ESA

5309 Shilshole Avenue NW
Suite 200
Seattle, WA 98107
206.789.9658 phone
206.789.9684 fax

www.esassoc.com

memorandum

date July 2, 2015

to Jared Bond, City of Lynnwood

from Aaron Booy and Adam Merrill

subject Critical Areas Ordinance Update - Gap Analysis and Best Available Science Consistency Review

The City of Lynnwood (City) is in the process of updating its Critical Areas Ordinance (CAO, Lynnwood Municipal Code [LMC] Chapter 17.10) in accordance with the requirements of the Growth Management Act (GMA) (RCW 36.70A). ESA is pleased to be assisting the City with that process. The GMA requires cities to consider best available science (BAS) in the development of critical areas policies and regulations. In 2005, the City reviewed the best available science and conducted a major update of its CAO to comply with the GMA. The City expects the current CAO update to be relatively limited in scope.

ESA reviewed the City's CAO for consistency with the current scientific literature and applicable agency guidance now available. HWA Geosciences reviewed the Geologically Hazardous Areas regulations (LMC 17.10.090 through 17.10.094) as a subconsultant to ESA.

In general, the latest documents in the record pertaining to these critical areas have been prepared by state agencies as guidance to local governments. The ESA team also reviewed recently updated critical area codes from other neighboring jurisdictions and recommended changes that would help Lynnwood achieve greater consistency with current standards and practices. Our recommendations also reflect our professional judgment and experience assisting numerous cities and counties with code interpretation and administration.

Gap Analysis and Consistency Review Methods

ESA conducted a review of the current CAO sections for the purposes of identifying areas of inconsistency with agency guidance and best available science. To organize our review and recommendations, we developed a matrix (attached to this memo) documenting consistency between CAO provisions and GMA regulations, relevant agency guidance and best available science published since 2005. The gap analysis matrix provides an assessment of general consistency, a suggested or recommended change to the CAO, and the corresponding rationale and source for each recommendation. When the matrix states that the CAO is "inconsistent with BAS", this means that the code provision does not, in our opinion, meet or is not supported by best available science or state agency guidance. When the matrix states that the CAO is "could be revised to be more consistent," this means that portion(s) of the code provision are supported by best available

science or state agency guidance, but could be strengthened to be fully compliant. Oftentimes, there are several options open to the City to revise the code language or standards to achieve compliance with the science.

We also provide recommendations that are better described as changes to "improve clarity" or "improve internal consistency;" these address provisions that are could be confusing or difficult to administer due to a lack of clarity or readability. Lastly, several recommendations are in response to the City staff list of code provisions that are lacking, unclear, or incorrect and need to be addressed during CAO update.

Overall Code Structure and Content

In general, the Lynnwood CAO is reasonably clear and has a comparable structure with state guidelines. As detailed in the attached matrix, to comply with the GMA the updated CAO must include designation and protection provisions for two additional critical areas: critical aquifer recharge areas and frequently flooded areas. The wetlands, fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas, and geologically hazardous areas regulations, as well as several of the administrative procedures sections, need to be updated in a few key areas to improve their consistency with BAS and current agency guidelines.

Updates to Scientific Literature

The following sections summarize new scientific literature and regional policy concerning critical areas protection and management and are intended to inform the specific recommendations for code updates in the attached matrix.

Wetlands

Wetlands are specifically identified for protection as a critical area by the GMA (WAC 365-190-080[3]). The current CAO provides standards for protection of wetlands beginning at LMC 17.10.050. In general, the latest documents in the record pertaining to wetlands have been prepared by state and federal agencies. Since the City's last major CAO update, new scientific findings have been published describing methods for assessing wetlands on a watershed-based and landscape-scale, alternative mitigation strategies (mitigation banking and in-lieu fee programs), improving the success of compensatory mitigation, and buffer effectiveness. For example, the Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology) and Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) released a two-volume BAS document that is still the primary source of new information for wetland management: Wetlands in Washington State – Vol. 1 A Synthesis of the Science (Sheldon et al. 2005) and Vol. 2 Guidance for Protecting and Managing Wetlands (Granger et al. 2005).

