Existing Regulation(s)	Proposed Amendment & Description			
The existing mitigation requirements require that there is no net loss of wetland area, equivalent or better biological functions and values, mitigation in kind, and that mitigation area is based upon a strict ratio associated with wetland type.	Wetland mitigation would continue to require no net loss, require equivalent or better biological functions and values, but will authorize different types of mitigation (not just in-kind) based upon an adjusted rate of mitigation ratio. For example, impacts to a category 2 wetland, would be mitigated at a ratio of 3:1 for wetland creation, but would be mitigated at a ratio of 8:1 for wetland rehabilitation.			
Desired Result of Amendment:				
The proposed amendments will clarify and refine the required mitigation for impacts to wetlands, in				
particular related to the type of mitigation required by the city.				

## Amendment Source:

Best Available Science Report "Wetlands" by AMEC Environment & Infrastructure, Inc.

## Best Available Science Support: Supported

Best Available Science Report "Wetlands" by AMEC Environment & Infrastructure, Inc.

## Affected Code Section(s) (incudes duplicative and overlapping sections):

• 21A.50.310 Wetlands – Mitigation Requirements.

Notes:

## **Evaluation Form – Planning Commission Approved**

Ratings are either: large positive (P), small positive (p), neutral, large negative (N), small negative (n)				
Environmental	р	Implementation	Neutral	
<ul> <li>Increased on-site protection of wetlands</li> <li>Neutral protection of public assets and resources (e.g. streets, water quality)</li> <li>Decreased cumulative impacts to wetlands</li> <li>Neutral effect on potential to restore damaged wetlands</li> <li>Decreased chance of damage to wetlands</li> <li>Decreased potential to damage high quality, unique wetlands</li> <li>Decreased loss of wetland functions and values</li> <li>Basing wetland mitigation on the type of mitigation proposed will more ensure that functions / values impacted through development will be mitigated appropriately. For example, mitigation through the creation of wetland would require relatively less mitigation than mitigation through wetland enhancement. Consequently it is expected that mitigation will better match projected impacts to wetlands.</li> </ul>		<ul> <li>Overall neutral effect on clarity of regulations and chance for unintended consequences</li> <li>Neutral effect on ability for consistent, efficient implementation by the staff</li> <li>Neutral effect on likelihood of support/approval by other agencies</li> <li>Increased effective mitigation, neutral effect to monitor</li> <li>The proposed amendments will provide clarity on appropriate mitigation, although the calculation of mitigation is more complex.</li> </ul>		
Property	Neutral	Overal	l Effect	
<ul> <li>Neutral effect on flexibility and options for property owner's use of property</li> <li>Increased predictability for permit applicants and neighbors</li> <li>Neutral recognition of site improvements and existing uses in standards</li> <li>Slightly increased expense / time</li> <li>The proposed amendments will increase predictability for an applicant on proposing mitigation on a project. There is no expected impact on flexibility; however, more complex ratios may add a modest amount of expense and time to the property owner.</li> </ul>		Positive		

**Evaluation Form – Planning Commission Approved**