Inglewood Sub-basin Plan Addendum

Prepared for

City of Sammamish
801 228th Avenue SE
Sammamish, WA 98075

Prepared by

Parametrix
411 108th Avenue NE, Suite 1800
Bellevue, WA 98004-5571
T. 425.458.6200 F. 425.458.6363
www.parametrix.com

In association with

Windward Environmental
200 West Mercer Street, Suite 401
Seattle, WA 98119
T. 206.378.1364

September 2011 | 558-3847-002 (02/06)

CITATION

City of Sammamish. 2011. Inglewood Sub-basin Plan Addendum. Prepared by Parametrix, Bellevue, Washington, in association with WindWard Environmental, Seattle, Washington. September 2011.

CERTIFICATION

The technical material and data contained in this document were prepared under the supervision and direction of the undersigned, whose seal, as a professional engineer licensed to practice as such, is affixed below.

ERIN JAYNE NELSON
STATE OF WASHINGTON
32201
REGISTERED
PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER

9/9/2011

EXPIRES 10 29 2012

Erin J. Nelson

Prepared by Erin Nelson

JAN E. ROSHOLT
STATE OF WASHINGTON
12722
REGISTERED
PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER

9/13/2011

Checked by Jan Rosholt

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY ES-1

1. INTRODUCTION 1-1
1.1 BASIN PLANNING CONTEXT 1-1

2. COMMUNITY AND REGULATORY FRAMEWORK 2-1
2.1 CITY OF SAMMAMISH SURFACE WATER CODE AND REQUIREMENTS 2-2
2.2 CITY OF SAMMAMISH COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2-3
2.2.1 Town Center Plan 2-3
2.2.2 Critical Areas Ordinance 2-4
2.3 CITY OF SAMMAMISH SHORELINE MASTER PROGRAM 2-4
2.4 SEATTLE AND KING COUNTY PUBLIC HEALTH DEPARTMENT 2-4
2.5 WATER AND SEWER DISTRICTS 2-4

3. WATERSHED CHARACTERISTICS 3-1
3.1 PHYSICAL SETTING 3-1
3.2 LAND USE AND POPULATION 3-3
3.3 GEOLOGY AND GROUNDWATER 3-15
3.3.1 Geology 3-15
3.3.2 Groundwater Occurrence 3-23
3.4 SURFACE WATER HYDROLOGY 3-23
3.4.1 Hydrologic Modeling 3-24
3.5 WETLANDS 3-29
3.6 STREAM AND HILLSLOPE GEOMORPHOLOGY 3-35
3.7 FISH HABITAT AND USE 3-36
3.8 WATER QUALITY 3-37

4. RECOMMENDED STRATEGIES 4-1
4.1 PRESERVATION AND ENHANCEMENT OF ECOLOGICAL FUNCTION 4-1
4.1.1 Capital Project 4-2
4.1.2 Educational Strategy 4-3
4.2 REDUCE EFFECTS OF ONGOING STORMWATER DISCHARGES FROM EXISTING DEVELOPMENT 4-3
4.2.1 Capital Strategies 4-4
4.3 PLAN FOR FUTURE IMPACTS AND MINIMIZE EFFECTS 4-4

5. PROJECT PRIORITIZATION 5-1
5.1 CRITERIA 5-1
5.2 MATRIX OF PROJECTS 5-1

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

6. REFERENCES 6-1

LIST OF FIGURES

1 Inglewood Sub-basin 1-3
2 Basin Plan Framework 1-5
3 Inglewood Sub-basin Critical Areas 2-5
4 Inglewood Sub-basin 1979 Aerial Photography 3-5
5 Inglewood Sub-basin 1996 Aerial Photography 3-7
6 Inglewood Sub-basin 2002 Aerial Photography 3-9
7 Inglewood Sub-basin 2009 Aerial Photography 3-11
8 Inglewood Sub-basin Comprehensive Plan Zoning 3-13
9 Inglewood Sub-basin Geology 3-17
10 General Geology and Location of Geologic Cross Sections 3-19
11 Geologic Cross Sections A-A' and B-B' 3-21
12 Inglewood Sub-basins 3-25
13 Inglewood Sub-basin Hydrological Modeling Results 3-27
14 Inglewood Sub-basin Wetlands 3-31

LIST OF TABLES

ES-1 Matrix of Recommended Projects ES-2
1 Regulatory Framework of Surface Water Management in the Inglewood Sub-basin 2-1
2 Relationship of Comprehensive Plan Goals to Existing City Regulations and Programs 2-3
3 Summary of Existing Conditions and Future Impacts 3-2
4 Inglewood Sub-basin Wetlands 3-33
5 Strategies to Preserve or Enhance Ecological Function in the Inglewood Sub-basin 4-2
6 Projects to Reduce Ongoing Stormwater Impacts 4-3
7 Summary of Stormwater Treatment Requirements and Preferred Choices 4-4
8 Previously Recommended Strategies to Plan for and Reduce Effects of Future Stormwater Runoff 4-5
9 Criteria and Scoring for Project Prioritization 5-1
10 Matrix of Recommended Projects 5-2

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

LIST OF PHOTOGRAPHS

1 Dying trees associated with saturated conditions on west side of 228th Avenue NE 3-24

2 Incised stream channel adjacent to residence 3-35

3 Dry streambed upstream of 216th Avenue NE 3-36

4 George Davis Creek flow through old water supply diversion dam upstream of East Lake Sammamish Parkway 3-37

APPENDICES

A Hydrologic Modeling Report

B Wetland Data Forms

C Field Data Comparison – 1990 and 2008

D Photo Logs

E Specific Conceptual Project Alternatives

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

bgs	below ground surface
CAO	Critical Areas Ordinance
CIP	Capital Improvement Project
City	City of Sammamish
DEIS	Draft Environmental Impact Statement
Ecology	Washington State Department of Ecology
GMA	Growth Management Act
gpm	gallons per minute
KCC	King County Code
LID	Low Impact Development
msl	mean sea level
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
RCW	Revised Code of Washington
SEPA	State Environmental Policy Act
SMC	Sammamish Municipal Code
UGA	urban growth area
USGS	U.S. Geological Survey
WDFW	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This plan provides an update to a previous basin planning effort conducted in 2005. The Inglewood Sub-basin is one of two basins located at the headwaters of the proposed Sammamish Town Center. The purpose of this basin update is to improve existing natural and built conditions that may have changed since 2005 and to consider potential impacts resulting from development of the Town Center. Previous studies have included this basin, beginning in 1995 with King County's East Lake Sammamish Basin and Nonpoint Action Plan, and again in 2005 with the completion of the Inglewood Sub-basin Plan.

The Inglewood Sub-basin is in fair condition with respect to some characteristics, such as quality of wetlands and riparian forest adjacent to George Davis Creek, and large areas of recessional outwash geology that serves as an underground reservoir and collection system for surface water runoff. However, it is impaired with respect to fish habitat and access. There are three fish passage barriers located within 1/2 mile of Lake Sammamish that prevent fish use of upstream habitat.

Specific features that define the Inglewood Sub-basin and are important considerations in the development of projects and strategies are as follows:

Geology—The underlying geology in the Inglewood Sub-basin consists of compacted till and highly infiltrative recessional glacial outwash. The outwash serves a very important function in this basin, serving as a gigantic subsurface reservoir that recharges deeper groundwater aquifers and supplies flow to George Davis Creek and associated wetlands. It is important to minimize development of impervious surfaces on these highly infiltrative areas to protect the groundwater recharge capacity.

Wetland—There are very high quality, large wetlands in the Inglewood Sub-basin that provide hydrologic functions of storing water and attenuating flood flows, as well as providing diverse habitat for birds and other wildlife species. It is important to protect these areas for their critical functions.

Fish Passage Barriers—There are at least three fish passage barriers on George Davis Creek within the first 1/2 mile of Lake Sammamish. Despite relatively good fish habitat, these barriers represent a costly and unlikely restoration of anadromous fish populations to the lower reaches of George Davis Creek. For this reason, the removal of these barriers is not recommended as part of this plan.

The projects and strategies recommended herein are designed to preserve ecological function in areas that are currently functioning well, solve existing problems, and prevent future degradation as the Inglewood Sub-basin is further developed (Table ES-1). The cost of these projects is about $350,000, not including property acquisition, if required.

Table ES-1. Matrix of Recommended Projects

Strategy	Project Identification	Type of Strategy: Planning	Type of Strategy: Education	Type of Strategy: Capital	Description	Potential Partners	Cost	Priority
Conduct Wetland Tours	Ed-1		X		Sponsor wetland tours to foster appreciation and stewardship of Sammamish wetlands	Audubon Society, non-profit environmental groups	$6,000	Low
NE 217th Street Road Drainage Modification	CIP-1			X	Improve road drainage to reduce flooding to neighboring residence.	None	$59,000	Low
228th Avenue NE Stormwater Discharge Modification	CIP-2			X	Modify stormwater outfall discharge from 228th Avenue NE to reduce erosion and saturated conditions.	None	$55,000 to $78,000	Medium
NE 2nd Street Culvert Replacement	CIP-3			X	Replace culverts at NE 2nd Street driveway.	None	$40,000	Medium

1. INTRODUCTION

This plan provides an update to a previous basin planning effort conducted in 2005. The Inglewood Sub-basin is one of two basins located at the headwaters of the proposed Sammamish Town Center (Figure 1). The purpose of this basin update is to improve existing natural and built conditions that may have changed since 2005 and to consider potential impacts resulting from development of the Town Center. Previous studies have included this basin, beginning in 1995 with King County's East Lake Sammamish Basin and Nonpoint Action Plan, and again in 2005 with the completion of the Inglewood Sub-basin Plan.

1.1 BASIN PLANNING CONTEXT

The goals of this basin plan are to identify stormwater and surface water-related projects and strategies that (1) protect existing natural resources, (2) restore or enhance ecological or surface water functions where they are impaired, and (3) prevent future degradation of natural resources from future development. The City's Comprehensive Plan (City of Sammamish 2003) provides the impetus for completing basin plans:

> "The City shall provide Basin Plans for all areas of the City by either adopting existing plans or creating new ones, to assure that permitted development will not degrade the surface or ground water resources." (Goal ECP-1.27)

Additionally, the City has many environmental goals in the Comprehensive Plan (City of Sammamish 2003) that relate directly to basin planning efforts, including:

> **"**Preserve and enhance the natural features and historic, cultural and archeological resources of the community." (Goal LUG-9)
>
> **"**Preserve trees and other natural resources as integral components of the community's overall design." (Goal LUG-10)
>
> **"**Practice environmental stewardship by protecting, enhancing, and promoting the natural environment in and around the City." (Goal EC-1)
>
> **"**Maintain a surface water and groundwater system that serves the community, enhances the quality of life, and protects the environment." (Goal EC-3)



K:\gis\3847_sammamish\basin_planning\mapdocs\reportmaps_060110\inglewood_tc_8x11_062410.mxd

Parametrix

N

0 2,000

Scale in Feet

Inglewood Sub-basin

Sammamish Town Center

Figure 1
Inglewood Sub-basin

These City goals, as well as regulatory directives, such as the City's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Phase II permit, and public safety issues such as flooding and access to clean water, provide the framework for development of the Inglewood Sub-basin plan (Figure 2).



Figure 2. Basin Plan Framework

In general, this basin plan is organized into sections based on the community and regulatory framework and what is known (review of previous documentation, results of the Parametrix field investigation and hydrologic modeling), followed by recommendations that are consistent with the City's goals and policies to address existing and potential future watershed concerns. Specific projects and strategies to address watershed concerns were developed into stand-alone projects that can be implemented through the City's Capital Improvement Project (CIP) program.

2. COMMUNITY AND REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

The City of Sammamish governs land use, stormwater, and the use of natural resources through codes and ordinances that are specific to the City or dictated by overarching state and federal regulations. These regulations, along with the City's vision to "blend small town atmosphere with suburban character" and maintain "quality neighborhoods, vibrant natural features, and outstanding recreational opportunities," result in several overlapping policies and goals regarding the management of stormwater and natural resources in the Inglewood Sub-basin. Table 1 summarizes existing federal, state, and local regulations related to stormwater runoff and natural resources and the relevance of these regulations to the Inglewood Sub-basin.

Table 1. Regulatory Framework of Surface Water Management in the Inglewood Sub-basin

Law	Implementing Entity	Regulatory Programs	Intent and Specifics	Relevance to Inglewood Sub-basin
Clean Water Act	Washington State Department of Ecology	NPDES Phase II Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System Permit	Eliminate discharge of pollutants into the nation's water, and achieve water quality levels that are protective of beneficial uses	The City of Sammamish is a NPDES Phase II permittee and must comply with conditions of the permit.
	Washington State Department of Ecology	Surface Water Quality Standards	Protect and regulate the quality of surface water in Washington State through (1) sustaining designated uses, (2) meeting numeric water quality criteria, and (3) implementing antidegradation policies	George Davis creek is listed on the state's 303(d) Category 5 list for water quality impairment by fecal coliform bacteria because of non-compliance with numeric water quality standards.
	Washington State Department of Ecology and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Sections 401 and 404	Requires a permit for activities classified by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for dredge or discharge of fill material to Waters of the United States	George Davis Creek and associated wetlands and tributaries, including Lake Sammamish, are considered Waters of the United States. In-water activities that meet minimum dredge and fill limits require a permit.
Tribal Agreements and Related Case Law	Muckleshoot Tribe or Snoqualmie Tribe		Protect fish populations in traditional fishing grounds of Native American tribes	Snoqualmie and Muckleshoot Tribes are party to SEPA review of development proposals and programs within the Inglewood watershed.
Endangered Species Act	United States Fish and Wildlife Service and NOAA Fisheries in consultation with lead federal agencies		Prevent further decline of listed terrestrial and aquatic species, including Puget Sound Chinook salmon, steelhead trout, marbled murrelet, and other species	Unknown status of endangered species in Inglewood Sub-basin.
State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA)	The City of Sammamish conducts reviews and issues SEPA determinations on proposed projects within its jurisdiction		Identify and require mitigation of the environmental impacts of proposals and programs	SEPA is used to address impacts on projects in the Inglewood Sub-basin that are not covered in other City code requirements.
Shoreline Management Act	City of Sammamish Shoreline Master Plan		Protect use and functions (economic, ecological, aesthetic) of shoreline areas	Only the part of the Inglewood Sub-basin that borders Lake Sammamish is included in the City's Shoreline Master Plan.

Table 1. Regulatory Framework of Surface Water Management in the Inglewood Basin (continued)

Law	Implementing Entity	Regulatory Programs	Intent and Specifics	Relevance to Inglewood Sub-basin
Washington State Hydraulic Code	Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW)		Sets requirements for placement of culverts and other hydraulic devices that may affect fish use	Projects within ordinary high water mark of streams must obtain a Hydraulic Project Approval permit from WDFW. Culverts must be fish passable where fish are present.
Growth Management Act (GMA)	City of Sammamish implements GMA	City of Sammamish Comprehensive Plan, Sammamish Town Center Plan	Regulate land use to meet growth targets while providing necessary services and protecting sensitive environmental resources	The Inglewood Sub-basin is located in a designated urban growth area (UGA) within the city of Sammamish.

2.1 CITY OF SAMMAMISH SURFACE WATER CODE AND REQUIREMENTS

The City's surface water code (Sammamish Municipal Code [SMC] §15.05.010), through adoption of King County's 1998 Surface Water Design Manual and code (King County Code [KCC] §9.12.035), outlines stormwater management requirements for new development and redevelopment projects that meet certain size thresholds within the City's jurisdiction. This is the primary regulatory mechanism for managing stormwater. The City is in the process of updating its code to include adoption of the latest King County Surface Water Design Manual (2009) or the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) 2005 Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington (2005 Ecology Manual), as required by the City's Phase II NPDES permit.

The City of Sammamish adopted a Low Impact Development (LID) Ordinance (02008-236) in 2008. This ordinance is based on incentives and encourages development proposals to incorporate LID techniques in exchange for increased density, signage, publicity, and other incentives.

In addition to adoption of a stormwater management manual that is consistent with the 2005 Ecology Manual, the City's NPDES Phase II permit outlines several stormwater management requirements related to water quality, including:

- Public education;
- Illicit discharge detection and elimination programs;
- Public involvement and participation;
- Construction and development runoff control; and
- Municipal operation and maintenance.

The City already has many of these stormwater management components in place and is currently updating its stormwater management approach to comply with NPDES Phase II permit requirements. The NPDES program requirements will affect the Inglewood Sub-basin in the following ways: updated stormwater management requirements for new development; opportunities for developers to obtain special allowances in exchange for utilizing LID techniques; increased maintenance frequency for City stormwater infrastructure; and continued public involvement and education regarding stormwater issues.

2.2 CITY OF SAMMAMISH COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

The Comprehensive Plan was adopted in 2003 and updated in 2006. It was developed in accordance with the state Growth Management Act's planning goals (Revised Code of Washington [RCW] 36.70A.020), which includes encouraging growth in urban areas where City services will be provided, limiting sprawl, protecting the environment and natural areas, and encouraging the involvement of citizens in the planning process. The Inglewood Sub-basin is located entirely within the city of Sammamish UGA. The Comprehensive Plan outlines several goals associated with each planning element. The goals related to surface water management and basin planning are summarized in Table 2 showing how these goals relate to existing City regulations.

Table 2. Relationship of Comprehensive Plan Goals to Existing City Regulations and Programs

	Elements of Comprehensive Plan Goals Related to Stormwater Management									
City Codes and Regulations	**Preservation of Natural Environment/Open Space**	**Encourage Non-traditional Alternatives to Stormwater Management**	**Environmental Education**	**Protect Surface and Ground Water Resources**	**Minimize Impervious Surfaces**	**Integrated Water Resources Management**	**Use Incentives, Regulations and Programs to Manage Water Resources**	**Enhance Water Quality**	**Protect Ground Water Recharge Quantity and Quality**	**Maintain Ecologic and Hydrologic Functioning of Natural Systems**
Critical Areas Ordinance	√			√					√	√
Growth Management Act	√									
LID Ordinance		√			√		√			
City/Town Center Stormwater Code		√		√	√	√				√
Shoreline Management Act	√									
NPDES Phase II Permit			√					√		

2.2.1 Town Center Plan

The Sammamish Town Center Plan was adopted in June 2008, outlining elements related to the development of 240 acres of property along 228th Avenue SE at the headwaters of the Thompson and Inglewood sub-basins. The elements in the Town Center Plan that relate to this basin plan include land use, open space, natural systems, and capital facilities and utilities. The Town Center Plan cites opportunities to "employ an integrated strategy to managing storm water and enhance the ecology" through "LID techniques to more closely emulate the natural hydrology" and "coordinate storm water management through an integrated regional system." A separate Comprehensive Stormwater Master Plan was prepared for the Town Center (Parametrix 2009a); design strategies for the Town Center will also be briefly discussed in this plan.

2.2.2 Critical Areas Ordinance

Several designated critical areas are located within the Inglewood Sub-basin, including landslide and erosion hazard areas on the flanks of George Davis Creek on the west slope of the Sammamish Plateau, wetlands, streams, wildlife corridors, and critical aquifer recharge areas (Figure 3). Approximately one-half of the entire basin is designated as a critical area. The City's Critical Areas Ordinance (No. 02005-193) and Environmentally Critical Areas Code (SMC Chapter 21A.50) specify activities allowed and prohibited in these areas, as well as requirements for mitigating impacts to critical areas. In addition to the Critical Areas Code that applies to the entire city, a special wetland overlay area has additional requirements and include portions of the Inglewood Sub-basin. The Critical Areas Code is important to basin planning because it outlines requirements related to surface water runoff and management through development restrictions adjacent to erosion hazard areas, limitations on impervious surface construction in critical aquifer recharge areas, and wetland and stream buffers to keep riparian areas and wildlife corridors intact.

2.3 CITY OF SAMMAMISH SHORELINE MASTER PROGRAM

The city's waterbodies that are considered shorelines of the state include Lake Sammamish, Pine Lake, and Beaver Lake. None of the streams located within the basin limits, including George Davis Creek, is large enough to be included in the Shoreline Master Program. The Inglewood Sub-basin does include a very small portion of the Lake Sammamish shoreline. Parametrix did not evaluate shoreline conditions and implications of the Shoreline Master Program for the Inglewood Sub-basin.