<u>Wetland Model Code</u>: The wetland model code found in the Critical Areas Assistance Handbook: Protecting Critical Areas Within the Framework of the Washington Growth Management Act (CTED, 2007) was updated in 2012 and can be found in Wetlands and CAO Updates: Guidance for Small Cities, Western Washington Version (Bunten et al., 2012). This model code offers example language that reflects many of the updates to BAS described in this section.

Wetland Delineation and Rating: In 2010, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers released the Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Western Mountains, Valleys, and Coasts (Corps, 2010). The regional supplement updates portions of the 1987 Corps' Wetland Delineation Manual and provides additional technical guidance and updated procedures for identifying and delineating wetlands. State law requiring the Washington State Wetlands Identification and Delineation Manual (Ecology, 1997) was repealed in 2011, and the state manual is no longer required or supported by Ecology. The Regional Supplement is now required by state law (WAC 173-22-035).

Ecology released an update to their wetland rating system, the Washington State Wetland Rating System for Western Washington: 2014 Update (Hruby, 2014), that went into effect January 2015. Most of the material in the 2014 updated manual remains the same as that in the 2004 manual. The updated wetland rating manual includes a new scoring range (i.e., between 9 and 27 under the updated manual versus 1 to 100 in the 2004 manual) that is based on a qualitative scale of functions from high, medium, or low. The new approach to scoring wetland functions on a high, medium, or low scale is more scientifically supportable (Hruby, 2014). The 2014 updated manual also includes new sections for assessing a wetland's potential to provide functions and values on a landscape-scale.

Alternative Mitigation: One of the most significant changes in BAS since Lynnwood's last code update involves alternative mitigation strategies. According to the National Research Council, compensatory mitigation implemented in the past, particularly on-site mitigation installed by the permittee, has frequently been unsuccessful and has not achieved the national policy of "no net loss" of wetland area and functions (NRC, 2001). Traditionally, permit applicants have constructed mitigation projects to compensate for effects to aquatic resources (e.g., wetlands, streams) with limited oversight and enforcement of mitigation requirements. This type of mitigation is referred to as "permittee-responsible" mitigation. Additionally, alternative forms of mitigation, such as mitigation banks and in-lieu fee (ILF) programs, and advance mitigation were not established uniformly across the country, or within individual states, and there were numerous cases where alternative mitigation programs were operated unsuccessfully.

To address these mitigation deficiencies, in early 2008 the US Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) and Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) released revised regulations governing compensatory mitigation for authorized impacts to waters of the US, including wetlands. The Federal Rule, formally known as the Compensatory Mitigation for losses of Aquatic Resources; Final Rule, lays out criteria and performance standards designed to improve the success and quality of mitigation activities (Corps, 2008).

The Federal Rule emphasizes a watershed approach to mitigation as part of the planning, implementation, and management of mitigation projects. A watershed approach is an analytical process for making compensatory mitigation decisions that support the sustainability or improvement of aquatic resources in a watershed; it involves consideration of watershed needs, and how locations and types of compensatory mitigation projects address those needs.

Alternatives to permittee-responsible mitigation are increasingly implemented within Washington State and around the country to compensate for authorized effects to aquatic resources. Common forms of alternative mitigation include:

- Mitigation Banks— restoring, establishing, enhancing, and/or preserving aquatic resources through funds paid to a public or private Sponsor to satisfy compensatory mitigation requirements for Corps permits. At banks, the Sponsor has already secured a mitigation site and initiated mitigation activities before fees are accepted. Typically, mitigation banks exist at one location and the Corps does not have authority over bank expenditures.
- In-Lieu Fee (ILF) Programs—restoring, establishing, enhancing, and/or preserving aquatic resources through funds paid to a governmental or non-profit natural resources management entity to satisfy compensatory mitigation requirements for Corps permits. In-lieu fee programs accept mitigation fees before securing and implementing projects. These programs implement mitigation at multiple sites as funds become available and after the Corps approves project funding.
- Consolidated Off-site Mitigation— restoring, establishing, enhancing, and/or preserving aquatic resources through funds paid to a public or private entity Sponsor. Mitigation typically occurs at a single location in a phased approach; as compensatory mitigation fees are paid to the public or private entity by permit applicants, portions of the mitigation site are constructed.
- Advance Mitigation— restoring, establishing, enhancing, and/or preserving of aquatic resources, undertaken by public or private permit applicants in advance of permitted impacts. This type of mitigation is considered permittee-responsible compensatory mitigation because only the permit applicant who implements the advance mitigation may use it to satisfy their compensatory mitigation obligations.

