cases would be more visible to neighboring properties, and with an associated potential for increased exposure of neighboring properties to noise levels or odors that might lead to complaints about spillover impacts. However, disturbances related to factors like noise and odor impacts would continue to be restricted by existing code provisions that would be continued in the current proposal. ~~proposed provisions.~~ These ~~nuisance~~ provisions would continue to apply to activities occurring such as customer visits, and disturbances of this kind would be subject to enforcement.

Given all of the factors described above, the overall worst-case potential land use compatibility impacts of the proposal are interpreted to be adverse but not significant adverse in magnitude. A wide variety of home occupation uses would be possible, and for some that could experience a high level of popularity, a high level of visitation could occur either temporarily or over sustained periods of time. These could lead to intermittent generation of effects such as excessive noise and related complaints made by nearby residents, which could generate a need for warnings or other enforcement actions to address or cease the impact-generating activities, and discourage future impacting events. Factors that suggest these impacts would not be significant adverse impacts in nature include:

- A large majority of home occupation uses do not generate excessive customer visits or spillover effects in streets or onto nearby properties;
- Retaining the current provisions that prohibit spillover effects of home occupations from occurring at property lines;
- The ability to continue to enforce street control rules that would prevent unlawful actions like blocking public streets with parked vehicles; and
- The responsibility for City staff to enforce the home occupation provisions on a case-by-case basis according to the particular facts in a given situation.

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

None proposed.

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

The proposed ordinance is not likely to generate significant adverse impacts on transportation, parking, public services or utilities elements of the environment, directly, indirectly, or cumulatively. ~~Regarding certain specific changes in the proposal: removing date limitations from the existing code, clarifying limits on home occupation related operations vehicles' use at the site without increasing that limit, clarifying on-site parking capabilities in required parking spaces, and increasing the sign size limit to 5 square feet would not generate adverse differences in future outcomes related to these elements of the environment. See discussion below for additional analysis of other details of the proposal.~~

Transportation and Parking

The current proposal would make permanent a number of home occupation provisions that were interim standards. Doing this would continue an approach that has fewer limitations on how home occupations may be conducted on a site. This includes factors such as allowing a greater number of employees to be present at the site, allowing customer visits without appointments, and accommodating additive levels of home-occupation-related parking and traffic congestion on nearby streets except for those generated by automobile sales and service uses. Compared to likely outcomes under the *interim* regulations, because these capabilities would be the same, no new levels of potential significant adverse transportation-, parking-, public services-, or utilities-related impacts are identified.

However, compared to the home occupation provisions that existed prior to the interim ordinance, the proposal would result in a probable net difference in generation of adverse transportation and parking impacts. As noted in written responses to topics in Section B earlier in this checklist:

The non-project proposal includes amendments that would accommodate more employee vehicle trips, more delivery trips, more occupation-related-vehicle trips, and more customer vehicle trips. It would also narrow project-related parking and traffic impact interests to only those generated by automobile sales and service home occupation uses. For non-automobile-sales-and-service-related home occupations that could attract regular customer activity, these provisions could lead to higher activity levels. Occupations (other than child care uses that are already allowed to have bigger operations) could have more employees, and attract more activity on adjacent streets and on property frontages through more customer visits. Potentially adverse differences in availability of parking and generation of localized traffic congestion could occur.

These could lead to an additional increment of street traffic, parking volumes, and increased congestion across a wide variety of local and arterial streets. It is not possible to narrowly identify which specific parts of the transportation network might be tangibly impacted by this non-project proposal applicable throughout the city. Home occupations would likely continue to occur in a widely dispersed geographical pattern, with great variety in how many transportation trips any given home occupation might generate. It is likely that a great majority of home occupations would generate relatively low numbers of trips ranging from perhaps 2 to 20 vehicle trips per day; and could include home occupations generating a regular flow of greater than 20 customer vehicle trips over the course of a day; and could include occasional instances of popular home occupations that could generate higher levels of visitation either temporarily or over sustained periods of

time. Although these varying levels of additional home occupation related trips could generate adverse congestion on local streets, it is unlikely that any particular street improvement needs would occur as a direct result. This relates to a probable temporary and highly variable demand generation for any given home occupation use over the long-term. Street improvement projects tend to be diagnosed, planned, and funded on the basis of long-term needs and demonstrable patterns of traffic volumes and circulation. It is unlikely that the effects of any given home occupation use or combination of nearby home occupation uses would necessitate lane expansion or turning lane or signalization improvement needs. This is interpreted based on the responsible official's knowledge of traffic impact analysis and City transportation planning practices.

Parking utilization in the wide variety of streets potentially affected by home occupation uses varies widely, ranging from local streets with low-to-moderate rates of available on-street parking use on a daily basis to other local or arterial streets where most on-street parking may be used a majority of the time. Existing residential uses contribute to a large increment of the existing on-street parking demand in any given area, particularly when residential households own and use multiple vehicles. Impacts on parking availability from any given future home occupation use could vary from occasional use of easily available spaces, to increasing competition among motorists for parking in places where most parking spaces are used. In the worst-case, home occupation uses that generate high volumes of daily customers for a sustained period of time would contribute incrementally to adverse increases in competition for on-street parking. Similarly, customer-related vehicle traffic or other vehicle trips related to home occupation uses could contribute to denser traffic flows and thus more congestion on streets, including non-arterial streets, which could lead to more frequent occasions of on-street traffic congestion and in the worst-case inappropriate actions such as double-parking or similar disruption of normal street traffic flows.

Public Services and Utilities

~~Proposed provisions relating to larger signs, customer visits without appointments, and deleting a limit on employee count would not~~ The contents of the proposal are not likely to result in probable adverse impact differences in relation to energy consumption. While additional employees at a home occupation site could cause increases in total energy consumption, it is unlikely that the increases in energy use would be large in magnitude of change or would exceed a local energy system's ability to provide such energy to the home occupation site. Also, simply adding employees to a home occupation would not necessarily increase energy consumption if, for example, the use's work activity is a low-intensity activity such as using computers occurring in the same space that a smaller number of employees would use. This outlook would also apply to other typical utilities – water, sewer – provided at sites that might be engaged in home occupations.

With additional activity levels possible at certain home occupations due to customer visits, outdoor activities, and numbers of employees, there is a chance that public disturbance and nuisance-related situations could arise at properties with home occupations, and/or due to traffic or parking congestion situations if they would disrupt local street use and accessibility. If this occurs, it could result in an additional increment of demand for police and fire/emergency services if a greater number of service calls would occur (Sano, Seattle Police Department, 2022). While this could generate adverse impacts upon these service providers, due to a relatively low probability of sustained activity over time these incidental possible increases in

service demand would not likely generate significant adverse impacts upon police and fire/emergency service providers in terms of staffing or equipment needs or related costs.

Proposed measures to reduce or respond to such demand(s) are:

None proposed.

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

No conflicts with environmental protection laws are anticipated.