2.4 SEATTLE AND KING COUNTY PUBLIC HEALTH DEPARTMENT

The Seattle and King County Public Health Department regulate drinking water sources, including surface water developed for water supply, and drilled wells using groundwater as a source of potable water. Additionally, the health department helps to ensure that septic systems are installed and operating properly. The commercial area in the Inglewood Sub-basin at the intersection of Inglewood Hill Road and 228th Avenue SE receives sanitary sewer service from the Sammamish Plateau Water and Sewer District; however, most of the basin still relies on private septic systems. Parametrix did not investigate whether there have been any water quality or quantity concerns from private well owners, or whether private sewer systems are properly functioning.

2.5 WATER AND SEWER DISTRICTS

Most of the Inglewood Sub-basin is within the Sammamish Plateau Water and Sewer District service area; however, a very small portion on the north side is in the Northeast Sammamish Sewer and Water District service area. As mentioned above, large areas of the basin are still on private sewer systems, but the District's plan is to construct future mains and lift stations to service the basin (Sammamish Plateau Water and Sewer District 2003). As the area is redeveloped, new water lines will also likely service those residents that are currently on private well systems.

The District operates 13 municipal water wells in the vicinity of the city limits. These wells range in depth from 134 feet below ground surface (bgs) to 955 feet bgs for a total capacity of approximately 7,000 gallons per minute (gpm) (WSDOH 2011).



Path: K:\gis\3847_sammamish\basin_planning\mapdocs_v10\Ing_crit_areas_090611.mxd

Parametrix

Inglewood Sub-basin
Stream
200' Shoreline Buffer
Waterbody
NWI/ City of Sammamish Mapped Wetlands
Field Modified/Additional Wetlands
Class 1- 1 year TOT
Class 1- 5 year TOT
Class 2- 10 year TOT
Erosion Hazard Area
Critical Aquifer Recharge Area
Landslide Hazard
Wildlife Corridor (King County)

N

0 2,000
Scale in Feet

Note: Wetland and stream buffers are not shown.

Figure 3
Inglewood Sub-basin Critical Areas

3. WATERSHED CHARACTERISTICS

Existing watershed characteristics were evaluated through review of previous studies and documentation, aerial photographs, maps, and field reconnaissance that included walking the stream channels and visiting wetlands in the basin. Additionally, supplemental information was obtained from residents at public meetings held in December 2008 and March 2009. Physical stream channel attributes collected in the field, along with existing land use, future zoning, and geologic data, were used to develop a hydrologic model of the basin to evaluate existing and future surface water flow conditions.

The Inglewood Sub-basin is in fair condition with respect to some characteristics, such as quality of wetlands and riparian forest adjacent to George Davis Creek, and large areas of recessional outwash geology that serves as an underground reservoir and collection system for surface water runoff. However, the basin is impaired with respect to fish habitat and access. There are three fish passage barriers located within 1/2 mile of Lake Sammamish that prevent fish use of upstream habitat. Table 3 summarizes existing conditions, potential future impacts, and existing regulatory measures in place to ensure protection of natural resources.

The watershed threats in the Inglewood Sub-basin are primarily related to the conversion of land to rural and suburban uses, particularly development over areas of recessional outwash. If the basin is built out to its full zoning potential, this could represent an increase in impervious surfaces from 15 percent to 32 percent.

3.1 PHYSICAL SETTING

The Inglewood Sub-basin is located on the east side of Lake Sammamish in east King County, Washington. The sub-basin is approximately 2.6 square miles, with an elevation range of 615 feet above mean sea level at the top of the Sammamish Plateau, to an elevation of 40 feet above mean sea level at the mouth of George Davis Creek (also known as Inglewood Creek) in Lake Sammamish. George Davis Creek is the primary drainage feature in the Inglewood sub-basin. Approximately 32 percent of the sub-basin is forested, with much of the forested area located in the riparian corridor adjacent to George Davis Creek. Impervious surface is roughly 15 percent of the total area based on average assumed impervious surface coverage for the different land types in the sub-basin. Road density in the basin is about 10.4 miles per square mile, which is fairly high for the level of development in the basin.

Table 3. Summary of Existing Conditions and Future Impacts

	Watershed Characteristic	Existing Conditions	Potential Future Impacts	Existing Regulatory Measures to Ensure Protection
Biological Characteristics	**Fisheries**	Aquatic habitat is in fair condition, but limited by stream flow and access. Stream flow is present in the winter months; much of George Davis Creek is dry during the summer and fall.	Unlikely that future development will significantly affect habitat. Flows are attenuated through infiltration into the recessional outwash.	Critical Areas Ordinance (CAO)—150-foot stream buffer on George Davis Creek.
		Complete fish passage barriers exist downstream of East Lake Sammamish Trail, at East Lake Sammamish Parkway, and upstream at an old concrete dam located about 1/2 mile upstream of the parkway.		CAO—Subdivisions must place wildlife corridors (such as George Davis Creek) in a contiguous permanent open-space tract.
		Large woody debris has been placed in the channel as restoration, which is likely to prevent sediment movement rather than create fish habitat.		
	Wetlands	Several large depressional wetlands, with groundwater hydrology and seasonal flooding. Some wetlands and buffers are degraded from residential development; others are in fairly good shape.	Vegetation and hydroperiod changes from increased stormwater runoff or infiltration; encroachment from urbanization.	CAO—Wetland buffers vary from 50 to 215 feet depending on wetland category.
		Many wetlands in the Inglewood Sub-basin have been encroached upon by development and have resulted in wetland fragmentation.		CAO—Wetland special district overlay (180) requires a maximum impervious surface area of 8% in areas zoned R-1 within a special overlay area. Some portions of Inglewood sub-basin are within this overlay.
		Wetlands receive more flow now with increased development (anecdotal information). Trees have been dying due to longer periods of saturation in some areas.		CAO—Surface water discharges are allowed in wetlands and their buffers only if the discharge does not increase rate of flow, decrease water quality, or change plant composition.
	Riparian Corridor	Fairly good condition in vicinity of George Davis Creek.	Encroachment from development, change in size and type of vegetation (smaller trees, less dense).	CAO—Wetland and stream buffers (see above) and vegetation management plan for clearing done in critical areas
				50% of sites must retain trees or re-vegetate with trees in areas zoned R-1 within wetland special overlay area.
Chemical Characteristics	**Water Quality**	George Davis Creek is on 303(d) list as a Category 5 impaired waterbody for fecal coliform bacteria.	Unknown; there is not a continuous flow of water in the creek, and infiltration of surface water likely removes fecal coliform bacteria.	

Table 3. Summary of Existing Conditions and Future Impacts (continued)

	Watershed Characteristic	Existing Conditions	Potential Future Impacts	Existing Regulatory Measures to Ensure Protection
Physical Characteristics	**Groundwater Hydrology**	Several domestic groundwater wells in the Inglewood Sub-basin.	Reduction in groundwater elevations in shallower aquifers due to more impervious surfaces and less groundwater recharge.	CAO—Much of Inglewood sub-basin is located within critical aquifer recharge areas. 75% of on-site stormwater generated from new development must be infiltrated in these areas, unless not feasible.
		Groundwater recharge occurs in undeveloped portions of the basin at quite high rates depending on surface geologic conditions.		CAO—Some activities are prohibited in critical aquifer recharge areas to protect groundwater quality.
	Surface Hydrology	Surface water hydrological conditions are relatively intact. Much of the Inglewood Sub-basin has very high infiltration rates in the recessional outwash, which attenuates flows in the stream channel.	Increased flows, durations, and volumes from new development could overwhelm capacity of outwash or affect wetlands.	King County Title 9—Surface water management code adopted by City of Sammamish, Level 3 flow control match 100-year peak for predeveloped forest conditions.
	Hillslope Geomorphology	Lower reaches of George Davis Creek are within an erosion hazard area. Many landslides were observed adjacent to George Davis Creek; some may be due to residential surface water discharges.	Removal of vegetation or discharge of stormwater near the slopes of George Davis Creek could compromise slope conditions and cause additional landslides.	
Built Environment	**Impervious Surface Coverage**	Currently, approximately 15% total impervious surface in basin.	Impervious surface estimates for future land use is 32% of basin.	CAO—Wetland overlay limits impervious surface to 8% in areas zoned R-1.

3.2 LAND USE AND POPULATION

Population on the Sammamish Plateau grew by nearly 600 percent between 1970 and 2001 (City of Sammamish 2003). Parametrix reviewed historical aerial photographs from 1944, 1970, 1979, 1996, 2002, and 2009. The 1979, 1996, 2002, and 2009 photographs are shown in Figures 4 through 7. The basin was very rural and mostly forested in the 1979 aerial photograph. Some residential and commercial development took place in the north portion of the basin (north of Inglewood Hill Road and at the intersection of Inglewood Hill Road and 228th Avenue SE) between 1979 and 1996. Significant land conversions have occurred since 1996 with the construction of two large high schools on 228th Avenue SE and several residential communities in the southeast part of the basin.

The Inglewood Sub-basin is not built out based on existing zoning (Figure 8). The proposed Town Center includes more than 150 acres in the Inglewood Sub-basin, some of which will be converted to dense development. Additionally, there are some areas zoned R-4 and R-6 (four and six dwelling units per acre, respectively) that are currently forested or developed at a rural density. These areas could be built out and result in stormwater and surface water impacts, particularly in those areas adjacent to wetlands, such as near Eastside Catholic High School, and steep slopes adjacent to George Davis Creek on the west slope of the plateau (in the vicinity of NE 6th Place).



K:\gis\3847_sammamish\basin_planning\mapdocs\reportmaps_060110\histl8x11_060110.mxd

Parametrix

Inglewood Sub-basin
Sammamish Town Center

N

0 2,000
Scale in Feet

Figure 4
Inglewood Sub-basin
1979 Aerial Photography



K:\gis\3847_sammamish\basin_planning\mapdocs\reportmaps_060110\histl8x11_060110.mxd

Parametrix

Inglewood Sub-basin
Sammamish Town Center

N

0 2,000
Scale in Feet

Figure 5
Inglewood Sub-basin
1996 Aerial Photography



K:\gis\3847_sammamish\basin_planning\mapdocs\reportmaps_060110\histl8x11_060110.mxd

Parametrix

0 N 2,000

Scale in Feet

Inglewood Sub-basin

Sammamish Town Center

Figure 6
Inglewood Sub-basin
2002 Aerial Photography



K:\gis\3847_sammamish\basin_planning\mapdocs\reportmaps_060110\histl8x11_060110.mxd

Parametrix

0 N 2,000

Scale in Feet

Inglewood Sub-basin

Sammamish Town Center

Figure 7
Inglewood Sub-basin
2009 Aerial Photography



K:\gis\3847_sammamish\basin_planning\mapdocs\reportmaps_060110\zoning8x11_060110.mxd

Parametrix

N

0 2,000

Scale in Feet

Zoning

CB	R-1	R-4i
NB	R-12	R-6
O	R-18	R-6i
	R-4	R-8

Inglewood Sub-basin

Sammamish Town Center

Figure 8
Inglewood Sub-basin Comprehensive Plan Zoning

3.3 GEOLOGY AND GROUNDWATER

3.3.1 Geology

The geological features of the East Lake Sammamish Plateau have been mapped by Derek B. Booth and others at the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS 2006). A map of the basin surface geology is presented in Figure 9. Cross sections showing approximate subsurface geologic conditions were developed based on water well logs obtained from Ecology and geotechnical studies available in unpublished reports (Hong West and Associates 1996; Nelson and Associates 1987; Terra Associates 1995, 1998, 1999). These cross sections are shown in Figures 10 and 11. The geological features are characterized by the following general sequence of unconsolidated glacial deposits from the surface downward:

- Vashon recessional outwash (Qvr);
- Vashon till (Qvt);
- Vashon advance outwash (Qva); and
- Pre-Vashon undifferentiated unconsolidated deposits—glacial and non-glacial (Qpf).

Most of the upland areas of the Sammamish Plateau and the Inglewood Sub-basin are mantled by Vashon Till (Qvt), a densely compacted poorly sorted mixture of boulders, cobbles, gravel, and sand in a matrix of silt and clay, often identified in driller's logs as "hardpan." The till is up to about 150 to 200 feet thick in some upland areas of the Sammamish Plateau based on a review of well records in the vicinity. The presence of till is an important consideration for stormwater management techniques because it is more difficult to infiltrate stormwater in these areas due to the compact nature and low permeability of the till.

The Vashon Till is locally overlain by Vashon Recessional Outwash deposits (Qvr)—a poorly sorted to well sorted, light gray, stratified gravel and sand with minor amounts of silt and clay deposited behind the receding glacier. The recessional outwash deposits are relatively thin on the south side of the Inglewood Sub-basin (less than 20 feet) but get thicker toward the north (up to 50 feet or more). The recessional outwash is the surficial geologic unit present throughout the George Davis Creek corridor. It plays an important role in stormwater management in that it serves as a large underground reservoir for water and stormwater readily infiltrates where recessional outwash is present.

The Vashon Till is underlain by Vashon Advance Outwash (Qva) that consist of variably compacted sand and gravel deposited by streams and rivers ahead of the advancing glacier. Vashon Advance Outwash is typically variable in grain size, varying from silt to gravel and in sorting from well sorted to unsorted. The advance outwash is not exposed in the Inglewood Sub-basin.

Pre-Vashon glacial deposits underlying the Vashon Advance Outwash include both glacial and non-glacial units. Two finer-grained and three coarser-grained units have been defined within these undifferentiated deposits.

Most of the surficial soils in the upland areas of the Inglewood Sub-basin are mapped as Alderwood Series (Soil Conservation Service 1973) developed in the weathered Vashon Till and Everett soils developed in the recessional glacial outwash. The Alderwood soils are very gravelly sandy loam to very gravelly fine sandy loam and are typically moderately well drained, moderately deep, and are formed in glacial tills in upland areas. The Everett soils are somewhat excessively drained and gravelly.



K:\gis\3847_sammamish\basin_planning\mapdocs\reportmaps_060110\geol8x11_060110.mxd

Parametrix Data Source: USGS

N

0 2,000

Scale in Feet

- Inglewood Sub-basin
- Sammamish Town Center
- Alluvium (Qal)
- Mass Wastage Deposits (Qmw)
- Wetland Deposits (Qw)
- Vashon Recessional Outwash (Qvr, Qvr3, Qvi)
- Vashon Till (Qvt)
- Vashon Advance Outwash (Qva)
- Pre-Vashon Undifferentiad Deposits (Qpf)

Figure 9 Inglewood Sub-basin Geology



Parametrix 558-3847-002/01(07) 6/10 (B)

N

0 2,600

SCALE IN FEET

Figure 10
General Geology and Location of Geologic Cross Sections



Geologic Cross Section Along 228th Ave
City of Sammamish Town Center



Geologic Cross Section Along NE 8th Street
City of Sammamish Town Center

Parametrix 558-3847-002/01(07) 6/10 (B)

Figure 11
Geologic Cross Sections A-A' and B-B'

More recent surficial units mapped within the Inglewood Sub-basin include:

- Alluvium (Qal);
- Wetland deposits (Qw); and
- Mass-wastage deposits (Qmw).

Wetland deposits (Qw) are mapped along small portions of the upper reaches of George Davis Creek, and are described as peat and alluvium, poorly drained and intermittently wet.

3.3.2 Groundwater Occurrence

Groundwater resources of the Sammamish Plateau are described in Turney et al. (1995) and Leisch et al. (1963). Precipitation provides the source of recharge to shallow aquifers in the upland areas of the Sammamish Plateau. Recharge in the project vicinity is estimated to be 10 to 20 inches per year in the till, and 21 to 30 inches per year in the recessional outwash (Turney et al. 1995). Groundwater flow in the upper units is locally influenced by variations in lithology. Deeper aquifers are recharged by downward movement from shallow aquifers and by lateral flow from regional recharge areas to the east. In the upper aquifers of the project vicinity, overall groundwater flow is westward toward Lake Sammamish.

Areas of the Inglewood Sub-basin with recessional outwash mapped at the surface are designated as critical aquifer recharge areas in the Critical Areas Ordinance due to the permeable nature of these deposits. Although permeable, the relatively limited depths of the recessional outwash are not adequate to yield significant quantities of groundwater to wells. However, infiltration of precipitation through the recessional outwash provides an important source of recharge to underlying aquifers.

The upper part of the Vashon Till is typically more permeable than the lower part, and perched or semi-perched groundwater occurs locally within sand and gravel lenses. Wells completed in the till may yield small quantities of water that are adequate for domestic supply. The Vashon Advance Outwash yields a more reliable source of groundwater to some domestic wells in upland areas of the Sammamish Plateau completed at depths of approximately 100 to 300 feet.

Unconsolidated Pre-Vashon deposits underlying the Vashon Advance Outwash in the project vicinity provide the source of water supply to the City of Sammamish wells, completed at depths ranging from about 350 to 700 feet bgs, and elevations from 100 to less than -350 feet mean sea level (msl). Four wells are located in the Inglewood Sub-basin along 228th Avenue (Wells 4, 5, 11.1, and 11.2), completed at approximate depths from 500 to over 700 feet bgs. Wellhead protection areas are designated in accordance with the Critical Areas Ordinance for each of the City wells. Water wells along East Lake Sammamish Parkway are typically less than 100 feet deep and many have artesian flow.

3.4 SURFACE WATER HYDROLOGY

The surface water hydrology of the Inglewood Sub-basin is governed by rainfall rates, vegetative conditions (forest vs. grass), surface geology (permeable vs. impermeable geologic units), topography, and land development. Surface flow in the upper portion of George Davis Creek is seasonal, largely fed by groundwater supplied by the shallow recessional outwash aquifer. In the winter when water levels in the recessional outwash are high enough, local springs flow to George Davis Creek. Generally, the lower part of George Davis Creek (from about 212th Avenue NE to the mouth) flows year-round. There are several large wetlands bisecting 228th Avenue SE; these wetlands serve to store a significant amount of surface water. The presence of the highly infiltrative recessional outwash and large wetlands likely attenuates flows to the stream channel.

Currently, the basin is approximately 15 percent impervious. There was only one localized runoff-related problem identified in this basin. Runoff from 228th Avenue NE is currently discharged through an outfall near the top of the slope on the west side of 228th Avenue NE immediately north of SE 8th Street. This discharge has caused erosion and also may be contributing to saturated conditions that have resulted in the death of several large fir trees in this area (Photograph 1). Additionally, two other drainage issues were identified:

- Residential flooding on NE 217th Street; and
- Damaged culverts on NE 2nd Street.

The NE 217th Street flooding was brought to the City's attention by a local resident who experiences flooding from road runoff. The damaged culverts were identified during field visits by Parametrix. Capital projects to address these issues are described further in the recommended strategies in Section 4.

Photograph 1. Dying trees associated with saturated conditions on west side of 228th Avenue NE

3.4.1 Hydrologic Modeling

The surface hydrology of the Inglewood Sub-basin was modeled using MGS Flood, an HSPF-based (Hydrologic Simulation Program Fortran) continuous hydrologic model. The basin was divided into 17 sub-basins for the purposes of modeling (Figure 12). Existing and future hydrologic conditions were modeled to evaluate existing and potential future impacts related to increased flow rates. Additionally, the existing and future flows were compared to conditions that would have existed in a pre-developed (forested) condition. Current City of Sammamish stormwater regulations require new development to match pre-developed conditions for the 2-year and 100-year peak flow rates. The modeling results indicate that with future stormwater mitigation, pre-developed peak flow conditions can be met with application of these stormwater management techniques. Figure 13 shows existing, forested, and future mitigated flows for the 2-year, 10-year, and 100-year peak flow rates. The complete modeling results are provided in Appendix A.

Current stormwater requirements require management of flow rates and durations to minimize erosive forces in sensitive stream channels; however, they do not address increased stormwater volumes, which could affect wetland hydrology.



K:\gis\3847_sammamish\basin_planning\mapdocs\reportmaps_060110\Inglewood_tc_8x11_062410.mxd

Parametrix

N

0 2,000

Scale in Feet

Inglewood Sub-basins

Sammamish Town Center

Figure 12
Inglewood Sub-basins

2-Year Peak Discharge Comparison



10-Year Peak Discharge Comparison



100-Year Peak Discharge Comparison



Figure 13
Inglewood Sub-basin Hydrological Modeling Results

3.5 WETLANDS

Wetlands in the Inglewood Sub-basin were evaluated during a limited field investigation from publicly accessible sites. Wetlands were assessed in the field using a quick assessment method; a proper delineation would be necessary to confirm wetland classifications and ratings. Wetland data forms are provided in Appendix B. Prior to the field visit the following documents were reviewed:

- Inglewood Sub-basin Plan (City of Sammamish 2005);
- City of Sammamish Town Center Sub-Area Plan Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) (City of Sammamish 2007);
- Sammamish Stormwater Comprehensive Plan (City of Sammamish 2001);
- Wetland data on the City of Sammamish Web site; and
- National Wetland Inventory Maps.