Alternative forms of mitigation do not change the requirements for permit applicants to adhere to "mitigation sequencing" required by regulatory agencies. These are step-wise requirements under federal and state laws that mandate permit applicants to demonstrate that avoidance and minimization measures have been taken before the remaining aquatic resource effects are determined unavoidable. Avoidance and minimization measures occur during project design and are intended to avoid and reduce a project's effects prior to construction. Once a determination is made that project effects are unavoidable, compensatory mitigation is required.

In the Federal Rule, the Corps outlined a mitigation hierarchy, preferring mitigation banks over ILF programs and ILF programs over permittee-responsible mitigation.

<u>Compensatory Mitigation:</u> Where compensatory mitigation (permittee-responsible) is the best option for mitigating wetland impacts, recent guidance has been developed to improve mitigation success. Ecology, in coordination with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), developed a two-part guidance document intended to improve the quality, consistency, and effectiveness of compensatory mitigation in Washington State.

Part 1 of the document, Wetland Mitigation in Washington State—Part 1: Agency Policies and Guidance (Ecology Publication #06-06-011a, March 2006a), provides regulatory background and outlines information that regulatory agencies use. Some of this information has been superseded by recent guidance discussed in the Alternative Mitigation section; however, wetland mitigation ratios listed in this document are the basis for many local jurisdictions' mitigation requirements. Part 2 of the document, Wetland Mitigation in Washington State—Part 2: Developing Mitigation Plans (Ecology Publication #06-06-011b, March 2006b) provides specific technical guidance on developing a compensatory wetland mitigation plan.

As an alternative to using mitigation ratios, the Ecology developed Calculating Credits and Debits for Compensatory Mitigation in Wetlands of Western Washington (Hruby, 2012) for estimating whether a project's compensatory mitigation plan adequately replaces lost wetland functions and values . Termed the "Credit-Debit Method," this manual uses a functions and values-based approached to score functions lost at the project site (i.e., "Debits") compared to functions gained at a mitigation site (i.e., "Credits"). A mitigation project is considered successful when the "credit" score for a compensatory mitigation project is higher than the "debit" score. Based on our local experience, the Corps and Ecology are increasingly relying on the Credit-Debit Method instead of mitigation ratios alone.

Buffer Effectiveness: In 2005, the Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology) and Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) released Wetlands in Washington State – Vol. 1 A Synthesis of the Science (Sheldon et al. 2005) that synthesized literature related to wetland buffers and buffer effectiveness. In 2013, the Department of Ecology updated the 2005 synthesis with a literature review of scientific documents published between 2003 and 2012, titled Update on Wetland Buffers: The State of the Science, Final Report (Hruby, 2013).

The updated buffer synthesis confirmed that buffers perform an important water quality function by trapping pollutants before they reach a wetland. Generally, the wider the buffer, the more effective it may be at protecting water quality; however, recent research reveals that several other factors contribute to the effectiveness of water quality functions (e.g., slope, type of vegetation, surface roughness, soil properties, type and concentration of pollutants, etc.). Specifying only the width of a buffer as a means for protecting water quality functions can be complicated and may not address these other factors (Hruby, 2013). With respect to protecting habitat quality, research in the past decade reveals that larger buffers are needed to protect wetland-dependent species, which may require larger areas of relatively undisturbed uplands for survival (Hruby, 2013).

Ecology's recommended buffers in the model wetlands code (Table "XX.1") outlines a combined fixed-with and variable-width approach to wetland buffers, with a minimum buffer prescribed based on a wetland's category and an additional buffer based on increasing habitat points (Bunten et al., 2012; Table XX.1 revised December 2014). In highly developed communities, such as Lynnwood, standard buffer widths may be difficult to achieve. For reductions to a standard buffer width, an applicant should demonstrate that a smaller buffer will protect wetland functions and values, with additional mitigation measures applied where needed to support "no net loss" of those functions and values (Granger et al., 2005). Ecology's model code (Table XX.2) outlines required mitigation measures that can be used to protect wetlands (Bunten et al., 2012). The model code recommends that standard buffers should not be reduced below 25 percent of the standard buffer with (Bunten et al., 2012).

