

- f. How many vehicular trips per day would be generated by the completed project? If known, indicate when peak volumes would occur.

It is anticipated that 5-10 vehicle trips per day would be generated by the WWTP. This is approximately the number that occurs now with the existing WWTP.

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

Does not apply.

15. **Public Services**

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

No.

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

None.

16. **Utilities**

- a. Circle utilities currently available at the site: electricity, natural gas, water, refuse service, telephone, sanitary sewer, septic system, other.

- 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.

Improvements to the wastewater treatment plant will require all the utilities that currently serve the site. Water and sewer will be provided by the City of Woodland, telephone by GTE Northwest, electricity by Cowlitz County PUD No. 1, and refuse service by Ted's Sanitary.

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT

EVALUATION FOR
AGENCY USE ONLY

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: Robert Alan Paul
Date Submitted: 3/15/99

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT

D. SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT
ACTIONS

(Do not use this sheet for project actions.)

Because these questions are very general, it may be helpful to read them in conjunction with the list of the elements of the environment.

When answering these questions, be aware of the extent the proposal, or the types of activities likely to result from the proposal, would affect the item at a greater intensity or at a faster rate than if the proposal were not implemented. Respond briefly and in general terms.

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?
 - **Proposal will increase WWTP capacity to allow for growth and thereby increase treated discharge to water.**
 - **Emission to air will be reduced.**
 - **Chlorine will not be used, therefore, it will not be stored and there will no discharge to the river.**
 - **Noise may be increased because of aeration equipment.**

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are:

- **The increase of discharge has been carefully evaluated and will not cause any violation in Water Quality Standards.**
- **Emissions reduced because of higher level of treatment.**
- **Chlorine will be replaced with UV disinfection.**
- **Noise will be controlled via use of silencers and housing equipment inside building.**

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT

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

No impact anticipated.

Proposed measures to protect or conserve plants, animals, fish, or marine life are:

None.

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

No impact anticipated.

Proposed measures to protect or conserve energy and natural resources are:

None.

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?

No use or impact anticipated.

Proposed measures to protect such resources or to avoid or reduce impacts are:

None.

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?

No impact anticipated.

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT

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

None.

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

No impact anticipated.

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

None.

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.

WASHINGTON STATE WATER POLLUTION CONTROL REVOLVING FUND (SRF) ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

I. INTRODUCTION AND INSTRUCTIONS (PLEASE READ CAREFULLY)

All projects which receive financial assistance from the State Water Pollution Control Revolving Loan Fund (SRF) program must meet the provisions of the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) rules (Chapter 197-11 WAC) and the SRF State Environmental Review Process (WAC 173-98-100). The State Environmental Review Process (SERP) is established to ensure that environmentally sound alternatives are selected and to satisfy the state's responsibility to help ensure that recipients comply with the National Environmental Policy Act and other applicable environmental laws, regulations, and executive orders.

If no environmental documentation has been prepared for your proposal:

1. Complete this checklist;
2. Complete the accompanying SEPA checklist; and
3. Submit them with your application.

The staff of the Department of Ecology will use the checklists and detailed information contained in the facilities plan to help you determine the environmental impacts of your proposal and the appropriate threshold determination.

If you have completed the SEPA process:

1. Complete this checklist;
2. Attach it to your SEPA documentation; and
3. Submit it with your application.

The staff of the Department of Ecology will use the checklists and detailed information contained in the facilities plan to determine if your proposal is in compliance with the SERP process.

Additional information concerning the entire SERP process is contained in SRF program regulations (Chapter 173-98 WAC), the SRF program guidelines, and Appendix I of the SRF program guidelines.

The environmental checklist asks you to provide specific information about your proposal. Answer the questions accurately and carefully with the most precise information known, or give the best description you can. Environmental issues must be resolved before the facilities plan can be approved. If a question does not apply to your proposal, write "does not apply". Complete answers to the questions now may avoid unnecessary delays later.

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.

If you have problems completing this checklist, staff from the Water Quality Financial Assistance Program can assist you.

II. BACKGROUND

A. Name of proposed project:

City of Woodland General Sewer Plan/Facility Plan

B. Name of applicant: **City of Woodland**

C. Contact Person: **Rob VanderZanden**

Affiliation: **City of Woodland Public Works Director**

Address: **230 Davidson Avenue
P.O. Box 9
Woodland, WA 98674**

Phone Number: **(360) 225-7999**

D. Name of person completing checklist: **Gibbs & Olson, Inc.**

Affiliation: **City of Woodland's Consulting Engineer**

Address: **1405 - 17th Avenue, Suite 300
P.O. Box 400
Longview, WA 98632**

Phone Number: **(360) 425-0991**

E. Date checklist prepared: **March 5, 1999**

F. Describe the purpose and need for the proposal.

This project recommends improvements to the City of Woodland's WWTP that will provide increased wastewater treatment capability to meet current treatment and water quality standards, provide additional treatment flexibility and reliability for the City of Woodland WWTP. The recommended improvements will be completed in two phases to provide the estimated capacity required for the planning period. The City of Woodland General Sewer Plan/Facility Plan is necessary to provide the planning needed to lift the City's moratorium on sewer hook-ups imposed by DOE in 1998 due to WWTP capacity issues.