The eastern portion of the Inglewood Sub-basin is located within the Town Center Special Study area. Most of the wetlands in the Inglewood Sub-basin are located in the eastern portion of the sub-basin; therefore, most of the wetlands have been delineated and rated as part of the Town Center Sub-Area Plan. Wetland locations are shown in Figure 14. As stated in the Town Center Sub-Area Plan DEIS, there may be unmapped wetlands on private properties. Wetlands in the Inglewood sub-basin are listed in Table 4 below; however, they are described in more detail in the Town Center Sub-Area Plan (City of Sammamish 2007).

The Inglewood Sub-basin contains numerous wetlands and is dominated by a large wetland complex, which begins in the Bear-Evans Creek Sub-Basin and continues west to approximately 222nd Avenue just north of Main Street. As stated in the Town Center Sub-Area Plan DEIS (City of Sammamish 2007), this wetland complex is important for groundwater recharge, erosion and flood protection, and maintaining downstream water quality and fish habitat. Wetland 1509, the primary wetland in this complex, is a Category I wetland and contains forested, scrub-shrub, and emergent vegetation classes as well as a bog or fen. Wetland 1511 is also rated a Category I wetland. This wetland contains forested, scrub-shrub, emergent, and aquatic bed vegetation classes and provides excellent habitat due to its size, diversity, and interspersion of habitats (Table 4).

Wetlands 13, 18, 1511, 1512, 1580B, 1509, SW 91, and SW 96 are all connected by George Davis Creek or its tributaries. Other wetlands in the basin may also be connected but their connections were not seen during the limited site visits. Most of the smaller wetlands in the basin are depressional. Many of the wetlands are affected by residential and other large developments.



Parametrix

N

0 2,000

Scale in Feet

Inglewood Sub-basin

Field Modified/Additional Wetlands

NWI/ City of Sammamish Mapped Wetlands

Figure 14
Inglewood Sub-basin Wetlands

Table 4. Inglewood Sub-basin Wetlands

Wetland Name[a]	Approximate Size (acres)	Characteristics	Cowardin Classification	Hydrogeomorphic Classification	Hydrology	Impacts	Mitigation Opportunities	Current Buffers	City of Sammamish (Quick Rating)
1509 (East Lake Sammamish 1509)	150	Wetland complex with bog; headwater tributary to George Davis Creek; high value wildlife habitat; partially in the Bear-Evans Basin	Forested, scrub-shrub, emergent	Depressional	Surface water, seasonally flooded/saturated, permanently flooded/saturated	Residential development, pipeline	Enhancement	Forested and grass lawn; Sammamish buffer is 215 feet	Category I (High)
1511 (East Lake Sammamish 11)	4.4	Wetland at headwater intermittent tributary to George Davis Creek; several man-made ponds	Forested, scrub-shrub, emergent, aquatic bed	Depressional, slope	Surface water	Residential development	Restoration	Forested, herbaceous-native, grass lawn; Sammamish buffer is 150 feet.	Category I (Moderate)
1577 (East Lake Sammamish 77)	1.6	Includes two headwater intermittent tributaries to George Davis Creek; site may be used by pileated woodpecker	Forested, scrub-shrub, emergent	Depressional, riverine, slope	Surface water, seasonally flooded/saturated	Road		Forested, herbaceous-native, grass lawn; Sammamish buffer is 100 feet.	Category I (special characteristics), Category II (functions) (Moderate)
1580B	1.1	Associated with intermittent tributary to George Davis Creek	Emergent	Depressional, riverine, slope	Surface water	Residential development, grazing/agriculture	Restore buffer	No buffer; Sammamish buffer is 50 feet	Category IV (Low)
SW91	0.03	Provides moderate habitat and water quality functions but no hydrologic functions	Emergent	Slope	Not assessed	Not assessed	Not assessed	Sammamish buffer is 50 feet	Category IV
SW92	0.3	Has a diversity of habitats and possibly provides habitat for pileated woodpecker	Forested, scrub-shrub, emergent	Depressional	Not assessed	Not assessed	Not assessed	Sammamish buffer is 50 feet	Category III
SW93	0.06	Provides moderate habitat value because of diversity of hydroperiods and vegetation. Part of a wetland complex associated with an intermittent stream.	Forested, scrub-shrub, emergent	Depressional	Not assessed	Not assessed	Not assessed	Sammamish buffer is 50 feet	Category III
SW94	0.4	Provides moderate habitat, water quality, and hydrologic functions.	Forested, scrub-shrub, emergent	Depressional	Not assessed	Not assessed	Not assessed	Sammamish buffer is 50 feet	Category III
SW96	0.01	Associated with intermittent stream	Forested, scrub-shrub, emergent	Depressional	Not assessed	Not assessed	Not assessed	Sammamish buffer is 100 feet	Category II
1502	>2	Provides excellent water quality functions and moderate habitat functions	Forested, scrub-shrub, emergent	Depressional	Groundwater	Residential development	Restoration	Forested and lawn grass for most of its circumference; Sammamish buffer is 100 feet.	Category II (Moderate)
1559 (East Lake Sammamish 59)	6.3	Provides moderate water quality, hydrologic, and habitat functions.	Forested, scrub-shrub	Depressional	Seeps, seasonally flooded/saturated	Residential development	Minimal	Forested for 1/2 of its circumference; Sammamish buffer is 75 feet.	Category II (Low)
1832 (Evans Creek #32, Llama Lake)		Provides moderate water quality and hydrologic functions and low habitat functions	Emergent, open water	Depressional	Groundwater, seasonally flooded/saturated	Residential development	Restoration	Forested and lawn grass; Sammamish buffer is 50 feet.	Category III (Low)
13		May be a stormwater feature created from construction of condos. South of Inglewood Hill Road	Emergent	Depressional					
14		At base of slope near Presbyterian Church north of Inglewood Hill Road	Emergent	Depressional	Seep, runoff	Residential development		Forested for 1/2 of its circumference	(Low)
18	17.2	Headwater tributary to George Davis Creek	Forested, scrub-shrub, emergent	Riverine	Surface water	Residential development	Restore artificial ponds; replant lawn with native vegetation	Buffer for 1/2 of its circumference	(High)

[a] If the wetland was previously named, this name was used. If the wetland was not named, wetlands were numbered beginning with 1 and ending with 18. Previous wetland names (e.g., Wetland 17) were not used to avoid two wetlands having the same name.

3.6 STREAM AND HILLSLOPE GEOMORPHOLOGY

In the early 1990s King County conducted field studies of George Davis Creek and the Inglewood Sub-basin. Results of these efforts are documented in the King County Basin and Nonpoint Action Plan for the East Lake Sammamish Basin (King County 1994) as well as the East Lake Sammamish Basin Conditions Report—Preliminary Analysis (King County 1990). The 2008 field efforts of Parametrix were compared to field notes collected by King County in the early 1990s. The King County evaluation occurred after a very large storm event in January 1990 that flooded East Lake Sammamish Parkway and caused extensive damage to the George Davis Creek channel downstream of 216th Avenue NE. The channel in this area is located in a forested ravine with very steep-sided slopes. Evidence of several landslides was observed by King County, and again by Parametrix, particularly on the south side of the ravine. In the intervening years since the King County study, a large restoration effort was conducted, with large woody debris and root wad structures installed in the stream channel at approximate 50- to 100-foot intervals. It appears that these structures serve to minimize downstream sediment movement from landslides and high flows.

One 12-inch-diameter stormwater discharge pipe was observed on the north hillside of George Davis Creek. This pipe has been tightlined down the hill and is equipped with an energy dissipator. Other smaller stormwater pipes were observed from individual residences on the south hillside. These pipes have all been tightlined to the stream channel to prevent hillslope erosion.

George Davis Creek flows intermittently and is fed by both surface flow and groundwater seepage. The channel appears to be in fairly stable condition, with the exception of an area just upstream of East Lake Sammamish Parkway adjacent to several residences. The creek is incised in this area ranging from 2.5 to 6 feet (Photograph 2).

Photograph 2. Incised stream channel adjacent to residence

Upstream of 216th Avenue NE, George Davis Creek and its tributaries consist of stream channels that are alternately straightened channels located adjacent to roads or residences and undefined channels associated with wetlands. The stream channel segments upstream of 216th Avenue NE are dry most of the year (Photograph 3).

Photograph 3. Dry streambed upstream of 216th Avenue NE

Appendix C summarizes conditions observed in 1990 and 2008, documented downstream to upstream. Appendix D provides a sequence of photographs of George Davis Creek, starting at the mouth and proceeding upstream. The photographs are representative of the general stream conditions in the various portions of the stream. Overall, the riparian buffers appear to be functioning properly and the stream channel is generally stable.

3.7 FISH HABITAT AND USE

George Davis Creek historically served as habitat for coho and sockeye salmon according to A Catalog of Washington Streams and Salmon Utilization (Williams et al. 1975). Aquatic habitat conditions were assessed by fish biologists during field reconnaissance surveys conducted on December 3 and 4, 2008. In general, habitat conditions between East Lake Sammamish Parkway and NE 6th Street could be considered good. This area has a very good riparian corridor, good supply of large woody debris (partially due to restoration efforts), and good quality of stream gravel. However, there are multiple fish passage barriers that prevent anadromous fish from using this reach and the supply of water is intermittent. The most downstream fish barrier is near the mouth of Lake Sammamish, where George Davis Creek is conveyed through a house in a concrete box structure. The downstream end of this barrier has been removed, with reconstruction of the house; however, the upstream pipe that conveys flow through another residential lot will not be replaced. The East Lake Sammamish Parkway crossing is also a fish passage barrier, consisting of several stormwater manholes and culverts. Just upstream of East Lake Sammamish Parkway is a 3.5-foot-tall concrete water diversion dam (no longer operational) that conveys water through holes in the wall (Photograph 4).

Photograph 4. George Davis Creek flow through old water supply diversion dam upstream of East Lake Sammamish Parkway

3.8 WATER QUALITY

No recent water quality samples have been collected for George Davis Creek. In the 2005 Inglewood Sub-basin Plan (Entranco 2005), it was reported that George Davis Creek is on Ecology's 303(d) Category 5 list for impaired waters due to elevated levels of fecal coliform bacteria. George Davis Creek is still on the 2008 303(d) list for fecal coliform bacteria (Ecology 2008).

4. RECOMMENDED STRATEGIES

Specific features that define the Inglewood Sub-basin and are important considerations in the development of projects and strategies are as follows:

Geology—The underlying geology in the Inglewood Sub-basin consists of compacted till and highly infiltrative recessional glacial outwash. The outwash serves a very important function in this basin, serving as a gigantic subsurface reservoir that recharges deeper groundwater aquifers and supplies flow to George Davis Creek and associated wetlands. It is important to minimize development of impervious surfaces on these highly infiltrative areas to protect the groundwater recharge capacity.

Wetlands—There are very high quality, large wetlands in the Inglewood Sub-basin that provide hydrologic functions of storing water and attenuating flood flows as well as providing diverse habitat for birds and other wildlife species. It is important to protect these areas for their critical functions.

Fish Passage Barriers—There are at least three fish passage barriers on George Davis Creek within the first 1/2 mile of Lake Sammamish. Despite relatively good fish habitat, these barriers represent a costly and unlikely restoration of anadromous fish populations to the lower reaches of George Davis Creek. In the 2005 Inglewood Sub-basin Plan, replacement of just one barrier at the East Lake Sammamish Parkway crossing was estimated to cost $1.5 million, with the availability of vacant parcels. Since 2005, the vacant parcels have been developed and there are no parcels available for stream realignment to allow for fish passage. The cost today to do this work would be significantly more and is not feasible. For this reason, the removal of these barriers is not recommended as part of this plan.

The projects and strategies recommended below are designed to preserve ecological function in areas that are currently functioning well, solve existing problems, and prevent future degradation as the Inglewood Sub-basin is further developed. Specific projects identified are presented in more detail in Appendix E.

4.1 PRESERVATION AND ENHANCEMENT OF ECOLOGICAL FUNCTION

The natural areas (George Davis Creek and associated wetlands) in the Inglewood Sub-basin are now largely protected through existing ordinances; however, past actions and developments have resulted in fish passage barriers and loss or degradation of wetlands. Still, the George Davis Creek riparian corridor and many of the associated wetlands are in very good condition. Through the City's Critical Areas Ordinance, areas adjacent to stream corridors and wetlands are protected with buffers up to 215 feet. It is important to enforce this ordinance and prevent encroachment of development into stream and wetland buffers to prevent future degradation.

The 2005 Inglewood Sub-basin Plan (Entranco 2005) recommended making the mouth of George Davis Creek fish passable. Given the extent of barriers in George Davis Creek and the availability of year-round flow, it is probably not worth the expense of providing fish passage in this stream when there are other projects that would result in greater benefits to fish and the natural resources.

Table 5 lists some strategies to preserve and enhance existing ecological function in the Inglewood Sub-basin. Full descriptions and planning level cost estimates are provided in Appendix E.

Table 5. Strategies to Preserve or Enhance Ecological Function in the Inglewood Sub-basin

Strategy	Project Identification	Type of Strategy			Description	Potential Partners
		Planning	Education	Capital		
Enhance Wetland 1509	Enh-1			X	Restore/enhance pasture area in Wetland 17	Private property owners, developers in need of potential mitigation, conservancy groups
Conduct wetland tours	Ed-1		X		Sponsor wetland tours to foster appreciation and stewardship of Sammamish wetlands	Audubon Society, non-profit environmental groups

4.1.1 Capital Project

4.1.1.1 Implement Wetland Enhancement

Washington State and federal regulatory agencies require that mitigation efforts follow the prescribed sequence below:

- Avoiding the impacts altogether by not taking a certain action or parts of an action.
- Minimizing impacts by limiting the degree or magnitude of the action and its implementation, by using appropriate technology, or by taking affirmative steps to avoid or reduce impacts.
- Rectifying the impact by repairing, rehabilitating, or restoring the affected environment.
- Reducing or eliminating the impact over time by preservation and maintenance operations during the life of the action.
- Compensating for the impact by replacing, enhancing, or providing substitute resources or environments.
- Monitoring the impact and taking appropriate corrective measures.

In light of these requirements, preservation of existing wetlands is recommended, especially the wetland complex consisting of Wetlands 1509 and 1577. This can be done through enforcement of existing critical areas regulations (SMC 21A.50), outright purchase of properties, or establishment of conservation easements. Outright purchase of these properties is likely cost prohibitive; however, the City could consider using funds from their critical areas mitigation fee program (SMC 21A.50.360) to secure properties consistent with a watershed-based mitigation strategy. Alternatively, these projects could act as stand-alone watershed management projects. Mitigation opportunities are limited in the Inglewood sub-basin primarily because so much of it has recently been developed with inadequate protection of the wetlands and their buffers. Entire subdivisions and schools would need to be removed to make significant improvements to the watershed, which is impractical. In addition, due to the recent development a number of the wetlands and their buffers have been affected and mitigation has occurred. The areas that have already been subject to mitigation cannot be used for mitigation again. The City should also focus their efforts on ensuring these mitigation areas are successful, as well as effective enforcement of existing regulations including monitoring, contingency measures, and collection of bonds (SMC 21A.50.140 to 21A.50.190).

Because mitigation opportunities are limited, only one potential mitigation project is suggested. The proposed project is based on limited field observations from publicly accessible sites and photographic interpretation. Other mitigation opportunities likely exist. The proposed mitigation option would require a wetland delineation and further evaluation of the wetland for mitigation potential. Mitigation would require either purchase of the property, establishment of a conservation easement, and cooperation of the landowner.

4.1.2 Educational Strategy

4.1.2.1 Conduct Wetland Tours (Ed-1)

The Inglewood Sub-basin has some high quality wetlands that provide important ecological functions, including attenuation of stormwater runoff and habitat for terrestrial and aquatic species. One of the best ways to educate citizens about stewardship of their natural environment is to show them. Wetland tours that feature Wetlands 1509, 1511, and 1577 in the Inglewood Sub-basin, as well as other unique wetland environments on the Sammamish Plateau would be one way to promote environmental stewardship and increase understanding of the importance of wetlands.

4.2 REDUCE EFFECTS OF ONGOING STORMWATER DISCHARGES FROM EXISTING DEVELOPMENT

Three stormwater drainage problems were identified during this basin planning effort. Aside from these issues, there does not appear to be any significant flooding, stream channel erosion, or wetland elevation changes associated with stormwater discharges in the Inglewood Sub-basin. This may be due in part to the presence of highly infiltrative recessional outwash.

Table 6 lists projects to reduce the effects of ongoing stormwater discharges in Inglewood Sub-basin. Full descriptions and planning level cost estimates are provided in Appendix E.

Table 6. Projects to Reduce Ongoing Stormwater Impacts

Strategy	Project Identification	Type of Strategy			Description	Potential Partners
		Planning	Education	Capital		
NE 217th Street Road Drainage Modification	CIP-1			X	Modify road drainage to prevent flooding at adjacent residence.	None
228th Avenue NE Drainage Modification	CIP-2A or 2B			X	Modify discharge of stormwater runoff from road outfall to prevent downstream erosion and saturated conditions that appear to be causing trees to die.	None
NE 2nd Street Culvert Replacement	CIP-3			X	Replace damaged culverts at driveway crossing to prevent possible roadway flooding.	Property owner

4.2.1 Capital Strategies

4.2.1.1 NE 217th Street Road Drainage Modification (CIP-1)

This project involves modifying the drainage features on NE 217th Street, including installation of a curb to the road shoulder to direct water away from the residence that experiences flooding. Catch basins and pipes would be installed to collect and convey water from the east side of the road to the existing detention facility located downstream.

4.2.1.2 228th Avenue NE Drainage Modification (CIP-2)

This project involves modifying an existing drainage outfall located on the west side of 228th Avenue NE. Currently, the outfall discharges to an open channel on a steep slope and conveys water to the base of the hill where it pools and has resulted in saturated conditions that have killed several trees. This project consists of tightlining the stormwater runoff from the outfall to an existing pond.

4.2.1.3 NE 2nd Street Culvert Replacement (CIP-3)

This project involves the replacement of two 24-inch culverts and a 12-inch culvert that conveys George Davis Creek under a driveway on NE 2nd Street. The culverts are damaged and could result in flooding on NE 2nd. The culverts are sized appropriately and could be replaced with similar culverts of equivalent capacity.

4.3 PLAN FOR FUTURE IMPACTS AND MINIMIZE EFFECTS

The Inglewood Sub-basin will likely undergo changes in the next several decades, including development of the proposed Town Center and conversion of forested parcels to denser development in accordance with current zoning. Most of the parcels that can be expected to be developed over the next several decades are located in critical areas or within the Town Center. In these areas there are regulations and standards in place to require responsible management of stormwater to protect the resources. Stormwater management techniques and strategies are constantly evolving; currently, the regional emphasis is on low impact development to minimize the effects of stormwater runoff. This is the recommended approach for the Town Center (Parametrix 2009a), and is one of the only ways to mitigate stormwater volume resulting from land conversion.

The Town Center Comprehensive Stormwater Plan recommended using the LID techniques listed in Table 7 to mitigate stormwater runoff.

Table 7. Summary of Stormwater Treatment Requirements and Preferred Choices

Type of Impervious Surface	Treatment Required		First Choice	Second Choice	Third Choice
	Water Quality	Flow Control			
Rooftops		√	Rainwater Harvesting and Reuse	Green Roofs	Bioretention
Roads and Parking Lots	√	√	Minimize Surfaces	Bioretention	Pervious Pavement
Sidewalks and Patios		√	Pervious Pavement	Full Dispersion	Bioretention

The City of Sammamish has adopted an LID ordinance in which LID is provided incentives for new development. There has been little opportunity to test the effectiveness of this ordinance for encouraging use of LID because the economic slowdown of 2009 to 2010 has resulted in little to no development in the city. Whereas the LID ordinance is voluntary, LID will likely be mandatory (to the extent practical) in the Town Center (City of Sammamish Town Center Draft Comprehensive Stormwater Plan, 2010).

In addition to the use of technical methods to accomplish stormwater management goals, such as LID, there are other implementation mechanisms that could be explored in the future. Some of these implementation strategies are described in the Draft Non-Traditional Stormwater Approaches Memorandum (Parametrix 2009b).