Streams, and Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitats

Fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas (FWHCA) are specifically identified for protection as a critical area by the Growth Management Act (WAC 365-190-080[3]). The current CAO provides standards for protection of streams (included in the GMA as a FWHCA) starting at LMC Section 17.10.060, and for "fish and wildlife priority habitats" starting at LMC Section 17.10.080.

The latest documents in the record pertaining to fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas have been prepared predominantly by state, federal, and tribal agencies. Much of this science is related to protecting

salmon and fisheries habitat. For example, in 2009, the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) published Land Use Planning for Salmon, Steelhead and Trout: A Land Use Planner's Guide to Salmonid Habitat Protection and Recovery as part of an initiative to integrate local planning programs with salmon recovery efforts (Knight, 2009). Other documents are related to managing biodiversity and habitat quality with urban development. In 2009, WDFW also published Landscape Planning for Washington's Wildlife: Managing for Biodiversity in Developing Areas, which provides guidance for wildlife issues related to rural and urban residential development.

Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas Model Code: The model code found in the Critical Areas Assistance Handbook: Protecting Critical Areas Within the Framework of the Washington Growth Management Act (CTED, 2007) is the most recent related to fish and wildlife habitat conservations areas; however, portions of Wetlands and CAO Updates: Guidance for Small Cities, Western Washington Version (Bunten et al., 2012) are applicable or were referenced for code consistency.

Buffer Effectiveness: When discussing BAS for buffers and buffer effectiveness for fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas, one must distinguish between stream/riparian buffers (those areas providing functions related to fish habitat and stream processes) and habitat buffers (areas including riparian buffers and the terrestrial areas adjacent to them which provide wildlife functions for a variety of species). Recommendations for stream buffers have remained relatively similar since the City's last CAO update, with recommended buffer widths varying from 75 feet to well over 300 feet to protect a suite of ecological functions (Brennan et al., 2009; May, 2003; Knutson and Naef, 1997).

Much of the recent scientific research regarding buffer effectiveness and habitat quality is related specifically to wetlands and wetland-dependent species, and is summarized in Update on Wetland Buffers: The State of the Science, Final Report (Hruby, 2013). Although this synthesis of the science is directly related to wetlands and wetland-dependent species, these species may also use riparian buffers for travel or life processes.

Research indicates that uplands surrounding wetlands and streams can serve as critical habitat for some species, a concept that expands the notion of a buffer beyond simply protecting wetland and riparian functions to protecting aquatic-dependent species (Hruby, 2013; Semlitsch and Jensen, 2001). Several literature sources have suggested that these terrestrial areas adjacent to wetlands and streams be termed "core habitat." Studies on wetland-dependent species report that core habitat needs to extend between 1,000 feet to 0.6 mile from the wetland edge to be effective in supporting population survival; however, there is little information on how much connectivity is needed between a critical area and core habitat (Hruby, 2013). Research indicates that stream/riparian buffers alone will not be enough to protect certain species and that a broader approach to protecting wildlife is needed, especially in areas that are intensely developed (Hruby, 2013; Semlitsch and Jensen, 2001).

Research related to general wildlife habitat connectivity, however, indicates that connectivity is important for species to travel and carry out life processes. Small mammals, amphibians, and reptiles are generally more sensitive to changes and gaps in connectivity compared to larger mammals and birds (WDFW, 2009). Areas with less than 50 percent undisturbed land cover (i.e., developed urban environments) need assistance to ensure that habitat connectivity is maintained (WDFW, 2009). In addition to using local critical areas inventory information and Priority Habitats and Species (PHS) data, WDFW recommends protecting large undeveloped habitat patches and open space areas as part of planning and building habitat corridors (WDFW,

2009). Habitat corridor widths greater than 1,000 feet generally provide the most benefit for the most species (WDFW, 2009).

In general, the standards related to wetland buffer reductions and averaging discussed earlier are deemed to be applicable to fish and wildlife habitat conservation area buffers, although specific requirements and protections may be required for local, state, and federally listed species. The mitigation measures outlined in Ecology's model code (Table XX.2; Bunten et al., 2012) can also be used to minimize impacts to fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas. Low Impact Development (LID) strategies, which are mainly geared towards improving water quality and hydrology, can also have secondary benefits to wildlife (WDFW, 2009).

Frequently Flooded Areas

Frequently flooded areas are specifically identified for protection as a critical area by GMA (WAC 365-190-110). The current CAO does not identify or address frequently flooded areas as critical areas; however the City does have adopted flood hazard area regulations that meet minimum NFIP and Washington State criteria, adopted at LMC Chapter 16.46.

The existing adopted flood hazard area regulations focus chiefly from the perspective of flood effects on human health, safety, and property, and the effects of human activities on flooding. Floodplains perform a variety of beneficial functions including providing for natural flood and erosion control, water quality maintenance, groundwater recharge, biological productivity, fish and wildlife habitat (Steiger et al. 2005), production and of wild and cultivated products, recreational opportunities, and areas for scientific study and outdoor recreation (Kusler 2011). Floodplains typically contain several major types of habitats including aquatic, riparian, wetland, and upland habitat.

Recent BAS and regional guidance for protection of ecological functions within a floodplain emphasizes the importance of other critical areas (including wetlands, streams, riparian areas, and FWHCAs) within floodplains, and emphasizes the importance of protection of these critical areas (PSP 2010; NMFS 2009; Ecology 2015). Guidance highlights the importance of other critical areas provisions in ensuring that floodplain ecological functions are protected into the future. Due to a 2009 Biological Opinion by the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) regarding protection Endangered Species Act listed salmonid species from the effects of floodplain development activities, assessment of floodplain habitat impacts and new standards for protection are now required for NFIP participating communities (NMFS 2009; FEMA 2013).

Ecology has recently published *Guidance to Local Governments on Frequently Flooded Areas Updates in CAO's* that addresses the key elements of updating the frequently flooded areas provisions in a CAO Update (Ecology 2015). The guidance addresses relevant information sources and approaches to incorporating the protection of ecological functions into the CAO.

<u>Climate Change and Frequently Flooded Areas in Lynnwood</u>: A recent review of the effects of climate change (ISAB 2007) identifies one main probable consequence of global warming along the Pacific coast of North America especially relevant to Lynnwood: urban stormwater infrastructure - regional climate model simulations generally predict increases in extreme high precipitation over the next half-century; existing drainage infrastructure designed using mid-20th century rainfall records is anticipated to reach capacity and result in urban flooding more frequently (Rosenberg et al. 2009).

This suggests that hazards associated with urban flooding could increase in the decades ahead. Management of frequently flooded areas provides an opportunity for the City to anticipate increased flood hazards related to climate change and provide standards to further minimize future risks.

Geologically Hazardous Areas

Geologically hazardous areas are specifically identified as a critical area by GMA (WAC 365-190-120). The current CAO provides criteria for identifying geologically hazardous areas, including: naturally occurring slopes of 40 percent or more; and/or other areas which the city has reason to believe are geologically unstable due to factors such as landslide, seismic or erosion hazards. The current CAO provides standards for protection of safety of citizens from geologically hazardous areas starting from LMC Section 17.10.090, which includes standards for identification, setbacks, report requirements for geologic hazard areas, alteration allowances, and alteration conditions.

Recently, Snohomish County completed a criterial area review/update subsequent to the recent SR530/Oso landslide which included a BAS addendum that synthesized many of the recent reports prepared after the Oso event (Iverson et al. 2015). The intent was to ascertain whether or not the existing landslide hazard area definition should be modified or expanded based on the finding of these more recent scientific studies. The key difficulty however is that no two sites are the same and stability is controlled by many factors such as; surrounding land use, stratigraphy, soils or geology, topography or landforms, clearing and grading activities, surcharge loads, and total rainfall over a sustained period of time. The conclusion is that the landslide hazard area setbacks in the existing Snohomish County Code (SCC) and the International Building Code (IBC) are insufficient in some circumstances with an emphasis on run out length of slides. The slide run out aspects of landslides is described by the articles by Hungr, Iverson and McDougall, referenced below. In addition, the development of up to date maps using remote sensing laser scanning equipment referred to as Light Detection And Ranging or LIDAR is important tool needed to assist design professionals and the City to more rapidly and accurately assess landslide susceptibility.