Maintenance of the recessional outwash infiltration area is important because this helps ensure a stable flow regime in George Davis Creek. The critical aquifer recharge areas designated in the Critical Areas Ordinance coincide with these outwash areas. The ordinance requires that 75 percent of stormwater volume generated from development in these areas is infiltrated. This requirement should be enforced through the development review process.

Several programmatic strategies were recommended in the 2005 Inglewood Sub-basin Plan (Entranco 2005), including the following:

- Maintain Current Detention Standards;
- Encourage Widespread Use of Low Impact Development Techniques;
- Maintain Hydraulic Connectivity to Infiltration Areas;
- Map Infiltration Areas;
- Identify Potentially Flood-Prone Properties;
- Improve Wetland Maps;
- Preserve Infiltration Areas as a Natural Resource;
- Encourage Public Education and Outreach Programs;
- Reduce Phosphorus to Lake Sammamish;
- Remove Solids for Protection of Infiltration Areas;
- Limit Livestock Access to Creeks;
- Install Flow Gauges in the Upper Basin; and
- Investigate Sources of Fecal Coliform Bacteria.

An assessment of these strategies and current recommendations is shown in Table 8. No additional strategies or projects are recommended at this time to address future impacts.

Table 8. Previously Recommended Strategies to Plan for and Reduce Effects of Future Stormwater Runoff

Strategy	Purpose	Current Relevance	Concur with Recommendation?
Maintain Current Detention Standards	Reduce flooding potential throughout the basin, limit impacts to stream channels.	Although there are few flooding problems and little evidence of stream channel erosion due to high flows, current flow control standards should be maintained so that problems do not arise if the infiltration	Yes

Table 8. Previously Recommended Strategies to Plan for and Reduce Effects of Future Stormwater Runoff (continued)

Strategy	Purpose	Current Relevance	Concur with Recommendation?
		capacity of the outwash soils is exceeded.	
Encourage Widespread Use of Low Impact Development Techniques	Use on-site infiltration techniques to reduce sizes of traditional facilities and recharge aquifers.	The City is encouraging the widespread use of LID techniques through its LID ordinance, and demonstration projects such as the use of pervious pavement at City Hall.	Yes
Maintain Hydraulic Connectivity to Infiltration Areas	Provide opportunities for infiltration by maximizing use of open conveyance systems that are unlined.	Much of the stormwater infrastructure in the Inglewood Sub-basin consists of open conveyance systems. Continue using open systems where possible.	Yes
Map Infiltration Areas	Understanding the best infiltration areas will facilitate better protection and/or use of these areas for stormwater management.	Areas of existing infiltration areas are based on geologic maps prepared by the USGS. Geotechnical reports for projects in the area match geologic units mapped by the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS). This level of detail should be sufficient for planning-level stormwater management. Site-specific investigations should be done at the time of project development.	No
Identify Potentially Flood-Prone Properties	Know in advance what properties are likely to flood due to exceedance of infiltration capacity in outwash.	Unless there have been specific problems associated with infiltration capacities being exceeded, this would be difficult to evaluate without a detailed subsurface evaluation.	No
Reduce Phosphorus to Lake Sammamish	Improve water quality in Lake Sammamish through enhanced stormwater treatment that removes phosphorus	Phosphorus removal should be more focused on the lower portion of the basin, because much of the stormwater runoff in the upper part of the basin infiltrates and effectively removes phosphorus.	Yes
Remove Solids for Protection of Infiltration Areas	Removal of large sediment from runoff will help preserve beneficial function of outwash soils for infiltration.	Construction requirements for temporary sediment and erosion control and stormwater facility pre-treatment requirements target removal of sediment. Regular inspection of construction sites and stormwater facilities should be done to identify and correct problems.	No, already done
Limit Livestock Access to Creeks	Limit livestock access to stream channels to prevent sedimentation and fecal coliform bacteria pollution.	Very few livestock were observed in this basin. Confirm if this is a current problem.	No, unless this is still a problem
Install Flow Gauges in the Upper Basin	Recording flows in the outwash area will provide a better understanding of infiltration capacity.	Gauges have not been installed, but would add valuable information.	Yes
Investigate Sources of Fecal Coliform Bacteria	Identification of fecal coliform sources will help target reductions.	It is not known whether fecal coliform bacteria is still a problem in George Davis Creek because the water quality data are old. Source tracing is costly and unreliable.	No
Improve Wetland Maps	More accurate wetland maps are important for	The wetland maps should be updated because delineations are only valid	Yes

Table 8. Previously Recommended Strategies to Plan for and Reduce Effects of Future Stormwater Runoff (continued)

Strategy	Purpose	Current Relevance	Concur with Recommendation?
	enforcement of CAO requirements and protection of these resources.	for 5 years and the existing wetland information appears to be out of date.	
Preserve Infiltration Areas as a Natural Resource	Protection of the infiltration capacity of the outwash in the basin will preserve this natural resource and help maintain moderate flows to downstream reaches.	Most of the undeveloped infiltration areas are also designated as critical areas that have additional requirements for stormwater management. The City should evaluate whether the areas identified in the 2005 Inglewood Sub-basin Plan are adequately protected with ordinances.	Yes, unless adequate protection already exists
Encourage Public Outreach and Education Programs	Work with land owners to achieve a positive outcome beneficial to George Davis Creek.	The City is required to do public outreach and education as part of its NPDES Phase II permit. Inglewood Sub-basin could be targeted for certain types of education.	Yes

5. PROJECT PRIORITIZATION

The projects recommended above represent solutions to existing problems in the Inglewood Sub-basin. Many of the recommended projects would be eligible for grant funding. Parametrix prioritized the projects using several criteria, including (1) likelihood of success at achieving the desired outcome, (2) degree to which project meets multiple objectives, (3) degree to which project alleviates threats to wildlife and habitat or property, and (4) cost.

5.1 CRITERIA

Table 9 lists the criteria and rank the scores associated with a high, medium, or low ranking for each criterion.

Table 9. Criteria and Scoring for Project Prioritization

	Rank scores		
Criteria	**High (5 points)**	**Medium (3 points)**	**Low (1 point)**
Likelihood of Success	Proven in other cases	Mixed results in other cases	Unproven
Number of Issues Addressed	More than three	Two to three	One
Protection of Habitat	Protects both habitat and property	Protects habitat or property	Protects neither
Cost Category (first 5 years)	< $20,000	($20,000 – $50,000)	(> $50,000)

The combined scores of individual criteria were ranked according to the following scores:

Low priority (6 to 8 total points)

Medium priority (10 to 12 total points)

High priority (over 12 total points)

5.2 MATRIX OF PROJECTS

Table 10 lists the recommended projects that would preserve ecological function, provides proposed costs, and ranks the priority for project implementation.

Table 10. Matrix of Recommended Projects

		Type of Strategy						Project Criteria				
Strategy	**Project Identification**	**Planning**	**Education**	**Capital**	**Description**	**Potential Partners**	**Cost**	**Likelihood of Success**	**Number of Issues Addressed**	**Protects Habitat**	**Cost**	**Priority**
Conduct Wetland Tours	Ed-1		X		Sponsor wetland tours to foster appreciation and stewardship of Sammamish wetlands.	Audubon Society, non-profit environmental groups	$6,000	L	L	L	H	Low
NE 217th Street Road Drainage Modification	CIP-1			X	Improve road drainage to reduce flooding to neighboring residence.	None	$59,000	H	L	L	L	Low
228th Avenue NE Stormwater Discharge Modification	CIP-2			X	Modify stormwater outfall discharge from 228th Avenue NE to reduce erosion and saturated conditions.	None	$55,000 - $78,000	H	M	M	L	Medium
NE 2nd Street Culvert Replacement	CIP-3			X	Replace culverts at NE 2nd Street driveway.	None	$40,000	H	L	L	H	Medium

6. REFERENCES

City of Sammamish. 2003. City of Sammamish Comprehensive Plan. Adopted September 16, 2003. Updated August 2006 per Ordinance No. 02003-130.

City of Sammamish. 2007. City of Sammamish Town Center Sub-Area Plan DEIS.

City of Sammamish. 2009. City of Sammamish Town Center Draft Comprehensive Stormwater Plan. Prepared by Parametrix. October 2009.

Ecology (Washington State Department of Ecology). 2008. Water Quality Assessment 303(d) list approved by EPA on January 29, 2009. Accessed at: http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wq/303d/2008/index.html.

Entranco. 2005. City of Sammamish Inglewood Sub-basin Plan. Bellevue, Washington. February 2005.

Hong West and Associates, Inc. 1996. Geotechnical Study: Proposed 228th Avenue Issaquah-Pine Lake Road, King County, Washington. Prepared for Tams Consultants Inc. Available from Geomap NW.

King County. 1990. East Lake Sammamish Basin Conditions Report—Preliminary Analysis. King County Surface Water Management Division. Seattle, Washington. September 1990.

King County. 1994. Final East Lake Sammamish Basin and Nonpoint Action Plan. Report prepared by the Issaquah/East Lake Sammamish Watershed Management Committee. King County Lead Agency.

King County. 1995. East Lake Sammamish Basin and Nonpoint Action Plan Annual Report, 1994 water year. King County Department of Public Works, Surface Water Management Division. Seattle, Washington.

Leisch, B.A., C.E. Price, and Kenneth L. Walters. 1963. Geology and Groundwater Resources of Northwestern King County, Washington. Washington Division of Water Resources Water Supply Bulletin No. 20. Prepared in cooperation with U.S. Geological Survey.

Nelson, David, and Associates, Inc. 1987. Geotechnical Evaluation, Lancaster Ridge, King County, Washington. Prepared for Lakeridge Development Corporation, Bellevue, Washington. Available from Geomap NW.

Parametrix. 2009a. Comprehensive Stormwater Master Plan. Prepared for the City of Sammamish. Bellevue, Washington.

Parametrix. 2009b. Draft Non-traditional Stormwater Approaches Memorandum. Bellevue, Washington.

Sammamish Plateau Water and Sewer District. 2003. Wastewater Comprehensive Plan. Volume 1 Report. Draft Approved for Distribution. October 2003.

Soil Conservation Service. 1973. Soil Survey of King County Area, Washington.

Terra Associates, Inc. 1995. Geotechnical Report—Site No. 61, Elementary School, Lake Washington School District #414, King County, Washington. Prepared for Lake Washington School District. Available from Geomap NW.

Terra Associates, Inc. 1998. Preliminary Geotechnical Report—Lein Plat, 228th Avenue SE and SE 3rd Street Right-of-way, King County, Washington. Prepared for Doneshvar & Associates, Kirkland, Washington. Available from Geomap NW.

Terra Associates, Inc. 1999. Subsurface Exploration, Skinner North Gravity Interceptor, Sammamish, Washington. Prepared for Pacific Properties, Inc., Bellevue, Washington. Available from Geomap NW.

Turney, G.L., S.C. Kahle, and N.P. Dion. 1995. Geohydrology and Ground-water Quality of East King County, Washington. Water Resources Investigations Report 94-4082. Prepared in cooperation with Seattle-King County Department of Public Health, Tacoma, Washington.

USGS (U.S. Geological Survey). 2006. Geologic Map of the Issaquah 7.5' Quadrangle, King County, Washington by Derek B. Booth, Timothy J. Walsh, Kathy Goetz Troost, and Scott A. Shimel.

Williams, R.W., R.M. Laramie, and J.J. Ames. 1975. A Catalog of Washington Streams and Salmon Utilization. Volume 1—Puget Sound. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife. Olympia, Washington.

WSDOH (Washington State Department of Health). 2011. Water Facilities Inventory (WFI) Form. System ID No. 409009, System Name: Sammamish Plateau Water & Sewer.

APPENDIX A

Hydrologic Modeling Report

Hydrologic Analysis of the Inglewood Basin, Thompson Basin and Sammamish Town Center Using the HSPF Model



Prepared for

The City of Sammamish

by

MGS Engineering Consultants, Inc.

7326 Boston Harbor Road NE
Olympia, WA 98506
(360) 570-3450

December 8, 2009

Hydrologic and Hydraulic Analysis of Inglewood Basin, Thompson Basin, and Sammamish Town Center Using the HSPF Model

Prepared for

The City of Sammamish

by

MGS Engineering Consultants, Inc.

7326 Boston Harbor Road NE
Olympia, WA 98506
(360) 570-3450

MGS Engineering Consultants, Inc.

MGS Engineering Consultants, Inc.
7326 Boston Harbor Road NE
Olympia, Washington 98506
(360) 570-3450

The engineering analyses and technical material presented in this report were prepared under the supervision and direction of the undersigned professional engineer.

Bruce Barker, P.E.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report documents the development of hydrologic models used in the analysis of the Inglewood Basin, Thompson Basin, and Sammamish Town Center. The models were developed to quantify the runoff conditions in the two principal streams; George Davis and Ebright creeks under historic, current, and future land use. In addition, the models were used to analyze the effectiveness of stormwater controls at mitigating the increased runoff associated with future development in the basins.

Two hydrologic models were used in the analysis; the Hydrological Simulation Program-Fortran (HSPF) model and MGSFlood. HSPF has been used extensively in the Puget Sound region over the past 20 years for stormwater analysis. The HSPF model input was originally developed by King County as part of East Lake Sammamish Basin Plan in the mid 1980's and subsequently updated by the City of Sammamish for the Inglewood Basin Plan in 2004. The model input was updated and refined for the current study and recalibrated to streamflow data collected over a 20 month period from October 2001 through May 2003. HSPF model input and calibrated parameters were used in MGSFlood to analyze mitigation alternatives that included stormwater detention and Low Impact Development (LID).

The Inglewood Basin encompasses approximately 1640 acres (2.6 square miles) of suburban land in the City of Sammamish tributary to George Davis Creek. The geology in the central portion of the watershed is composed of highly infiltrative glacial outwash deposits. The outwash infiltrates the majority of surface flow produced in the upper parts of the watershed and results in little or no flow in the stream immediately upstream of the ravine. The stream intersects the groundwater table in the ravine and receives the majority of flow via groundwater discharge in this area. The groundwater discharge also produces year around base flow in the lower reaches of the stream. The outwash deposit infiltrates and stores runoff from the upper watershed and is equivalent to approximately 7,000 acre-feet of stormwater detention storage. Flows in the lower stream reaches are relatively low (attenuated) during floods because of the storage that occurs in the outwash deposit.

The Thompson Basin is located adjacent to the Inglewood basin and drains 800 acres (1.3 square miles) of suburban land via Ebright Creek. The Thompson Basin does not have the same infiltrative outwash deposit as the Inglewood basin, but does have a large wetland (Wetland 17) situated at the top of the ravine. This 30 acre wetland provides substantial flood attenuation and buffering of flows entering from the uplands before discharging to the ravine.

Historic (forested), existing, and future build-out conditions were simulated with the hydrologic models, and flood peak and flow duration statistics were computed. Little or no increases in runoff rates relative to existing conditions were predicted under the mitigated future land use scenario for the Inglewood Basin. In the Thompson Basin,

future peak flow rates were predicted to decrease relative to existing conditions. These results show that stormwater mitigation designed according to the City's stormwater detention standard, which seeks to control runoff rates and durations to forested conditions, is effective at mitigating increased runoff associated with development. Because of this, the rates of erosion and flooding should not increase in the future and in most areas of the Thompson Basin, may actually decrease provided that the facilities are properly designed, constructed, and maintained.

The report includes the following recommendations to maintain a stable flow regime to ensure the health of the stream system in the future:

- Maintenance of Outwash Infiltration Areas – The glacial outwash deposit in the central part of the Inglewood Basin is currently infiltrating the majority of surface runoff from the upper watershed. Maintaining the infiltration function of this area is critical to ensuring a stable flow regime and the health of the stream. In addition, infiltration of urban runoff should be encouraged wherever feasible in the Thompson watershed.

- On-Site Detention Standard – The City's proposed detention standard, which is consistent with the 2005 Ecology Stormwater Management Manual, is effective at mitigating the increased potential for flooding and erosion associated with development. Stormwater detention facilities designed according to this standard are large and often expensive to construct. Low Impact Development (LID) methods provide a means to reduce the rate and volume of runoff associated with development, and increases the amount of potential groundwater recharge. LID methods can reduce the size of detention facilities, or replace them altogether. LID methods should be encouraged to the greatest extent practical for new construction in the Inglewood and Thompson Basins.

- Streamflow Monitoring – Streamflow gages have been operated and maintained by a private contractor in the past at the mouth of George Davis and Ebright creeks. These gages should be reestablished and the data collected from them quality checked and validated on an on-going basis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 2

HSPF MODEL ANALYSIS APPROACH 2

SUBBASIN DELINEATION INGLEWOOD BASIN/GEORGE DAVIS CREEK 2
SUBBASIN DELINEATION THOMPSON BASIN/EBRIGHT CREEK 2
SUBBASIN DELINEATION TOWN CENTER 3
LAND USE SCENARIOS ANALYZED 5
Historic Land Use 5
Existing Land Use 5
Future Land Use 5
Land Cover Categories 5

GEOLOGY 9

HSPF MODEL CONFIGURATION 11

INGLEWOOD BASIN 11
THOMPSON BASIN 14
STORMWATER DETENTION SIMULATION 16

HSPF MODEL CALIBRATION 17

INTRODUCTION 17
CALIBRATION DATA 17
HSPF MODEL CALIBRATION RESULTS 18

TOWN CENTER ANALYSIS USING THE MGSFLOOD MODEL 20

HSPF WATERSHED MODEL – ANALYSIS/PREDICTION APPROACH 20

SIMULATION PERIOD 20
PEAK FLOW MAGNITUDE-FREQUENCY STATISTICS 20
FLOW DURATION STATISTICS 21

FLOOD FREQUENCY AND FLOW DURATION RESULTS 23

INTRODUCTION 23
FLOOD PEAK DISCHARGE RESULTS 23
FLOW DURATION RESULTS 31

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS 35

RECOMMENDATIONS 36

REFERENCES 37

APPENDIX A – LAND USE DATA 39

Hydrologic Analysis of the Inglewood Basin, Thompson Basin, and Sammamish Town Center

INTRODUCTION

This report presents findings of a hydrologic analysis of the Inglewood and Thompson Basins in the City of Sammamish. The analysis was performed using the Hydrological Simulation Program Fortran[1] (HSPF) and MGSFlood[2] hydrologic models. The purpose of the analysis was to determine streamflow magnitude-frequency and flow duration statistics at locations of interest in the watersheds under existing and future land use, and determine the effectiveness of mitigation alternatives.

The proposed Sammamish Town Center project, which consists of approximately 208 acres of residential and commercial development, straddles the Thompson/Inglewood basin divide. MGSFlood model and input was developed for historic, existing and future land use. MGSFlood includes routines for quickly analyzing mitigation alternatives including detention and Low Impact Development (LID) techniques.

HSPF MODEL ANALYSIS APPROACH

SUBBASIN DELINEATION INGLEWOOD BASIN/GEORGE DAVIS CREEK

The Inglewood Basin encompasses approximately 1640 acres (2.6 square miles) of suburban land in the City of Sammamish. The principal stream in the Inglewood Basin is named George Davis Creek. The creek originates at a wetland area on the Sammamish plateau and drops approximately 400 feet in three miles to Lake Sammamish (Figure 1).

HSPF model input for the watershed was developed by the USGS[3] and utilized by King County as part of the 1991 East Lake Sammamish Basin Plan[4]. The model was updated in 2004 for the Inglewood Basin Plan Update[5]. The model input was modified in the current analysis to reflect changes in land use that have occurred since 2004, and additional subbasins were added for the analysis of the Sammamish Town Center.

SUBBASIN DELINEATION THOMPSON BASIN/EBRIGHT CREEK

The Thompson Basin is located south of Inglewood and receives runoff from approximately 800 acres (1.25 square miles) of suburban land. The principal stream is Ebright Creek, which originates on the Sammamish plateau and discharges to Lake Sammamish (Figure 1).

HSPF model input for the watershed was developed by the USGS[3] and utilized by King County as part of the 1991 East Lake Sammamish Basin Plan[4]. The model was updated as part of the current analysis to reflect changes in land use, include additional subbasins, and update routing hydraulics.

SUBBASIN DELINEATION TOWN CENTER

The proposed Sammamish Town Center is a commercial and residential development that encompasses approximately 208 acres in the headwaters of both the Thompson and Inglewood basins (Figure 1). Decisions on flow control standards and mitigation alternatives will affect the streams and wetlands in both the Thompson and Inglewood Basins. The subbasin delineation for the Town Center was based on local topography and the 2008 Town Center Plan[5], which defined land use throughout the Town Center Complex. Subbasins delineated for the Town Center are shaded in Figure 1.



Figure 1 – Inglewood Basin, Thompson Basin and Town Center Subbasins

LAND USE SCENARIOS ANALYZED

Three land use scenarios were analyzed; historic conditions, existing land use, and future build-out. Each scenario is summarized in the sections below.

Historic Land Use

Historic land use was analyzed to provide an assessment of conditions in the watershed prior to any development or land use alterations by humans. The scenario was developed by replacing all land covers except for wetlands in the existing land use scenario with forest. All constructed stormwater control facilities are also assumed to be removed. This scenario is useful for estimating what the hydrologic conditions were that led to the formation of the streams.

Existing Land Use

Existing land use was developed based on aerial photos taken in 2006. Land use was defined based on the categories shown in Table 1. The existing land use coverage is shown in Figure 2. Significant existing stormwater detention facilities were included in this scenario. In addition, this scenario was used in hydrologic model calibration to ensure that simulated runoff matched recorded data.

Future Land Use

The future land use scenario was developed based on current zoning and the Town Center Plan[5]. Each land use zone was assigned to one of the hydrologic land uses defined in Table 1 resulting in the Future Land Use Coverage shown in Figure 3. This scenario represents future build-out conditions in the watershed and is the most severe hydrologic condition. Stormwater flow control measures were included for areas that increased in development density relative to existing conditions.

Land Cover Categories

Four land cover categories were considered in analyzing the watershed hydrology: forest, grass, wetland, and impervious. The percentage of each cover allocated to the mapped land uses are shown in Table 1. The effective impervious surface areas were determined based on relationships with mapped impervious surface developed by Sutherland[6] and Dinicola[7].

Table 1 – Land use and Percentage of HSPF Cover Categories

Land Use Code	Land Use	Effective Impervious	Grass	Forest	Wetland
C	Commercial/Industrial	85%	15%	0%	0%
MF	Multi-Family	48%	52%	0%	0%
H	High Density Residential	23%	75%	0%	0%
L	Low Density Residential	10%	90%	0%	0%
RF	Rural Residential Forest	4%	0%	96%	0%
RG	Rural Residential Grass	4%	0%	0%	0%
G	Grass	0%	100%	0%	0%
F	Forest	0%	0%	100%	0%
W	Wetlands/Open Water	0%	0%	0%	100%

The area within each subbasin was classified into areas of common land cover and geologic/soil type, called *PERLNDS*. The HSPF and MGSFlood models compute the hydrologic response of each PERLND within a subbasin on a per-unit-area basis and proportions the amount of surface runoff, interflow and groundwater entering the stream within each subbasin consistent with the PERLND area total for the subbasin.

The area of each category under forested, existing, and future build-out conditions for each basin is summarized in Appendix A.



Figure 2 – Inglewood and Thompson Basins, Existing Land Use (2006)



Figure 3 – Inglewood and Thompson Basins, Future Land Use, Developed from City of Sammamish Zoning and Town Center Plan

GEOLOGY

The Inglewood Basin consists of a broad till-capped plateau drained by gently sloping channels. The watershed geology was obtained from King County Department of Natural Resources[8] (Figure 4). The main stream channel flows across recessional outwash deposits incised into the till. Runoff generated on the adjacent till areas must migrate through the outwash before reaching the stream channel. In locations where the perched water table remains near the surface, several wetlands have formed. In the central portion of the watershed (Subbasins I2, I3, and I4), the groundwater is relatively deep, and the stream channel remains dry the majority of the time. Downstream of this point, the stream flows through an incised ravine and drops approximately 300 feet in less than a mile to Lake Sammamish. The lower stream reaches in Subbasin I1 receive discharge from the regional groundwater, which provides a reliable source of base flow to the stream throughout the year.

The Thompson basin is similar to Inglewood in that it originates in uplands of the Sammamish Plateau and drains through a ravine to Lake Sammamish. The lower reaches of the stream also intersect the regional groundwater table, which supports a nearly constant base flow. The Thompson Basin differs geologically from Inglewood in that it does not have a deep outwash deposit that infiltrates runoff upstream of the ravine. The runoff response in Ebright Creek is dominated by a surface and interflow response, similar to many other watersheds in the Puget Lowland that are underlain by glacial till .

For hydrologic modeling purposes, each geologic association in the watershed was assigned to one of three categories; till, outwash, or wetland according to the HSPF modeling methodology developed by the USGS[3,7]. These were combined with surface cover categories consisting of urban grass, forest, wetland/saturated soils, and impervious to form the PERLND groups shown in Table 2.

Table 2 – HSPF Land Cover/Geology (PERLND) Combinations

HSPF PERLND	Land Characteristics
Till Forest	Glacial till soils mature cover, all slopes
Till Urban Grass	Glacial till soils urban grass, all slopes Includes impervious surfaces not directly connected to the drainage network.
Outwash Forest	Glacial outwash soils mature cover, all slopes
Outwash Urban Grass	Glacial outwash soils urban grass, all slopes. Includes impervious surfaces not directly connected to the drainage network.
Wetland/Saturated Soils	Wetlands or areas with saturated soils
Impervious (HSPF IMPLND)	Impervious surfaces that are directly connected to the drainage network.



Figure 4 – Inglewood and Thompson Basins Geology as Defined for HSPF and MGSFlood Models

HSPF MODEL CONFIGURATION

INGLEWOOD BASIN

The geology of the Inglewood Basin consists of till in the uplands with glacial outwash in the ravine that carries the stream channel. Surface runoff and interflow produced in the upland till areas is infiltrated as it flows across the outwash deposit and results in a markedly attenuated runoff response from the watershed.

To mimic the infiltration of runoff from the uplands into the outwash deposit as they flow through George Davis Creek, a separate outwash Pervious Land Segment (PERLND) was defined for each subbasin that represents moisture inputs from both precipitation falling on the surface of the outwash and from lateral inflow from the till uplands. The area of these groundwater PERLNDS is equal to the area of outwash within the subbasin. The surface runoff and interflow from the adjacent upland till areas were then connected to each groundwater PERLND which were then connected to the stream channel.

Several large residential developments were constructed in the upper watershed in the time since the King County East Lake Sammamish Basin Plan was completed. The stormwater detention facilities associated with these developments were included in the HSPF model developed for the present analysis. Subbasin I5B, I6A, and I7A were added and define the tributary area to each stormwater pond associated with the new residential development. The ponds were designed according to the King County[9] Level 2 standard and HSPF routing tables (FTABLES) were developed for each subbasin such that they represented the detention pond discharge characteristics in the subbasin. A schematic of the Inglewood Basin HSPF model configuration is shown in Figure 5.

The USGS calibrated the HSPF model to the Inglewood Basin as part of a study to develop and validate regionalized parameters for the HSPF model for use in western Washington[3,7]. The USGS simulated the flow attenuation caused by the outwash using the HSPF channel routing (RCHRES) routine. They added flood storage volume to the stream reaches in each subbasin until the simulated and gaged streamflows matched. This approach produced a reasonable calibration but was not used in the present analysis because it was thought to be less physically representative of the watershed than the approach used (described above). The flood storage volume in the USGS model totaled approximately 7,000 acre-feet, which indicates that 7,000 acre-feet of stormwater detention storage would be required to replicate the flood storage and attenuation provided naturally by the outwash deposit.

Because of the high level of flood attenuation provided by the outwash deposit, the flow attenuation resulting from on-site detention in the future land use scenario would be indistinguishable after routing through the outwash deposit. In addition,

connecting upstream stormwater ponds to the downstream groundwater PERLNDS can produce erroneous results in HSPF. Therefore, on-site detention mitigation was only included for the Town Center subbasins in the HSPF model. This does not mean that on-site detention should not be required in future developments in the Inglewood Basin; on the contrary, on-site detention should be required for future developments to ensure that discharge rates reaching the outwash do not increase to the point where they overwhelm the infiltration rate of the outwash deposit. This would result in a dramatic increase in the discharge rate in George Davis Creek as surface runoff in excess of the outwash infiltration rate discharged downstream.

The MGSFlood model was developed with routing reaches to account for the infiltration into the groundwater. The hydraulic characteristics of the routing reaches were defined to produce a response similar to the groundwater PERLNDS developed for the HSPF model. This approach allowed for detention to be included in all subbasins in the MGSFlood Inglewood model. For this reason, peak flow and duration results in the future land use scenario are slightly lower in the MGSFlood model than the HSPF model.



Legend

I8	Subbasin ID
RR1	Routing Reach Number
DET	Detention Routing
GW43	Groundwater PERLND Number
I11	Shaded Icons are Associated with the Town Center

Figure 5 – Inglewood Basin HSPF Model Schematic

THOMPSON BASIN

The Thompson Basin is similar to Inglewood in that it originates in uplands of the Sammamish Plateau and drains through a ravine to Lake Sammamish. The Thompson Basin differs geologically from Inglewood in that it does not have a deep outwash deposit that infiltrates runoff upstream of the ravine. The runoff response in Ebright Creek is similar to many other watersheds in the Puget Lowland that are underlain by glacial till. Thus, routing through the outwash deposit was not included for this basin. While Ebright Creek does not possess the natural infiltration and storage of the outwash, it does have a large wetland (Wetland 17) situated at the top of the ravine. This 30-acre wetland provides substantial flood attenuation and buffering of flows entering from the uplands before discharging to the ravine.

Several existing developments in the upper washed were broken out as separate subbasins (Subbasins t16 and t17) and detention was included using the King County[9] Level 2 standard. A schematic of the Thompson Basin HSPF model configuration is shown in Figure 6.



Figure 6 – Thompson Basin HSPF Model Schematic

STORMWATER DETENTION SIMULATION

Future land use was simulated with detention according to the City's proposed on-site detention standard. This standard is based on the current King County design manual[10], which requires that the post development runoff duration is controlled to the predeveloped forest duration from ½ of the predeveloped 2-year to the 50-year. Two detention ponds were included for each subbasin; one for areas on glacial till and one for areas on outwash. The outwash areas were sized as infiltration basins and only the overflow was connected to the receiving stream.

To account for uncertainty due to design, construction, and maintenance, detention mitigation simulated with the future land use scenario was assumed to be 90-percent effective. This was accomplished by sizing detention for only 90-percent of the developed area and routing 90-percent of the area to the pond. The remaining 10-percent of the developed area bypassed the pond. The exception was in the Town Center area where the bypass was not applied because this is a master planned development, and the design, construction, and maintenance will likely be more reliable than a typical development.

HSPF MODEL CALIBRATION

INTRODUCTION

Calibration of the HSPF model was performed to ensure that the hydrologic processes simulated by the model were representative of the conditions in the watershed. Calibration is the process whereby the model input parameters are adjusted until simulated and recorded discharge data match to the greatest extent possible.

CALIBRATION DATA

The model parameters were refined through calibration using streamflow data collected near the mouth of George Davis Creek and concurrent precipitation collected near the headwaters (City of Sammamish Gage 18Y) for the period October 2001-May 2003. Daily evaporation data were developed from data collected at the Puyallup 2 West Experimental Station (station number 45-6803). Flow data at the mouth of Ebright Creek were not of sufficient quality to use in model calibration.

Streamflow data for Ebright Creek was collected at a gage operated by commercial firm, Geotivity under contract to the City of Sammamish. Geotivity went bankrupt several years ago, and maintenance of the gage and quality checking of the data ceased at that time. The flow gage consisted of a sensor that tracked, among other things, the flow depth and velocity. Flow rate was computed using a functional relationship that included the recorded depth and velocity. This metering approach is commonly used in storm and sanitary sewers where the velocity varies across the flow area in a predictable manner. In stream channels, the cross section is irregular in shape and the velocity varies in a much less predictable manner.

The relationship used by Geotivity to derive streamflow from the depth and velocity measurements was not known. The data were analyzed and several relationships were tried to convert the depth and velocity measurements to discharge. The resulting flow data did not appear reasonable when compared with precipitation data recorded in the watershed.

An apparent shift in the depth recordings was also noted following a large storm that occurred in December 2007. Following the storm, the base flow depth recorded by the meter was higher, and resulted in a 1-2 cfs increase in the flow data than prior to the storm.

Because of the issues cited above, the recorded streamflow at the mouth of Ebright Creek were not used to calibrate the models. Parameters derived from the Inglewood Basin calibration were used for the Thompson Basin. Plots comparing simulated and recorded streamflow at the Ebright Creek gage are presented in the next section. The flow rate at the Ebright gage was derived by multiplying the recorded velocity times the cross sectional area corresponding to the recorded depth.

HSPF MODEL CALIBRATION RESULTS

Existing land use (year 2006) was used for model calibration. Model parameters for the pervious land segments (PERLNDS) were adopted from the 2004 Inglewood Basin Plan update[11]. Hourly streamflow data recorded by the City of Sammamish from October 2001-May 2003 near the outlet of George Davis Creek was used to verify that the current model with updated land use and subbasins produced results similar to the original calibration.

A comparison of simulated and recorded discharge at the outlet of George Davis Creek during water years 2002 and 2003 is shown in Figure 7. In general, the simulated and recorded magnitude and timing of discharge compared well. The general shape of simulated winter storm flows and the magnitude of summer base flows matched well with the recorded streamflow for this period. Several large runoff spikes in the streamflow record (December 2001, October 2002, and March 2003) were attributed to gage malfunction or poor quality data and were discounted in the model calibration. The streamflow record was not of sufficient quality to compute runoff volume or other statistics. The calibration was therefore judged qualitatively by the goodness of fit between simulated and recorded streamflow shown in Figure 7.



Figure 7 – HSPF Model Calibration, George Davis Creek

As discussed in the previous section, flow data at the mouth of Ebright Creek were deemed of insufficient quality to warrant use in the model calibration. Despite the uncertainty with the recorded streamflow data, there is a fairly close correspondence between the simulated and recorded flows (Figure 8), especially the storm that occurred in December 2007 (Figure 9).



Figure 8 – Comparison of Simulated and Recorded Flow at Mouth of Ebright Creek
(Note: Gage not used for Calibration due to data Quality Concerns)



Figure 9 – Comparison of Simulated and Recorded Flow at Mouth of Ebright Creek December 2007 Storm
(Note: Gage not used for Calibration due to data Quality Concerns)

TOWN CENTER ANALYSIS USING THE MGSFLOOD MODEL

MGSFlood[2] is a continuous rainfall runoff model used for stormwater facility analysis and design. The model uses the same rainfall-runoff algorithms as HSPF but includes routines for sizing stormwater detention facilities and simulating LID measures. MGSFlood model input was developed for both the Inglewood and Thompson Basins using the same land use, soil type, hydraulic routing, and runoff parameters used in the HSPF model. This approach allowed for numerous stormwater mitigation measures to be analyzed, especially in the Town Center basins. Simulation results for the Town Center alternatives are presented in the Town Center Comprehensive Stormwater Plan.

An additional benefit of the MGSFlood model is that it is much easier to use compared with HSPF. The MGSFlood model can be used in the future by City staff or their consultants to analyze changes to the Town Center plan or other developments in the watersheds and analyze the effects of the changes in a basin-wide context.

HSPF WATERSHED MODEL – ANALYSIS/PREDICTION APPROACH

SIMULATION PERIOD

Following the calibration phase, the model may be used for analysis and prediction of streamflows for various land use conditions. For this application, long-term, high-quality, precipitation timeseries are needed that are representative of the hourly, daily, weekly and monthly precipitation characteristics that have occurred in the past, and can be expected to occur in the future.

The Washington State Department of Transportation, Extended Precipitation Timeseries for Continuous Hydrologic Modeling[12,13] was used as input for the analysis of the Inglewood and Thompson Basins. This timeseries has a 1-hour timestep, is 158-years in length, and represents the rainfall characteristics of the basins (48 inches mean annual precipitation).

PEAK FLOW MAGNITUDE-FREQUENCY STATISTICS

Peak discharge magnitude-frequency estimates were computed at locations of interest in the watersheds using the HSPF model. The annual maxima discharge rates were saved at each location from the 158-years simulated. Peak flow and elevation magnitude-frequency relationships were computed using the Gringorten[14,15] plotting position formula (Equation 1).

$$Tr = \frac{N + 0.12}{i - 0.44} \qquad (1)$$

Where: Tr is the recurrence interval of the peak flow,
i is the rank of the annual maxima peak flow ordered from highest to lowest,
N is the total number of years simulated (158 in this case).

FLOW DURATION STATISTICS

Modifications to the land surface during urbanization increase both the runoff peak rate and volume. The increase in runoff volume is the result of the loss of water storage in the soil column because of the compaction of the soil and the introduction of impervious surfaces. Figure 10 compares the allocation of precipitation falling on a forested and an urban watershed. In the forested watershed, the precipitation ends up nearly all evaporation and infiltration with very little surface runoff. With an urban watershed, the evaporation and infiltration are reduced significantly, and a much higher percentage of the rainfall ending up as surface overland flow.



Figure 10 – Mean Annual Precipitation Water Budget for a Forested and Urban Site

The increase in runoff volume combined with the increase in runoff rate results in higher stream discharges occurring for a longer duration. The increase in duration of a given flow rate results in more erosive work on the stream channel over time, particularly when the discharge rate exceeds the threshold for streambed movement in the receiving channel.

Flow duration statistics provide a convenient tool for characterizing streamflow computed with a continuous hydrologic model. Duration statistics are computed by tracking the fraction of time that a specified flow rate is equaled or exceeded. HSPF does this by dividing the range of flows simulated into discrete increments and then tracks the fraction of time that each flow is equaled or exceeded. The fraction of time that a particular flow is equaled or exceeded is called *exceedance probability*. It should be noted that exceedance probability for duration statistics is different from the *annual exceedance probability* associated with flood frequency

statistics and there is no practical way of converting/relating annual exceedance probability statistics to flow duration statistics.

FLOOD FREQUENCY AND FLOW DURATION RESULTS

INTRODUCTION

Precipitation timeseries 158-years in length at a 1-hour timestep and daily evaporation derived from the Puyallup 2 West Experimental Station (station number 45-6803) were used as input to the model, which resulted in a 158-year, 1-hour timeseries of flow at the outlet of each subbasin simulated. Flood magnitude-frequency and duration analyses were subsequently performed on the flow timeseries at locations of interest in the watershed.

The future land use scenarios were simulated with stormwater mitigation designed according to the City's proposed stormwater detention ordinance[10]. The simulation results presented in this section provide an assessment of the performance of stormwater mitigation in a basin-wide context. Details on mitigation options for the Town Center that includes Low Impact Development as well as traditional stormwater detention, is presented in the Town Center Comprehensive Stormwater Plan.

FLOOD PEAK DISCHARGE RESULTS

Increases in peak discharge rates under future conditions in the Inglewood Basin are negligible in most areas and actually decrease other areas relative to the existing land use scenario (Figures 11a, 11b, and Tables 3a, 3b, and 3c). The reason for the small change in discharge rate is the presence of the glacial outwash deposit, which infiltrates the majority of surface runoff produced in the till capped uplands. As discussed in the model calibration section, the outwash deposit is equivalent to approximately 7,000 acre-feet of stormwater detention storage in the Inglewood Basin.

While natural infiltration of the outwash in the central portion of the watershed provides substantial natural buffering of the runoff under the future land use, on-site detention and LID controls are still necessary to ensure that runoff rates associated with future development do not overwhelm the infiltration capacity in the channels underlain by outwash.

Peak runoff rates in the Thompson Basin show a greater reduction in the future flows relative to existing conditions (Figures 12a, 12b and Tables 4a and 4b). This is because there are many developments in the basin with little or no stormwater controls and the Thompson Basin does not contain the infiltrative outwash present in the Inglewood Basin to mitigate runoff from existing development.

Peak runoff rates in the Town Center subbasins show a dramatic reduction in peak flows under future conditions relative to existing conditions in the majority of subbasins (Figures 13a, 13b, and Tables 5a, and 5b). In most areas, the peak discharge under future land use conditions is reduced to rates comparable to the forested land use condition.