Recent studies have determined that western Washington is generally at risk of strong ground motions resulting from movement along tectonic plates in Cascadia Subduction Zone (WDNR, 2012). Geologic studies have documented earthquakes with large magnitudes in the past, such as the estimated magnitude 9.0 earthquake that occurred about 300 years ago. This earthquake was located near the Washington coast and was relatively deep. In addition, smaller magnitude earthquakes along shallow fault systems such as the Seattle fault or South Whidbey Fault can cause just as strong ground motions because they are closer to the City and the ground surface.

Some land areas are more susceptible to earthquake damage due to local geologic conditions. Loose, saturated, granular (sandy) soils tend to experience the most severe ground shaking during an earthquake. When shaken these soils lose strength and will settle, spread or deform or flow like a liquid (liquefaction). The resulting loss of soil strength damages structures that had been supported by these soils. Soils with a potential susceptibility for liquefaction are typically located in low lying areas that contain fill, peat, alluvial or fluvial soils that are subject to shallow ground water conditions.

The definition for Seismic Hazard in the Lynnwood CAO would be more specific if the criteria includes" those areas mapped as moderate to high and high liquefaction susceptibility and peat deposits on the Liquefaction susceptibility Map of Snohomish County, Washington (WDNR, 2004).

Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas

Critical aquifer recharge areas (CARAs) are specifically identified for protection as a critical area by GMA (WAC 365-190-100). The current CAO does not identify or address CARAs as critical areas, despite the fact that CARAs mapped by Snohomish County extend into the northeastern portion of the City and associated urban growth areas.

Although the City's source of drinking water (the Spada Lake Reservoir) is located in eastern Snohomish County in the headwaters of the Sultan River watershed, the Alderwood Water and Wastewater District (AWWD) maintains and tests water quality at the 164th Street Artesian Well (also known as Well No. 5). This well has a recharge capture area that extends into the City of Lynnwood. Although it is no longer used as a source for the AWWD water distribution system it is maintained as an untreated water source for use by the public. The AWWD completed a Well Head Protection plan for Well No. 5 in 1997. The area of recharge for the well is shown the Snohomish County Aquifer Recharge/Well Head Protection Map in an area mapped having a low to moderate aquifer sensitivity.

Well No. 5 has provided consistently clean drinking water; however once ground water is contaminated it is difficult, costly, and sometimes impossible to clean up. Preventing contamination is necessary to maintain groundwater drinking supplies and to avoid extreme costs (or the loss of this resource) necessary if contamination were to occur (CTED, 2007). Depending upon which well head protection zone (zones the represent water travel toward the well over different periods of time such as 1 year, 5 year or 10 years, etc.) the proposed development resides, varying levels of protection and limitations of use are prescribed by the Washington State Department of Health.

The risk of ground water contamination depends on two main components. One set of conditions relates to the ground itself and how easy it is for water to pass through to ground water – this is the component that is identified through development of critical aquifer recharge area mapping. CARA mapping has been completed for the Lynnwood area by Snohomish County, and represent the areas where underlying soils and geologic conditions allow for groundwater recharge (and correspondingly have a higher chance for contamination).

The other component relates to how likely it is for potential contaminants to reach ground water. The amount of potential contaminant material, chemical composition, and how the material is handled all contribute to this component, and are the key area where CARA standards are necessary to ensure that the potential is minimized. CARA regulations to minimize the potential for aquifer contamination have not changed significantly in the last ten years, and remain focused on ensuring that uses and activities with higher potential for contamination are appropriately evaluated (or prohibited) when occurring in CARAs.

Ecology has published guidance to assist local jurisdictions with developing protection measures in their CAO that includes an 8-step process for identifying, characterizing, and managing groundwater withdrawals and recharge impacts (Ecology, 2005). The guidance also includes BAS sources for protecting CARAs.