Figure 11a – George Davis Creek, Comparison of 100-Year Flood Peak Discharge Existing, Future, and Forested Land Use



Figure 11b – Comparison of Flood Peak Discharge at Mouth of George Davis Creek (Inglewood Basin) Existing, Future, and Forested Land Use



Figure 12a – Ebright Creek, Comparison of 100-Year Flood Peak Discharge Existing, Future, and Forested Land Use



Figure 12b – Comparison of Flood Peak Discharge at Mouth of Ebright Creek (Thompson Basin) Existing, Future, and Forested Land Use



Figure 13a – Town Center Subbasins in the Inglewood Basin, Comparison of 100-Year Flood Peak Discharge
Existing, Future, and Forested Land Use



Figure 13b – Town Center Subbasins in the Thompson Basin, Comparison of 100-Year Flood Peak Discharge
Existing, Future, and Forested Land Use

Table 3a – Inglewood Basin Flood Magnitude-Frequency Estimates (cfs) Existing Land Use (2006) (Discharge is Referenced to Subbasin Outlet)						
	Flood Magnitude-Frequency Estimates (cfs)					
Subbasin	**2-yr**	**5-yr**	**10-yr**	**25-yr**	**50-yr**	**100-yr**
SUBBASIN I1	17	24	30	36	40	44
SUBBASIN I2	15	20	26	31	35	38
SUBBASIN I3	0.9	1.1	1.4	1.7	1.8	1.9
SUBBASIN I4	12	16	20	24	27	29
SUBBASIN I3A	1.9	2.5	3.1	3.7	4.0	4.2
SUBBASIN I4A	10	14	17	21	23	25
SUBBASIN I5	8.3	11	14	17	18	20
SUBBASIN I6	6.1	7.8	10	12	13	14
SUBBASIN I7	4.9	6.4	8.3	10	11	12

Table 3b – Inglewood Basin Flood Magnitude-Frequency Estimates (cfs) Future Land Use with Mitigation (Discharge is Referenced to Subbasin Outlet)						
	Flood Magnitude-Frequency Estimates (cfs)					
Subbasin	**2-yr**	**5-yr**	**10-yr**	**25-yr**	**50-yr**	**100-yr**
SUBBASIN I1	15	21	27	33	35	40
SUBBASIN I2	12	18	22	28	29	37
SUBBASIN I3	0.5	0.7	1.1	2.4	2.6	4.3
SUBBASIN I4	10	13	16	19	20	22
SUBBASIN I3A	0.2	0.3	0.4	2.1	2.6	3.2
SUBBASIN I4A	10	13	16	18	20	22
SUBBASIN I5	7.7	10	12	15	16	18
SUBBASIN I6	6.6	8.7	11	14	14	15
SUBBASIN I7	5.8	7.7	10	12	12	13

Table 3c – Inglewood Basin Flood Magnitude-Frequency Estimates (cfs) Forested Land Use (Discharge is Referenced to Subbasin Outlet)						
	Flood Magnitude-Frequency Estimates (cfs)					
Subbasin	**2-yr**	**5-yr**	**10-yr**	**25-yr**	**50-yr**	**100-yr**
SUBBASIN I1	14	21	28	34	36	42
SUBBASIN I2	12	17	23	29	31	36
SUBBASIN I3	0.7	0.9	1.3	1.6	1.7	1.9
SUBBASIN I4	11	14	19	23	24	27
SUBBASIN I3A	1.6	2.1	2.8	3.5	3.8	4.1
SUBBASIN I4A	8.9	12	16	19	21	23
SUBBASIN I5	6.6	8.8	12	14	15	17
SUBBASIN I6	4.4	5.8	7.9	10	11	12
SUBBASIN I7	3.3	4.3	5.9	7.4	8.0	8.9

Table 4a – Thompson Basin Flood Magnitude-Frequency Estimates (cfs) Existing Land Use (2006) (Discharge is Referenced to Subbasin Outlet)						
	Flood Magnitude-Frequency Estimates (cfs)					
Subbasin	**2-yr**	**5-yr**	**10-yr**	**25-yr**	**50-yr**	**100-yr**
SUBBASIN t1	16	26	36	43	45	51
SUBBASIN t2	15	25	34	39	42	47
SUBBASIN t3	13	19	24	30	35	38
SUBBASIN t4	11	15	21	27	30	31
SUBBASIN t5 WL17	10	13	19	24	26	28
SUBBASIN t8	6.4	10	15	20	21	22
SUBBASIN t9	2.2	3.1	4.2	6.0	6.4	6.8
SUBBASIN t12 WL61	2.1	2.9	3.9	5.6	6.0	6.3
SUBBASIN t7	3.0	4.2	5.4	7.1	7.4	7.7
SUBBASIN t15	3.5	5.4	7.1	10	11	13

Table 4b – Thompson Basin Flood Magnitude-Frequency Estimates (cfs) Future Land Use with Mitigation (Discharge is Referenced to Subbasin Outlet)						
	Flood Magnitude-Frequency Estimates (cfs)					
Subbasin	**2-yr**	**5-yr**	**10-yr**	**25-yr**	**50-yr**	**100-yr**
SUBBASIN t1	10	15	21	27	30	31
SUBBASIN t2	10	15	20	27	29	30
SUBBASIN t3	8.6	13	17	23	25	26
SUBBASIN t4	7.7	11	15	20	22	24
SUBBASIN t5 WL17	6.8	10	13	18	20	21
SUBBASIN t8	2.7	4.2	5.4	7.3	8.3	8.5
SUBBASIN t9	1.2	1.9	2.6	3.5	3.8	4.2
SUBBASIN t12 WL61	1.1	1.8	2.4	3.3	3.6	4.0
SUBBASIN t7	1.8	2.7	3.8	4.9	5.4	5.6
SUBBASIN t15	2.3	3.2	4.4	5.6	5.9	6.3

Table 4c – Thompson Basin Flood Magnitude-Frequency Estimates (cfs) Forested Land Use (Discharge is Referenced to Subbasin Outlet)						
	Flood Magnitude-Frequency Estimates (cfs)					
Subbasin	**2-yr**	**5-yr**	**10-yr**	**25-yr**	**50-yr**	**100-yr**
SUBBASIN t1	10	16	20	27	28	32
SUBBASIN t2	10	15	19	26	26	31
SUBBASIN t3	7.9	12	16	21	22	26
SUBBASIN t4	6.9	10	14	18	20	22
SUBBASIN t5 WL17	6.1	8.7	12	16	17	20
SUBBASIN t8	2.8	4.5	5.8	7.9	8.1	9.0
SUBBASIN t9	1.2	1.6	2.5	3.3	3.6	4.2
SUBBASIN t12 WL61	1.1	1.6	2.3	3.1	3.4	3.9
SUBBASIN t7	2.0	2.7	3.7	4.7	5.0	5.6
SUBBASIN t15	2.1	3.7	4.6	6.2	7.3	8.8

Table 5a – Town Center Flood Magnitude-Frequency Estimates (cfs) Existing Land Use (2006) (Discharge is Referenced to Subbasin Outlet)						
	Flood Magnitude-Frequency Estimates (cfs)					
Subbasin	**2-yr**	**5-yr**	**10-yr**	**25-yr**	**50-yr**	**100-yr**
SUBBASIN I8	0.72	1.19	1.63	2.52	2.61	3.22
SUBBASIN I9	1.37	2.12	2.88	3.84	4.03	4.91
SUBBASIN I10	1.52	2.40	3.25	5.10	5.47	6.43
SUBBASIN I11	0.61	1.02	1.47	1.87	2.03	2.32
SUBBASIN I12	1.20	1.89	2.52	3.86	4.08	4.96
SUBBASIN I13	3.41	5.16	6.84	9.78	10.37	12.93
SUBBASIN I14	0.52	0.84	1.02	1.35	1.51	1.87
SUBBASIN t9	0.46	0.69	0.91	1.35	1.56	1.70
SUBBASIN t10	2.14	3.24	4.27	6.78	7.53	8.51
SUBBASIN t11	0.47	0.76	1.05	1.60	1.70	2.04
SUBBASIN t12	0.64	0.92	1.11	1.37	1.52	1.93
SUBBASIN t13	1.28	2.08	2.85	4.60	5.02	5.77

Table 5b – Town Center Flood Magnitude-Frequency Estimates (cfs) Future Land Use with Mitigation (Discharge is Referenced to Subbasin Outlet)						
	Flood Magnitude-Frequency Estimates (cfs)					
Subbasin	**2-yr**	**5-yr**	**10-yr**	**25-yr**	**50-yr**	**100-yr**
SUBBASIN I8	0.20	0.35	0.50	0.66	0.73	0.74
SUBBASIN I9	0.47	0.75	1.09	1.41	1.54	1.56
SUBBASIN I10	0.38	0.61	0.87	1.22	1.36	1.43
SUBBASIN I11	0.28	0.44	0.64	0.82	0.91	0.98
SUBBASIN I12	0.73	0.89	1.04	1.31	1.37	1.51
SUBBASIN I13	0.87	1.42	1.88	2.61	2.89	3.25
SUBBASIN I14	0.32	0.46	0.60	0.78	0.87	1.00
SUBBASIN t9	0.27	0.33	0.39	0.46	0.49	0.50
SUBBASIN t10	0.61	0.88	1.20	1.61	1.66	1.78
SUBBASIN t11	0.46	0.76	1.05	1.61	1.71	2.05
SUBBASIN t12	0.66	0.94	1.14	1.39	1.55	1.98
SUBBASIN t13	0.64	0.81	1.09	1.37	1.44	1.47

Table 5c – Town Center Flood Magnitude-Frequency Estimates (cfs) Forested Land Use (Discharge is Referenced to Subbasin Outlet)						
	Flood Magnitude-Frequency Estimates (cfs)					
Subbasin	**2-yr**	**5-yr**	**10-yr**	**25-yr**	**50-yr**	**100-yr**
SUBBASIN I8	0.34	0.54	0.67	0.91	0.99	1.14
SUBBASIN I9	0.62	1.01	1.25	1.71	1.85	2.15
SUBBASIN I10	0.61	0.96	1.19	1.63	1.76	2.04
SUBBASIN I11	0.37	0.59	0.73	1.00	1.08	1.25
SUBBASIN I12	0.49	0.82	0.97	1.32	1.45	1.70
SUBBASIN I13	1.45	2.42	2.84	3.91	4.31	5.03
SUBBASIN I14	0.45	0.73	0.85	1.19	1.29	1.55
SUBBASIN t9	0.12	0.19	0.23	0.32	0.34	0.40
SUBBASIN t10	0.69	1.08	1.34	1.84	1.99	2.31
SUBBASIN t11	0.19	0.32	0.38	0.52	0.57	0.67
SUBBASIN t12	0.63	0.90	1.09	1.34	1.49	1.87
SUBBASIN t13	0.50	0.79	0.98	1.34	1.45	1.68

FLOW DURATION RESULTS

Flow duration statistics provide an indication of the relative amount of erosive work performed on the stream channel. The increase in duration at a given flow rate results in more erosive work being performed on the stream channel over time. As urbanization occurs in the watershed, the frequency of discharge that exceeds the historic bedload movement threshold increases. This results in greater erosive work on the stream channel leading to an expansion in the channel cross section and leads to larger sized stream gravel as the smaller gravel fraction is carried downstream.

Figures 14a and 14b compare flow duration statistics in the ravine area of George Davis and Ebright creeks, respectively and show a relatively small change in the flow duration statistics for future relative to existing land use. This suggests that under build-out conditions, the potential for increased stream channel erosion is relatively small. Again, this is due to the presence of highly infiltrative outwash in the central part of the watershed, which greatly reduces the surface runoff response from the watershed. Flow duration statistics for each subbasin are summarized in Tables 6a -6c for the Inglewood Basin and Tables 7a -7c for the Thompson Basin.



Figure 14a – Comparison of Simulated Flow Duration, Existing, Future, and Forest Land Use George Davis Creek, Inglewood Basin, Subbasin I2, Ravine



Figure 14b – Comparison of Simulated Flow Duration, Existing, Future, and Forest Land Use Ebright Creek, Thompson Basin, Subbasin t4, Ravine

Table 6a – Inglewood Basin Flow Duration Analysis Results, Existing Land Use

	Existing Land Use			
	Discharge Corresponding to Exceedance Probability (cfs)			
Subbasin	**90%**	**50%**	**20%**	**10%**
I1	0.10	0.78	3.47	5.78
I2	0.06	0.39	2.29	4.16
I3	0.02	0.11	0.25	0.35
I4	0.07	0.47	2.52	4.36
I5	0.06	0.41	1.64	2.83
I6	0.05	0.34	1.26	2.13
I7	0.05	0.32	1.03	1.74
I3A	0.03	0.19	0.45	0.70
I4A	0.07	0.45	2.14	3.64

Table 6b – Inglewood Basin Flow Duration Analysis Results, Future Mitigated Land Use

	Future Land Use Discharge Corresponding to Exceedance Probability (cfs)			
Subbasin	**90%**	**50%**	**20%**	**10%**
I1	0.10	0.84	3.54	5.64
I2	0.06	0.40	2.25	3.91
I3	0.01	0.07	0.17	0.24
I4	0.08	0.50	2.42	3.94
I5	0.07	0.46	1.86	3.11
I6	0.06	0.39	1.61	2.56
I7	0.06	0.37	1.38	2.19
I3A	0.01	0.04	0.08	0.12
I4A	0.07	0.49	2.36	3.83

Table 6c – Inglewood Basin Flow Duration Analysis Results, Forested Land Use

	Future Land Use Discharge Corresponding to Exceedance Probability (cfs)			
Subbasin	**90%**	**50%**	**20%**	**10%**
I1	0.08	0.58	2.79	4.81
I2	0.05	0.31	1.65	3.28
I3	0.01	0.09	0.21	0.30
I4	0.06	0.37	1.90	3.46
I5	0.05	0.32	1.23	2.09
I6	0.04	0.24	0.68	1.40
I7	0.03	0.22	0.51	1.04
I3A	0.02	0.16	0.37	0.55
I4A	0.05	0.35	1.62	2.89

Table 7a – Thompson Basin Flow Duration Analysis Results, Existing Land Use

	Existing Land Use Discharge Corresponding to Exceedance Probability (cfs)			
Subbasin	**90%**	**50%**	**20%**	**10%**
t1	0.08	0.53	2.48	4.24
t2	0.08	0.50	2.39	4.09
t3	0.07	0.45	2.05	3.52
t4	0.07	0.45	1.91	3.26
t5 Wetland 17	0.07	0.44	1.77	3.01
t8	0.04	0.24	0.60	1.09
t9	0.03	0.17	0.40	0.61
t12 Wetland 61	0.03	0.16	0.38	0.58
t7	0.03	0.21	0.49	0.90
t15	0.03	0.19	0.43	0.77

Table 7b – Thompson Basin Flow Duration Analysis Results, Future Mitigated Land Use

	Future Land Use Discharge Corresponding to Exceedance Probability (cfs)			
Subbasin	**90%**	**50%**	**20%**	**10%**
t1	0.09	0.80	3.29	4.89
t2	0.09	0.79	3.20	4.75
t3	0.09	0.72	2.82	4.17
t4	0.09	0.68	2.58	3.77
t5 Wetland 17	0.08	0.64	2.32	3.38
t8	0.05	0.31	0.80	1.15
t9	0.03	0.18	0.42	0.58
t12 Wetland 61	0.03	0.17	0.40	0.56
t7	0.04	0.27	0.63	0.90
t15	0.03	0.22	0.50	0.66

Table 7c – Thompson Basin Flow Duration Analysis Results, Forested Land Use

	Future Land Use Discharge Corresponding to Exceedance Probability (cfs)			
Subbasin	**90%**	**50%**	**20%**	**10%**
t1	0.05	0.35	1.54	2.75
t2	0.05	0.34	1.47	2.64
t3	0.05	0.30	1.17	2.17
t4	0.04	0.29	1.07	1.95
t5 Wetland 17	0.04	0.29	0.98	1.75
t8	0.02	0.16	0.38	0.59
t9	0.02	0.11	0.25	0.36
t12 Wetland 61	0.02	0.11	0.24	0.35
t7	0.02	0.14	0.33	0.47
t15	0.02	0.12	0.28	0.40

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A hydrologic analysis of the Inglewood and Thompson Basins was performed using the HSPF and MGSFlood models in support of the Inglewood Basin Plan Update, the Thompson Basin Plan, and the Sammamish Town Center Comprehensive Stormwater Plan. HSPF models developed for earlier analyses were updated to reflect changes in land use and to include additional subbasins in the proposed Town Center development area. The HSPF model was calibrated to streamflow data collected over a 20 month period from October 2001 through May 2003 at the outlet of George Davis Creek (Inglewood Basin). Flow data collected at the mouth of Ebright Creek was not of sufficient quality to use for model calibration; however, comparisons of simulated flows showed a fairly close match with the recorded data for Ebright Creek.

The MGSFlood model uses similar computational algorithms as HSPF, but also includes routines for analyzing stormwater detention and LID mitigation techniques. Watershed input data and runoff parameters used in the HSPF model development and calibration were used to create MGSFlood model input. The MGSFlood model was used to analyze treatment alternatives at Town Center that included detention and LID measures.

The presence of glacial outwash in the central part of the Inglewood Basin infiltrates the majority of surface flow produced in the upper parts of the watershed and results in little or no flow in the stream immediately upstream of the ravine (Subbasin I2). Downstream, the stream intersects the groundwater table (Subbasin I1) and receives the majority of flow via groundwater discharge. The groundwater discharge also produces year around base flow in the lower reaches of the stream. The outwash deposit infiltrates and stores runoff from the upper watershed and is equivalent to approximately 7,000 acre-feet of stormwater detention storage. Flows in the lower stream reach are relatively low (attenuated) during floods because of the storage that occurs in the outwash deposit.

The Thompson Basin does not have the same infiltrative outwash deposit as the Inglewood Basin, but does have a large wetland (Wetland 17) situated at the top of the ravine. This 30 acre wetland provides substantial flood attenuation and buffering of flows entering from the uplands before discharging to the ravine.

Existing and future build-out conditions were simulated with the HSPF model and flood peak and flow duration statistics computed. Little or no increases in runoff rates relative to existing conditions were predicted under future land for the Inglewood Basin. In the Thompson Basin, future peak flow rates were predicted to decrease relative to existing conditions. These results show that stormwater mitigation designed according to the City's stormwater detention standard, which seeks to control runoff rates to forested conditions, is effective at mitigating increased runoff due to development. Because of this, the rates of erosion and flooding should not increase in the future and in areas of the Thompson Basin, may actually decrease provided that the facilities are properly maintained in the future.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Maintenance of Outwash Infiltration Areas –The glacial outwash deposit in the central part of the Inglewood Basin is currently infiltrating the majority of surface runoff from the upper watershed. Maintaining the infiltration function of this area is critical to ensuring a stable flow regime and the health of George Davis Creek in the future.

   Infiltration of stormwater with pretreatment should be encouraged for new developments located in areas with outwash deposits. A general map of the geology of the Inglewood Basin showing the extent of the outwash deposit is shown in Figure 4. Local site conditions will dictate whether infiltration is feasible on an individual development site and must be evaluated by the site development engineer. Stormwater conveyance should also be maintained in open channels to the greatest extent possible to promote infiltration into the outwash deposit.

2. On-Site Detention and Low Impact Development Methods – The City's detention standard, which is consistent with the 2005 Ecology Stormwater Management Manual[16], is effective at mitigating the increased potential for flooding and erosion associated with development. Stormwater detention facilities designed according to this standard are large and often expensive to construct. Low Impact Development (LID) methods provide a means to reduce the rate and volume of runoff associated with development, and increases the amount of potential groundwater recharge. LID methods should be encouraged to the greatest extent practical for new construction in the Inglewood and Thompson watersheds.

3. Streamflow Monitoring – Streamflow gages have been operated and maintained by a third party contractor in the past at the mouth of George Davis and Ebright creeks. These gages should be reestablished and data collected from them quality checked and validated on an on-going basis.

REFERENCES

1. US Environmental Protection Agency, Hydrological Simulation Program-Fortran, Release 11, EPA/600/R-97/030, August 1997.

2. MGS Software, LLC, MGSFlood, Continuous Hydrologic Model for Stormwater Facility Analysis, Version 4, August 2009.

3. Dinicola, R. S., Validation of a numerical modeling method for simulating rainfall-runoff relations for headwater basins in western King and Snohomish counties, Washington, Water Supply Paper 2495, 2001.

4. King County Surface Water Management, East Lake Sammamish Basin Watershed Management Committee Basin and Nonpoint Action Plan, December 1994.

5. City of Sammamish, Sammamish Town Center Plan, June 2008.

6. Sutherland, Roger, C., Methodology for Estimating the Effective Impervious Area of Urban Watersheds, Technical Note 58, Watershed Protection Techniques, Vol 2, No 1, Fall 1995.

7. Dinicola, R. S., Characterization and Simulation of Rainfall Runoff Relations in Western King and Snohomish Counties, Washington, U.S. Geological Survey, Water-Resources Investigations Report 89-4052.

8. Sacket, Jill, Booth, Derek, Surface Geology of King County, GIS Coverage, King County GIS Center, April 2002.

9. King County, Washington Surface Water Design Manual, King County Department of Natural Resources, September 1998.

10. King County, Washington Surface Water Design Manual, King County Department of Natural Resources, January 2005.

11. MGS Engineering Consultants, Inc, Hydrologic and Hydraulic Analysis of Inglewood Creek using the HSPF Model, March, 2004.

12. Schaefer MG, Barker BL, Wallis JR and Nelson RN, Creation of Extended Precipitation Time-Series for Continuous Hydrological Modeling in Pierce County Washington, prepared for Pierce County Public Works by MGS Engineering Consultants Inc, Entranco, and JR Wallis, February 2001.

13. Schaefer MG and Barker BL, Extended Precipitation Time-Series for Continuous Hydrological Modeling in Western Washington, prepared for Washington State Department of Transportation by MGS Engineering Consultants Inc, April 2002.

14. Gringorten, I. I., A Plotting Rule for Extreme Probability Paper, Journal of Geophysical Research, vol. 68, pp. 813-814, 1963.

15. Stedinger JR, Vogel RM, and Foufoula-Georgiou E, Frequency Analysis of Extreme Events, Chapter 18, *Handbook of Hydrology*, McGraw Hill, 1992.

16. Ecology, Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington, Washington State Department of Ecology Water Quality Program, Publication Numbers 05-10-029 through 05-10-033 99-13, February 2005.

APPENDIX A – LAND USE DATA

Table A-1 – Inglewood Basin Forested Land Use (acres)

Subbasin	Impervious	Till Forest	Till Grass	Outwash Forest	Outwash Grass	Wetland	Total
I1	0.0	81.8	0.0	121.8	0.0	0.0	203.7
I10	0.0	20.5	0.0	3.2	0.0	0.0	23.7
I11	0.0	12.6	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	12.8
I12	0.0	13.7	0.0	5.5	0.0	0.0	19.2
I13	0.0	39.2	0.0	1.2	0.0	3.5	43.9
I14	0.0	9.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.7	11.7
I2	0.0	188.5	0.0	62.9	0.0	0.0	251.4
I3	0.0	39.4	0.0	12.4	0.0	5.1	56.9
I3A	0.0	4.3	0.0	24.0	0.0	27.0	55.4
I4	0.0	3.1	0.0	10.1	0.0	0.0	13.2
I4A	0.0	164.9	0.0	187.7	0.0	21.9	374.6
I5	0.0	8.3	0.0	48.3	0.0	19.3	76.0
I5A	0.0	49.9	0.0	6.3	0.0	14.6	70.8
I5B	0.0	54.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	54.4
I6	0.0	42.1	0.0	13.9	0.0	0.0	56.0
I6A	0.0	21.2	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	21.3
I7	0.0	216.5	0.0	5.4	0.0	17.5	239.4
I7A	0.0	17.7	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	18.0
I8	0.0	11.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.4
I9	0.0	20.8	0.0	3.1	0.0	0.2	24.1
Total	0.0	1020	0.0	506	0.0	111	1637.7

Table A-2 – Inglewood Basin Existing (year 2006) Land Use (acres)

Subbasin	Impervious	Till Forest	Till Grass	Outwash Forest	Outwash Grass	Wetland	Total
I1	20.0	32.5	41.3	43.1	66.8	0.0	203.7
I10	1.3	4.2	15.2	0.0	3.0	0.0	23.7
I11	0.5	7.9	4.2	0.0	0.2	0.0	12.8
I12	0.9	1.7	11.3	3.4	1.8	0.0	19.2
I13	4.5	11.9	22.9	0.0	1.0	3.5	43.9
I14	0.1	8.4	1.4	0.0	0.0	1.7	11.7
I2	27.7	63.0	104.7	12.0	44.0	0.0	251.4
I3	5.7	2.1	33.0	1.4	9.6	5.1	56.9
I3A	3.5	1.0	2.9	0.0	21.0	27.0	55.4
I4	0.8	2.9	0.0	0.6	8.9	0.0	13.2
I4A	102.9	28.7	88.1	36.9	96.1	21.9	374.6
I5	25.5	2.1	2.5	7.0	19.6	19.3	76.0
I5A	1.0	27.5	21.5	3.2	3.0	14.6	70.8
I5B	10.7	5.1	38.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	54.4
I6	2.3	13.7	26.7	2.9	10.4	0.0	56.0
I6A	4.9	0.0	16.3	0.0	0.1	0.0	21.3
I7	31.5	77.9	107.9	4.6	0.0	17.5	239.4
I7A	4.0	0.4	13.3	0.0	0.2	0.0	18.0
I8	0.5	3.5	7.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.4
I9	2.1	11.5	7.5	0.0	2.8	0.2	24.1
Total	251	306	567	115	289	111	1637.7

Table A-3 – Inglewood Basin Future Build-Out Land Use, According to City of Sammamish Zoning and Sammamish Town Center Plan (acres)

Subbasin	Impervious	Till Forest	Till Grass	Outwash Forest	Outwash Grass	Wetland	Total
I1	58.3	0.0	59.5	0.0	85.9	0.0	203.7
I10	4.5	0.0	16.8	0.0	2.4	0.0	23.7
I11	6.7	0.0	6.1	0.0	0.1	0.0	12.8
I12	8.7	0.0	6.0	0.0	3.4	1.0	19.2
I13	15.4	0.0	24.9	0.0	0.2	3.5	43.9
I14	2.7	0.0	7.0	0.0	0.0	1.9	11.7
I2	74.5	0.0	130.3	0.0	46.6	0.0	251.4
I3	12.6	0.0	26.2	0.0	9.0	9.0	56.9
I3A	4.5	0.0	0.3	0.0	11.1	39.5	55.4
I4	3.5	0.0	2.2	0.0	7.5	0.0	13.2
I4A	168.2	0.0	92.7	0.0	98.2	15.5	374.6
I5	30.0	0.0	5.5	0.0	10.8	29.6	76.0
I5A	11.6	0.0	41.0	0.0	5.3	12.9	70.8
I5B	17.3	0.0	35.7	0.0	0.0	1.4	54.4
I6	12.0	0.0	32.8	0.0	10.9	0.2	56.0
I6A	7.9	0.0	13.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	21.3
I7	63.9	0.0	153.8	0.0	3.8	17.8	239.4
I7A	5.4	0.0	11.8	0.0	0.2	0.7	18.0
I8	5.2	0.0	6.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.4
I9	10.8	0.0	11.8	0.0	1.5	0.0	24.1
Total	524	0	684	0	297	133	1637.7

Table A-4 – Thompson Basin Forested Land Use (acres)

Subbasin	Impervious	Till Forest	Till Grass	Outwash Forest	Outwash Grass	Wetland	Total
t01	0.0	15.2	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	16.2
t02	0.0	66.4	0.0	1.6	0.0	0.0	68.0
t03	0.0	45.8	0.0	3.3	0.0	3.3	52.4
t04	0.0	44.5	0.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	46.0
t05	0.0	85.9	0.0	48.1	0.0	28.3	162.3
t06	0.0	26.0	0.0	51.9	0.0	3.8	81.7
t07	0.0	23.5	0.0	33.6	0.0	7.7	64.7
t08	0.0	65.2	0.0	43.8	0.0	0.0	109.0
t09	0.0	4.0	0.0	7.3	0.0	0.0	11.3
t10	0.0	23.2	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	23.3
t11	0.0	5.4	0.0	4.2	0.0	0.4	10.0
t12	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.3	0.0	5.7	6.4
t13	0.0	16.8	0.0	4.4	0.0	0.0	21.2
t14	0.0	18.5	0.0	12.0	0.0	0.0	30.5
t15	0.0	5.9	0.0	24.6	0.0	0.0	30.5
t16	0.0	27.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	27.5
t17	0.0	36.9	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	37.1
Total	0.0	511.1	0.0	237.7	0.0	49.2	798.0

Table A-5 – Thompson Basin Existing Land Use (acres)

Subbasin	Impervious	Till Forest	Till Grass	Outwash Forest	Outwash Grass	Wetland	Total
t01	1.0	2.8	11.5	0.0	0.9	0.0	16.2
t02	2.5	32.6	31.5	1.2	0.3	0.0	68.0
t03	1.0	30.8	14.1	3.2	0.0	3.3	52.4
t04	1.6	24.0	19.0	0.0	1.5	0.0	46.0
t05	7.7	19.8	61.1	16.5	28.8	28.3	162.3
t06	5.7	5.6	18.5	25.0	23.1	3.8	81.7
t07	2.5	14.8	7.7	15.3	16.8	7.7	64.7
t08	5.6	26.0	35.9	11.1	30.4	0.0	109.0
t09	0.7	0.0	3.7	3.5	3.3	0.0	11.3
t10	2.3	0.0	20.9	0.0	0.1	0.0	23.3
t11	0.2	0.2	5.0	0.1	4.0	0.4	10.0
t12	0.0	0.1	0.3	0.2	0.1	5.7	6.4
t13	0.3	0.5	16.1	0.6	3.7	0.0	21.2
t14	11.4	3.6	8.0	1.2	6.3	0.0	30.5
t15	1.4	2.7	3.0	14.3	9.1	0.0	30.5
t16	9.3	0.5	17.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	27.5
t17	10.4	1.3	25.3	0.0	0.1	0.0	37.1
Total	63.5	165.2	299.2	92.3	128.7	49.2	798.0

Table A-6 – Thompson Basin Future Build-Out Land Use, According to City of Sammamish Zoning and Sammamish Town Center Plan (acres)

Subbasin	Impervious	Till Forest	Till Grass	Outwash Forest	Outwash Grass	Wetland	Total
t01	2.4	0.0	12.9	0.0	0.9	0.0	16.2
t02	11.0	0.0	55.6	0.0	1.4	0.0	68.0
t03	5.2	0.0	41.0	0.0	2.9	3.3	52.4
t04	7.6	0.0	37.5	0.0	1.0	0.0	46.0
t05	30.6	0.0	63.5	0.0	39.8	28.3	162.3
t06	18.2	0.0	21.2	0.0	38.6	3.8	81.7
t07	11.2	0.0	19.6	0.0	26.3	7.7	64.7
t08	24.2	0.0	49.5	0.0	35.2	0.0	109.0
t09	1.8	0.0	3.2	0.0	6.3	0.0	11.3
t10	7.8	0.0	15.4	0.0	0.1	0.0	23.3
t11	0.1	0.0	5.4	0.0	4.1	0.4	10.0
t12	0.1	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.3	5.6	6.4
t13	7.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	4.2	0.0	21.2
t14	15.5	0.0	8.5	0.0	6.4	0.0	30.5
t15	7.2	0.0	4.5	0.0	18.8	0.0	30.5
t16	13.3	0.0	14.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	27.5
t17	14.4	0.0	22.6	0.0	0.1	0.0	37.1
Total	177.4	0.0	384.9	0.0	186.6	49.2	798.0

APPENDIX B

Wetland Data Forms

Sammamish Basin Plans
Wetland Field Data Form

N of Inglewood Hill Rd.

Wetland No: 14. **Location:** behind Presbyterian Church. **Date:** Dec 4/08

Sub-basin: Inglewood **Cowardin Class:** PEM **HGM Class:** depressional.

Estimated Wetland Size (ac): <0.1 ____ 0.1-1 ✓ 1-5 ____ 5-10 ____ >10 ____

Identified by: CH, EC. **Photo No.** ____

Wetland Condition

Evidence of hydrologic alterations? If yes, indicate type. Yes [ ] No [✓]

- [ ] a. dredging
- [ ] b. filling
- [ ] c. draining
- [ ] d. clearing
- [ ] e. drainage ditches/diversions
- [ ] f. crop production
- [ ] g. other ____

Apparent impacts/threats to wetland from human use? If yes, indicate type. Yes [✓] No [ ]

- [ ] a. clearing
- [ ] b. grazing/agriculture
- [ ] c. litter
- [ ] d. recreational overuse
- [✓] e. residential development
- [ ] f. other ____

Hydrology

Water sources and hydroperiod:

- [ ] Ground water (perched water table, through flow…)
- [ ] Surface water
- [✓] Seep
- [ ] Seasonally flooded/saturated
- [ ] Permanently flooded/saturated
- [ ] Other ____

Inlet/outlet:

- [✓] a. constrained, size____
- [ ] b. unconstrained
- [ ] c. natural channel
- [✓] d. none runoff
- [✓] e. could not locate

Hydrologic connectivity to other wetlands and streams? Yes [ ] No [✓]

Indicators of wetland hydrology:

- [ ] a. inundation
- [✓] b. saturated in upper 12"
- [ ] c. water marks
- [ ] d. drift lines
- [ ] e. sediment deposits
- [ ] f. drainage patterns in wetlands
- [ ] h. water-stained leaves
- [ ] i. other ____

Soil

Is the wetland mapped on hydric soil? Yes [ ] No [ ]

Soil profile: –

Sammamish Basin Plans
Wetland Field Data Form

Vegetation

Dominant Species: PHAR, RUSP

Invasive Species? Yes (%) 90 No ___

Approximate age of dominant woody vegetation (years)?	<50	✓	50-80		>80	
# of habitat types:	1	✓	2		≥ 3	
Degree of interspersion:	Low	✓	Mod		High	

Vegetation connectivity to other habitats? no

Food sources or habitat features for wildlife? no

Buffer

Does the wetland have a buffer anywhere along its perimeter? Yes [✓] No [ ]

- [ ] a. grass-lawn
- [ ] b. herbaceous-native
- [ ] c. scrub-shrub
- [✓] d. forested
- [ ] f. other ___

If yes, what percentage of the wetland edge is protected by buffers of the width categories listed below? (Note: total should add to 100%)

- [ ] a. % no buffer
- [ ] b. % <25 ft
- [50] c. % 25-50 ft
- [ ] d. % 50-100 ft
- [ ] e. %>100 ft

Mitigation Opportunities

Are any mitigation opportunities present nearby? Yes [✓] No [ ]

- [✓] a. restoration
- [ ] b. creation
- [✓] c. enhancement
- [ ] d. preservation

Notes:

Sammamish Basin Plans
Rapid Qualitative Function Assessment Form

Wetland No. 14 Observer(s): CH, EC. Date: Dec 4/08

FUNCTION	LOW RATING	MODERATE RATING	HIGH RATING
	CRITERIA		
Water Quality Improvement	rapid flow through wetland	moderate flow through wetland ✓	little or no flow present
	<50% vegetation density	50-80% vegetation density	✓ >80% vegetation density
	no proximity to pollutants	✓ downstream from non-point pollutants	downstream from point discharges
Evaluation:	✓ detains <25% overland runoff	detains 25-50% overland runoff	detains >50% overland runoff
Flood/Storm Water Control	✓ size <5 acres	size 5-10 acres	size >10 acres
Evaluation:	✓ riverine, shallow depression	mid-sloped wetland	lake, depressions, headwaters, bogs
Groundwater Recharge	✓ size <5 acres	size 5-10 acres	size >10 acres
	temporarily saturated/inundated	✓ seasonally saturated/inundated	permanently inundated
Evaluation:	springs present outflow>inflow	✓ outflow=inflow	outflow<inflow
Natural Biological Support	✓ size <5 acres	size 5-10 acres	size >10 acres
	✓ isolated systems associated with ephemeral surface water	associated with permanent surface water	associated with permanent open water
	✓ one habitat type	two habitat types	three or more habitat types
	✓ little or no interspersion of habitats	some habitat interspersion	habitats highly interspersed
	✓ low plant diversity	moderate plant diversity	high plant diversity
	✓ few, if any habitat features present	some habitat features present	several habitat features present
	adjacent buffers primarily disturbed and/or developed	✓ buffers somewhat disturbed and/or developed	buffers generally undisturbed native vegetation and undeveloped
	✓ few connections to other habitat types	some connection to other habitat types	significant connections to high quality habitat types
Evaluation:	✓ Agricultural land or low vegetation structure	moderate vegetation structure	high vegetation structure
Erosion/Shoreline Protection	✓ sparse grass/forbs or not vegetation	sparse woody vegetation or dense herb vegetation	dense woody vegetation
Evaluation:			

Sammamish Basin Plans
Wetland Field Data Form

Wetland No: 18 **Location:** E of 229th 3 bisected by SE 8th **Date:** Dec 4/08

Sub-basin: Inglewood **Cowardin Class:** PSS, PFO, PEM **HGM Class:** Riverine

Estimated Wetland Size (ac): <0.1 ____ 0.1-1 ____ 1-5 ____ 5-10 ____ >10 X

Identified by: CH, EC **Photo No.** ____

Wetland Condition

Evidence of hydrologic alterations? If yes, indicate type. Yes [ ] No [X]

- [ ] a. dredging
- [ ] b. filling
- [ ] c. draining
- [ ] d. clearing
- [ ] e. drainage ditches/diversions
- [ ] f. crop production
- [ ] g. other ____

Apparent impacts/threats to wetland from human use? If yes, indicate type. Yes [ ] No [ ]

- [ ] a. clearing
- [ ] b. grazing/agriculture
- [ ] c. litter
- [ ] d. recreational overuse
- [X] e. residential development
- [ ] f. other ____

Hydrology

Water sources and hydroperiod:

- [ ] Ground water (perched water table, through flow…)
- [✓] Surface water
- [ ] Seep
- [ ] Seasonally flooded/saturated
- [ ] Permanently flooded/saturated
- [ ] Other ____

Inlet/outlet:

- [ ] a. constrained, size____
- [✓] b. unconstrained
- [✓] c. natural channel
- [ ] d. none
- [ ] e. could not locate

Hydrologic connectivity to other wetlands and streams? Yes [✓] No [ ]

Indicators of wetland hydrology:

- [ ] a. inundation
- [ ] b. saturated in upper 12"
- [ ] c. water marks
- [ ] d. drift lines
- [ ] e. sediment deposits
- [ ] f. drainage patterns in wetlands
- [ ] h. water-stained leaves
- [ ] i. other ____

Soil

Is the wetland mapped on hydric soil? Yes [ ] No [ ]

Soil profile: —

Sammamish Basin Plans
Wetland Field Data Form

Vegetation

Dominant Species: Invasive Species? Yes (%) ✓ No ___

Salix, ALRU, RUAR, THNA RUSP, SPDO, COSE

Approximate age of dominant woody vegetation (years)?	<50	✓	50-80		>80	
# of habitat types:	1		2		≥ 3	✓
Degree of interspersion:	Low		Mod		High	✓

Vegetation connectivity to other habitats? yes

Food sources or habitat features for wildlife? yes, - snags

Buffer

Does the wetland have a buffer anywhere along its perimeter? Yes ☐ No ☐

- ☐ a. grass-lawn
- ☐ b. herbaceous-native
- ☐ c. scrub-shrub
- ☐ d. forested
- ☐ f. other ___

If yes, what percentage of the wetland edge is protected by buffers of the width categories listed below? (Note: total should add to 100%)

- ☐ a. % no buffer
- ☐ b. % <25 ft
- 70 c. % 25-50 ft
- ☐ d. % 50-100 ft
- ☐ e. %>100 ft

Mitigation Opportunities

Are any mitigation opportunities present nearby? Yes ✓ No ☐

- ✓ a. restoration
- ☐ b. creation
- ✓ c. enhancement
- ☐ d. preservation

Notes: remove lawn grass that abuts wetland. artificial ponds created could remove (N of 8th off of 234th Ave SE

Sammamish Basin Plans
Rapid Qualitative Function Assessment Form

Wetland No. 18 Observer(s): CH, EC Date: Dec. 4/08

FUNCTION	CRITERIA: LOW RATING		MODERATE RATING		HIGH RATING
Water Quality Improvement		rapid flow through wetland	✓	moderate flow through wetland		little or no flow present
		<50% vegetation density		50-80% vegetation density	✓	>80% vegetation density
		no proximity to pollutants	✓	downstream from non-point pollutants		downstream from point discharges
Evaluation:		detains <25% overland runoff		detains 25-50% overland runoff	✓	detains >50% overland runoff
Flood/Storm Water Control		size <5 acres		size 5-10 acres	✓	size >10 acres
Evaluation:	✓	riverine, shallow depression		mid-sloped wetland	✓	lake, depressions, headwaters, bogs
Groundwater Recharge		size <5 acres		size 5-10 acres	✓	size >10 acres
		temporarily saturated/inundated	✓	seasonally saturated/inundated	✓	permanently inundated
Evaluation:		springs present outflow>inflow	✓	outflow=inflow		outflow<inflow
Natural Biological Support		size <5 acres		size 5-10 acres	✓	size >10 acres
		isolated systems associated with ephemeral surface water	✓	associated with permanent surface water		associated with permanent open water
		one habitat type		two habitat types	✓	three or more habitat types
		little or no interspersion of habitats		some habitat interspersion	✓	habitats highly interspersed
		low plant diversity		moderate plant diversity	✓	high plant diversity
		few, if any habitat features present		some habitat features present	✓	several habitat features present
		adjacent buffers primarily disturbed and/or developed	✓	buffers somewhat disturbed and/or developed		buffers generally undisturbed native vegetation and undeveloped
		few connections to other habitat types	✓	some connection to other habitat types		significant connections to high quality habitat types
Evaluation:		Agricultural land or low vegetation structure		moderate vegetation structure	✓	high vegetation structure
Erosion/Shoreline Protection		sparse grass/forbs or not vegetation		sparse woody vegetation or dense herb vegetation	✓	dense woody vegetation
Evaluation:						

Sammamish Basin Plans
Wetland Field Data Form

Wetland No: ~~WS~~ B32 Location: 235th Ave. NE. N of NE 8th Date: Dec 4/08

Sub-basin: Inglewood. Cowardin Class: PEM, open water HGM Class: Dep.