CAO Update Process

The attached matrix contains a number of draft recommendations and suggestions for the City staff to consider during the update. Once the City has determined which recommendations they would like to implement, ESA will turn to revising the actual code with support from the City. ESA can provide examples of suggested code language from other CAOs to the City on an iterative basis and send a strike-through and underline draft of the revised code or sections of the code. ESA will have a presence at various public meetings and provide technical support to City staff during the legislative process.

Best Available Science References Consulted During Consistency Review

Bunten, D., A.McMillan, R. Mraz, and J. Sikes. 2012. Wetlands and CAO Updates: Guidance for Small Cities. Western Washington Version. Washington State Department of Ecology Publication No. 10-06-002. October 2012 2nd Revision. Olympia, WA.

Corps (US Army Corps of Engineers). 2014. A Guide to Ordinary High water Mark (OHWM) Delineation for Non-Perennial Streams in the Western Mountains, Valleys and Coast Region of the United States. Prepared by M.K. Mersel and R.W. Lichvar. Prepared for Wetlands Regulatory assistance Program, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. ERDC/CRREL TR-14-13. August 2014.

CTED (Washington State Department of Community, Trade, and Economic Development). 2007. Critical Areas Assistance Handbook: Protecting Critical Areas within the Framework of the Washington Growth Management Act. Olympia, WA.

Environmental Laboratory. 1987. Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual. Technical Report Y-87-1. U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, Massachusetts.

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). 2013a. National Floodplain Insurance Program Community Rating System Coordinator's Manual. FIA-15/2013. Indianapolis, IN.

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). 2013b. Model Ordinance for Floodplain Management under the National Flood Insurance Program and the Endangered Species Act. FEMA - Region 10. Bothell, WA.

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). 2009. National Floodplain Insurance Program Floodplain Management Guidebook. FEMA – Region 10. Bothell, WA.

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). 2002. CRS Credit for Higher Regulatory Standards. Indianapolis, IN.

Granger, T., T. Hruby, A. McMillan, D. Peters, J. Rubey, D. Sheldon, S. Stanley, E. Stockdale. April 2005. Wetlands in Washington State - Volume 2: Guidance for Protecting and Managing Wetlands. Washington State Department of Ecology. Publication #05-06-008. Olympia, WA.

Hruby, T. 2014. Washington State Wetland Rating System for Western Washington: 2014 Update.. Washington Department of Ecology (Publication #14-06-029). Olympia, WA.

Hruby, T. 2013. Update on Wetland Buffers: The State of the Science, Final Report, October 2013. Washington State Department of Ecology Publication #13-06-11. https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/SummaryPages/1306011.html

Hruby, T., K. Harper, and S. Stanley. 2009. Selecting Wetland Mitigation Sites Using a Watershed Approach. Washington State Department of Ecology (Publication #09-06-032). Olympia, WA.

Hungr, O. 1995. A model for runout analysis of rapid flow slides, debris flows, and avalanches. Canadian Geotechnical Journal, 32:610-623.

Hungr, O., Evans, S.G., Bovis, M., and Hutchinson, J. N. 2001. Review of the classification of landslides of the flow type. Environmental and Engineering Geoscience, 7:221-238.

Hungr, O., and McDougall, Scott. 2004. A model for the analysis of rapid landslide motion across a three dimensional terrain. Canadian Geotechnical Journal, 41:1084-1097.

Iverson, R.M. 1997. The physics of debris flows, Rev. Geophys., 35(3), 245-296.

Iverson, R.M. and Denlinger, R.P. 2001. Flow of variably fluidized granular masses across a three dimensional terrain, 1. Coulomb mixture theory. Journal of Geophysical Research 106(B1): 553-566.

Iverson, Richard M. 2014. Natural hazards explained: Debris flows behavior and hazard assessment. Geology Today 30:15-20.

Iverson, R.M., George, D.L., Allstadt, K., Reid, M.E., Collins, B.D., Vallance, J. W., Schilling, S. P., Godt, J.W., Cannon, C. M., Magirl, C. S., Baum, D.L., Coe, J.A., Schulz, W.H. and Bower, J.B. 2015. Landslide mobility and hazards: implications of the Oso disaster. Earth and Planetary Science Letters 412:197-208.

Knight, K. 2009. Land Use Planning for Salmon, Steelhead and Trout. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife. Olympia, Washington.

Knutson, K. L., and Naef, V. L. 1997. Management recommendations for Washington's priority habitats: Riparian. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife. 181 pp.

May, C.W. 2003. Stream-riparian ecosystems in Puget Sound lowland eco-region: A review of best available science. Watershed Ecology LLC.

Mayer, P.M., S.K. Reynolds, M.D. McCutchen, and T.J. Canfield. 2006. Riparian buffer width, vegetative cover, and nitrogen removal effectiveness: A review of current science and regulations. EPA/600/R-05/118. Cincinnati, OH, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2006.

National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). 2009. Final Biological Opinion Implementation of the National Flood Insurance Program in the State of Washington, Phase One Document – Puget Sound Region. Bothell, WA.

National Resource Council (NRC). 2001. Compensating for Wetland Losses Under the Clean Water Act. The National Academies Press. Washington, DC. http://www.nap.edu/

Palmer, Stephen P., Samantha L. Magsino, Eric L. Bilderback, james L. Pooelstra, Derek S. Folger, and Rebecca A. Neggemann. 2004. Liquefaction Susceptibility and Site Class Maps of Washington State, By County, Open File Report 2004-20.

Sheldon, D., T. Hruby, P. Johnson, K. Harper, A. McMillan, T. Granger, S. Stanley, and E. Stockdale. March 2005. Wetlands in Washington State - Volume 1: A Synthesis of the Science. Washington State Department of Ecology. Publication #05-06-006. Olympia, WA.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps). 2010. Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Western Mountains, Valleys, and Coast Region. Version 2. Wetlands Regulatory Assistance Program. May 2010. ERDC/EL TR-10-3. http://www.usace.army.mil/CECW/Documents/cecwo/reg/west_mt_finalsupp.pdf.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), Seattle District. 2011. Components of a Complete Wetland Delineation Report. http://www.nws.usace.army.mil/Missions/CivilWorks/Regulatory/PermitGuidebook/Wetlands.aspx

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA). 2008. Compensatory Mitigation for Losses of Aquatic Resources. Final Rule. Federal Register 73(70): 19594-19705.

Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology). 2013. Funding Guidelines State Fiscal Year 2015 - Water Quality Financial Assistance. Appendix L referenced for guidance on buffer widths for anadromous fish streams. Publication no. 13-10-041. October 2013.

Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology). 2010. Determining the Ordinary High Water Mark on Streams in Washington State. Prepared by Dr. P. Olson and E. Stockdale, Shorelands and Environmental Assistance Program, Ecology. Ecology Publication #08-06-001. March 2010.

Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology). Isolated Wetlands Information webpage: www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/sea/wetlands/isolated.html

Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology). 2015. Guidance for Local Governments on Frequently Flooded Areas Updates in CAO's. January 20, 2015. Shorelands and Environmental Assistance Program. Olympia, WA. Available: http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/sea/floods/FloodedAreaGuidance.html

Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology). 2012. Guidance on In-Lieu Fee Mitigation. Ecology Publication No. 12-06-012. https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/publications/1206012.pdf

Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), and Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW). 2012. Advance Permittee-Responsible Mitigation. Ecology Publication No. 12-06-015. https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/publications/1206015.pdf

Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology). 2008. Making Mitigation Work: The Report of the Mitigation that Works Forum. Ecology Publication No. 08-06-018. https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/publications/0806018.pdf

Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology). U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), and US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 2006a. Wetland Mitigation in Washington State—Part 1: Agency Policies and Guidance. Ecology Publication: #06-06-011a. March 2006.

Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology). U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), and US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 2006b. Wetland Mitigation in Washington State—Part 2: Developing Mitigation Plans. Ecology Publication #06-06-011b. March 2006.

Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology). 2005. Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas – Guidance Document. Ecology Publication # 05-10-028. Olympia, WA.

Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW). 2009. Landscape Planning for Washington's Wildlife: Managing for Biodiversity in Developing Areas. Olympia, WA.

Washington State Department of Natural Resources (DNR). 2012. Earthquakes in Washington.