Estimated Wetland Size (ac): <0.1 ____ 0.1-1 ____ 1-5 ✓ 5-10 ____ >10 ____

Identified by: CH, EC. Photo No. ____

Wetland Condition

Evidence of hydrologic alterations? If yes, indicate type. Yes [ ] No [ ]

- [ ] a. dredging
- [ ] b. filling
- [ ] c. draining
- [ ] d. clearing
- [ ] e. drainage ditches/diversions
- [ ] f. crop production
- [ ] g. other ____

Apparent impacts/threats to wetland from human use? If yes, indicate type. Yes [✓] No [ ]

- [ ] a. clearing
- [ ] b. grazing/agriculture
- [ ] c. litter
- [ ] d. recreational overuse
- [✓] e. residential development
- [ ] f. other ____

Hydrology

Water sources and hydroperiod:

- [✓] Ground water (perched water table, through flow…)
- [ ] Surface water
- [ ] Seep
- [✓] Seasonally flooded/saturated
- [ ] Permanently flooded/saturated
- [ ] Other pondery

Inlet/outlet:

- [ ] a. constrained, size____
- [ ] b. unconstrained
- [ ] c. natural channel
- [✓] d. none
- [✓] e. could not locate

Hydrologic connectivity to other wetlands and streams? Yes [ ] No [✓]

Indicators of wetland hydrology:

- [✓] a. inundation
- [✓] b. saturated in upper 12"
- [ ] c. water marks
- [ ] d. drift lines
- [ ] e. sediment deposits
- [ ] f. drainage patterns in wetlands
- [ ] h. water-stained leaves
- [ ] i. other ____

Soil

Is the wetland mapped on hydric soil? Yes [ ] No [ ]

Soil profile: —

Sammamish Basin Plans
Wetland Field Data Form

Vegetation

Dominant Species: Invasive Species? Yes (%) 20 No ___

Poa, Salix sp. PHAR, SPDO

Approximate age of dominant woody vegetation (years)?	<50	✓	50-80		>80	
# of habitat types:	1	✓	2		≥ 3	
Degree of interspersion:	Low	✓	Mod		High	

Vegetation connectivity to other habitats? no

Food sources or habitat features for wildlife? no

Buffer

Does the wetland have a buffer anywhere along its perimeter? Yes [✓] No [ ]

- [✓] a. grass-lawn
- [ ] b. herbaceous-native
- [ ] c. scrub-shrub
- [✓] d. forested
- [ ] f. other ___

If yes, what percentage of the wetland edge is protected by buffers of the width categories listed below? (Note: total should add to 100%)

- [ ] a. % no buffer
- [65] b. % <25 ft
- [ ] c. % 25-50 ft
- [ ] d. % 50-100 ft
- [ ] e. %>100 ft

Mitigation Opportunities

Are any mitigation opportunities present nearby? Yes [ ] No [ ]

- [✓] a. restoration
- [ ] b. creation
- [ ] c. enhancement
- [ ] d. preservation

Notes:

Shelly 425-894-7704
Mike 425-444-0903

1832

Sammamish Basin Plans
Rapid Qualitative Function Assessment Form

Wetland No. 1115 Observer(s): CH, EC Date: Dec 4/08

FUNCTION	LOW RATING	MODERATE RATING	HIGH RATING
	CRITERIA		
Water Quality Improvement	rapid flow through wetland	moderate flow through wetland	✓ little or no flow present
	<50% vegetation density	50-80% vegetation density	✓ >80% vegetation density
	no proximity to pollutants	✓ downstream from non-point pollutants	downstream from point discharges
Evaluation:	✓ detains <25% overland runoff	detains 25-50% overland runoff	detains >50% overland runoff
Flood/Storm Water Control	size <5 acres	✓ size 5-10 acres	size >10 acres
Evaluation:	riverine, shallow depression	mid-sloped wetland	lake, depressions, headwaters, bogs
Groundwater Recharge	✓ size <5 acres	size 5-10 acres	size >10 acres
	temporarily saturated/inundated	✓ seasonally saturated/inundated	permanently inundated
Evaluation:	springs present outflow>inflow	✓ outflow=inflow	outflow<inflow
Natural Biological Support	✓ size <5 acres	size 5-10 acres	size >10 acres
	✓ isolated systems associated with ephemeral surface water	associated with permanent surface water	associated with permanent open water
	✓ one habitat type	two habitat types	three or more habitat types
	✓ little or no interspersion of habitats	some habitat interspersion	habitats highly interspersed
	✓ low plant diversity	moderate plant diversity	high plant diversity
	✓ few, if any habitat features present	some habitat features present	several habitat features present
	adjacent buffers primarily disturbed and/or developed	✓ buffers somewhat disturbed and/or developed	buffers generally undisturbed native vegetation and undeveloped
	✓ few connections to other habitat types	some connection to other habitat types	significant connections to high quality habitat types
Evaluation:	Agricultural land or low vegetation structure	✓ moderate vegetation structure	high vegetation structure
Erosion/Shoreline Protection	sparse grass/forbs or not vegetation	✓ sparse woody vegetation or dense herb vegetation	dense woody vegetation
Evaluation:			

Sammamish Basin Plans
Wetland Field Data Form

Wetland No: Pb 1502 **Location:** N of NE 8th **Date:** Dec 4/08

Sub-basin: Inglewood **Cowardin Class:** PSS, PEM **HGM Class:** Dep

Estimated Wetland Size (ac): <0.1 ____ 0.1-1 ✓ 1-5 ____ 5-10 ____ >10 ____

Identified by: CH, EC **Photo No.** ____

Wetland Condition

Evidence of hydrologic alterations? If yes, indicate type. Yes [ ] No [✓]

- [ ] a. dredging
- [ ] b. filling
- [ ] c. draining
- [ ] d. clearing
- [ ] e. drainage ditches/diversions
- [ ] f. crop production
- [ ] g. other ____

Apparent impacts/threats to wetland from human use? If yes, indicate type. Yes [✓] No [ ]

- [ ] a. clearing
- [ ] b. grazing/agriculture
- [ ] c. litter
- [ ] d. recreational overuse
- [X] e. residential development
- [ ] f. other ____

Hydrology

Water sources and hydroperiod:

- [X] Ground water (perched water table, through flow…)
- [ ] Surface water
- [ ] Seep
- [ ] Seasonally flooded/saturated
- [ ] Permanently flooded/saturated
- [ ] Other ____

Inlet/outlet:

- [ ] a. constrained, size____
- [ ] b. unconstrained
- [ ] c. natural channel
- [ ] d. none
- [✓] e. could not locate

Hydrologic connectivity to other wetlands and streams? Yes [ ] No [✓]

Indicators of wetland hydrology:

- [ ] a. inundation
- [✓] b. saturated in upper 12"
- [ ] c. water marks
- [ ] d. drift lines
- [ ] e. sediment deposits
- [ ] f. drainage patterns in wetlands
- [ ] h. water-stained leaves
- [ ] i. other ____

Soil

Is the wetland mapped on hydric soil? Yes [ ] No [ ]

Soil profile: —

Sammamish Basin Plans
Wetland Field Data Form

Vegetation

Dominant Species: Invasive Species? Yes (%) 20 No ___

RUSP, SPDO, ALRU, SALIX, RURA, THPL, PHAR

Approximate age of dominant woody vegetation (years)?	<50	✓	50-80		>80	
# of habitat types:	1		2	✓	≥3	
Degree of interspersion:	Low	✓	Mod		High	

Vegetation connectivity to other habitats?

Food sources or habitat features for wildlife?

Buffer

Does the wetland have a buffer anywhere along its perimeter? Yes [✓] No [ ]

- [✓] a. grass-lawn
- [ ] b. herbaceous-native
- [ ] c. scrub-shrub
- [✓] d. forested
- [ ] f. other ___

If yes, what percentage of the wetland edge is protected by buffers of the width categories listed below? (Note: total should add to 100%)

- [ ] a. % no buffer
- [ ] b. % <25 ft
- [80] c. % 25-50 ft
- [ ] d. % 50-100 ft
- [ ] e. %>100 ft

Mitigation Opportunities

Are any mitigation opportunities present nearby? Yes [✓] No [ ]

- [✓] a. restoration
- [ ] b. creation
- [ ] c. enhancement
- [ ] d. preservation

Notes:

WQ	H	BioSupport L
	H	L
	M	M
	L	L
Flood/Slo	L	L
	~~L~~ (shallow dip)	M
GW. Recharge	L	M
	M	~~M~~
	M	M
		H

Data transferred to → data sheet. Dec 8/08

Sammamish Basin Plans
Rapid Qualitative Function Assessment Form

Wetland No. 1502 Observer(s): WC, NEGH Date: Dec 4/08

FUNCTION		CRITERIA: LOW RATING		CRITERIA: MODERATE RATING		CRITERIA: HIGH RATING
Water Quality Improvement		rapid flow through wetland		moderate flow through wetland	✓	little or no flow present
		<50% vegetation density		50-80% vegetation density	✓	>80% vegetation density
		no proximity to pollutants	✓	downstream from non-point pollutants		downstream from point discharges
Evaluation:	✓	detains <25% overland runoff		detains 25-50% overland runoff		detains >50% overland runoff
Flood/Storm Water Control	✓	size <5 acres		size 5-10 acres		size >10 acres
Evaluation:	✓	riverine, shallow depression		mid-sloped wetland		lake, depressions, headwaters, bogs
Groundwater Recharge	✓	size <5 acres		size 5-10 acres		size >10 acres
		temporarily saturated/inundated	✓	seasonally saturated/inundated		permanently inundated
Evaluation:		springs present outflow>inflow	✓	outflow=inflow		outflow<inflow
Natural Biological Support	✓	size <5 acres		size 5-10 acres		size >10 acres
	✓	isolated systems associated with ephemeral surface water		associated with permanent surface water		associated with permanent open water
		one habitat type	✓	two habitat types		three or more habitat types
	✓	little or no interspersion of habitats		some habitat interspersion		habitats highly interspersed
	✓	low plant diversity		moderate plant diversity		high plant diversity
		few, if any habitat features present	✓	some habitat features present		several habitat features present
		adjacent buffers primarily disturbed and/or developed	✓	buffers somewhat disturbed and/or developed		buffers generally undisturbed native vegetation and undeveloped
		few connections to other habitat types	✓	some connection to other habitat types		significant connections to high quality habitat types
Evaluation:		Agricultural land or low vegetation structure	✓	moderate vegetation structure		high vegetation structure
Erosion/Shoreline Protection		sparse grass/forbs or not vegetation		sparse woody vegetation or dense herb vegetation	✓	dense woody vegetation
Evaluation:						

Sammamish Basin Plans
Wetland Field Data Form

Wetland No: 1509 **Location:** Start E of 228th Ave over to 244th **Date:** Dec 4/08

Sub-basin: Inglewood **Cowardin Class:** PSS, PEM, **HGM Class:** Riverine

Estimated Wetland Size (ac): <0.1 ____ 0.1-1 ____ 1-5 ____ 5-10 ____ >10 ✓

Identified by: CH, EC **Photo No.** ____

Wetland Condition

Evidence of hydrologic alterations? If yes, indicate type. Yes [ ] No [✓]

- [ ] a. dredging
- [ ] b. filling
- [ ] c. draining
- [ ] d. clearing
- [ ] e. drainage ditches/diversions
- [ ] f. crop production
- [ ] g. other development, pipeline

Apparent impacts/threats to wetland from human use? If yes, indicate type. Yes [✓] No [ ]

- [ ] a. clearing
- [ ] b. grazing/agriculture
- [ ] c. litter
- [ ] d. recreational overuse
- [X] e. residential development
- [ ] f. other ____

Hydrology

Water sources and hydroperiod:

- [ ] Ground water (perched water table, through flow…)
- [✓] Surface water
- [ ] Seep
- [✓] Seasonally flooded/saturated
- [✓] Permanently flooded/saturated
- [ ] Other ____

Inlet/outlet:

- [ ] a. constrained, size____
- [ ] b. unconstrained
- [ ] c. natural channel
- [ ] d. none
- [✓] e. could not locate

Hydrologic connectivity to other wetlands and streams? Yes [✓] No [ ]

Indicators of wetland hydrology:

- [✓] a. inundation
- [✓] b. saturated in upper 12"
- [ ] c. water marks
- [ ] d. drift lines
- [ ] e. sediment deposits
- [ ] f. drainage patterns in wetlands
- [ ] h. water-stained leaves
- [ ] i. other ____

Soil

Is the wetland mapped on hydric soil? Yes [ ] No [ ]

Soil profile: —

Sammamish Basin Plans
Wetland Field Data Form

Vegetation

Dominant Species: Invasive Species? Yes (%) 20+ No ___

RUSP, ~~RUCE~~ PHCA, POBA, red osier, TYLA, RUAR

Approximate age of dominant woody vegetation (years)?	<50	✓	50-80		>80	
# of habitat types:	1		2		≥ 3	✓
Degree of interspersion:	Low		Mod		High	✓

Vegetation connectivity to other habitats? yes.

Food sources or habitat features for wildlife? food, snags.

Buffer

Does the wetland have a buffer anywhere along its perimeter? Yes ✓ No ___

- [x] a. grass-lawn
- [ ] b. herbaceous-native
- [ ] c. scrub-shrub
- [x] d. forested
- [x] f. other large wetland, outer developed

If yes, what percentage of the wetland edge is protected by buffers of the width categories listed below? (Note: total should add to 100%)

- [ ] a. % no buffer
- [100] b. % <25 ft
- [ ] c. % 25-50 ft
- [ ] d. % 50-100 ft
- [ ] e. %>100 ft

Mitigation Opportunities

Are any mitigation opportunities present nearby? Yes ✓ No ___

- [ ] a. restoration
- [ ] b. creation
- [✓] c. enhancement
- [ ] d. preservation

Notes:

Sammamish Basin Plans
Rapid Qualitative Function Assessment Form

Wetland No. 1509 Observer(s): CH, EC Date: Dec 4/02

FUNCTION	CRITERIA: LOW RATING		MODERATE RATING		HIGH RATING
Water Quality Improvement		rapid flow through wetland	✓	moderate flow through wetland	
		<50% vegetation density		50-80% vegetation density	✓ >80% vegetation density
		no proximity to pollutants	✓	downstream from non-point pollutants	downstream from point discharges
Evaluation:		detains <25% overland runoff		detains 25-50% overland runoff	✓ detains >50% overland runoff
Flood/Storm Water Control		size <5 acres		size 5-10 acres	✓ size >10 acres
Evaluation:		riverine, shallow depression		mid-sloped wetland	lake, depressions, headwaters, bogs
Groundwater Recharge		size <5 acres		size 5-10 acres	✓ size >10 acres
		temporarily saturated/inundated		seasonally saturated/inundated	✓ permanently inundated
Evaluation:		springs present outflow>inflow		outflow=inflow	outflow<inflow
Natural Biological Support		size <5 acres		size 5-10 acres	✓ size >10 acres
		isolated systems associated with ephemeral surface water	✓	associated with permanent surface water	associated with permanent open water
		one habitat type		two habitat types	✓ three or more habitat types
		little or no interspersion of habitats		some habitat interspersion	✓ habitats highly interspersed
		low plant diversity		moderate plant diversity	✓ high plant diversity
		few, if any habitat features present		some habitat features present	✓ several habitat features present
		adjacent buffers primarily disturbed and/or developed	✓	buffers somewhat disturbed and/or developed	buffers generally undisturbed native vegetation and undeveloped
		few connections to other habitat types	✓	some connection to other habitat types	significant connections to high quality habitat types
Evaluation:		Agricultural land or low vegetation structure	✓	moderate vegetation structure	high vegetation structure
Erosion/Shoreline Protection		sparse grass/forbs or not vegetation		sparse woody vegetation or dense herb vegetation	✓ dense woody vegetation
Evaluation:					

Sammamish Basin Plans
Wetland Field Data Form

Wetland No: 1S11 **Location:** E of 228th, N of SE 8th **Date:** Dec 4/08

Sub-basin: Inglewood **Cowardin Class:** PSS, PEM **HGM Class:** Riverine

Estimated Wetland Size (ac): <0.1 ____ 0.1-1 ____ 1-5 ____ 5-10 ✓ >10 ____

Identified by: CH, CE **Photo No.** ____

Wetland Condition

Evidence of hydrologic alterations? If yes, indicate type. Yes [ ] No [✓]

- [ ] a. dredging
- [ ] b. filling
- [ ] c. draining
- [ ] d. clearing
- [ ] e. drainage ditches/diversions
- [ ] f. crop production
- [ ] g. other ____

Apparent impacts/threats to wetland from human use? If yes, indicate type. Yes [✓] No [ ]

- [ ] a. clearing
- [ ] b. grazing/agriculture
- [ ] c. litter
- [ ] d. recreational overuse
- [✓] e. residential development
- [ ] f. other ____

Hydrology

Water sources and hydroperiod:

- [ ] Ground water (perched water table, through flow…)
- [✓] Surface water
- [ ] Seep
- [ ] Seasonally flooded/saturated
- [ ] Permanently flooded/saturated
- [ ] Other ____

Inlet/outlet:

- [ ] a. constrained, size____
- [ ] b. unconstrained
- [✓] c. natural channel
- [ ] d. none
- [ ] e. could not locate

Hydrologic connectivity to other wetlands and streams? Yes [✓] No [ ]

Indicators of wetland hydrology:

- [✓] a. inundation
- [ ] b. saturated in upper 12"
- [ ] c. water marks
- [ ] d. drift lines
- [ ] e. sediment deposits
- [ ] f. drainage patterns in wetlands
- [ ] h. water-stained leaves
- [ ] i. other ____

Soil

Is the wetland mapped on hydric soil? Yes [ ] No [ ]

Soil profile: —

Sammamish Basin Plans
Wetland Field Data Form

Vegetation

Dominant Species: Invasive Species? Yes (%) ✓ No ___

JUNCUS, TYLA, GAUSP, RUBP, ROAR

Approximate age of dominant woody vegetation (years)?	<50	✓	50-80		>80	
# of habitat types:	1		2		≥ 3	✓
Degree of interspersion:	Low		Mod		High	✓

Vegetation connectivity to other habitats? yes.

Food sources or habitat features for wildlife? yes

Buffer

Does the wetland have a buffer anywhere along its perimeter? Yes [✓] No [ ]

- [✓] a. grass-lawn
- [✓] b. herbaceous-native
- [ ] c. scrub-shrub
- [✓] d. forested
- [ ] f. other ___

If yes, what percentage of the wetland edge is protected by buffers of the width categories listed below? (Note: total should add to 100%)

- [ ] a. % no buffer
- [ ] b. % <25 ft
- [ ] c. % 25-50 ft
- [50] d. % 50-100 ft
- [ ] e. %>100 ft

Mitigation Opportunities

Are any mitigation opportunities present nearby? Yes [✓] No [ ]

- [✓] a. restoration
- [ ] b. creation
- [ ] c. enhancement
- [ ] d. preservation

Notes: