



Ratings are either: large positive (P), small positive (p), neutral, large negative (N), small negative (n)			
Environmental	p	Implementation	Neutral
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improved on-site protection of the ECA functions and values</li> <li>Increased protection of public assets and resources (e.g. streets, water quality)</li> <li>Reduced cumulative impacts to the ECA</li> <li>Increased potential to restore damaged ECA</li> <li>Reduced chance of damage to ECA</li> <li>Better protects high quality, unique ECA features</li> <li>No net loss of ECA functions and values</li> </ul> <p>Eliminating the potential of relocation of Type F streams for public projects would provide increased on site and cumulative protections for Type F streams. It would not have an effect on restoration of damaged streams or net loss of functions and values since restoration would be required, but would better protect high quality features. Movement of a Type F stream for a public project would be expected to occur rarely.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased chances of unintended consequences</li> <li>Neutral effect on ability for consistent, efficient implementation by the staff</li> <li>Increased likelihood of support/approval by other agencies</li> <li>Neutral effect on mitigation success and monitoring</li> </ul> <p>Eliminating the allowance for disturbance of Type F streams would result in less chance for problems during construction. It would not affect the chances of mitigation success but may require less monitoring. There would be an increased chance of approval of other agencies, and no effect on consistency or efficient implementation by staff.</p>	
Property	N	Overall Effect	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduced flexibility and options for property owner's use of property</li> <li>Neutral effect on predictability for permit applicants and neighbors</li> <li>Decreased recognition of site improvements and existing uses in standards</li> <li>Increased expense / time if project must be redesigned to a more difficult location (e.g. street relocation through private property alternative route)</li> </ul> <p>The amendment would result in reduced flexibility for public infrastructure, and may increase costs to the public of alternative design. Reduced recognition of existing corridors for utilities or streets. No effect on predictability would be expected.</p>		<h2>Negative</h2>	



# Prohibit Stream

## Relocations for Capital Projects

Item 2-7b

Ratings are either: large positive (P), small positive (p), neutral, large negative (N), small negative (n)			
Environmental	p	Implementation	Neutral
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improved on-site protection of the ECA functions and values</li> <li>Increased protection of public assets and resources (e.g. streets, water quality)</li> <li>Reduced cumulative impacts to the ECA</li> <li>Increased potential to restore damaged ECA</li> <li><u>Increased potential to restore damaged stream channels or buffers</u></li> <li>Reduced chance of damage to ECA</li> <li>Better protects high quality, unique ECA features</li> <li>No net loss of ECA functions and values</li> </ul> <p>Eliminating the potential of relocation of Type F streams for public projects would provide increased on site and cumulative protections for Type F streams. It would not have an effect on restoration of damaged streams or net loss of functions and values since restoration would be required, but would better protect high quality features. Movement of a Type F stream for a public project would be expected to occur rarely.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased chances of unintended consequences</li> <li>Neutral effect on ability for consistent, efficient implementation by the staff</li> <li>Increased likelihood of support/approval by other agencies</li> <li>Neutral effect on mitigation success and monitoring</li> </ul> <p>Eliminating the allowance for disturbance of Type F streams would result in less chance for problems during construction. It would not affect the chances of mitigation success but may require less monitoring. There would be an increased chance of approval of other agencies, and no effect on consistency or efficient implementation by staff.</p>	
Property	Nn	Overall Effect	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduced flexibility and options for property owner's use of property</li> <li>Neutral effect on predictability for permit applicants and neighbors</li> <li>Decreased recognition of site improvements and existing uses in standards</li> <li>Increased expense / time if project must be redesigned to a more difficult location (e.g. street relocation through private property alternative route)</li> </ul> <p>The amendment would result in reduced flexibility for public infrastructure, and may increase costs to the public of alternative design, <u>although alternative permitting processes may be available. Stream re-locations are relatively rare, and are not expected to be an issue in the foreseeable future.</u> Reduced recognition of existing corridors for utilities or streets. No effect on predictability would be expected.</p>		<p><del>Negative</del> <u>Neutral</u></p>	



# Prohibit Stream

## Relocations for Public Capital Projects

## Item 2-7b

Ratings are either: large positive (P), small positive (p), neutral, large negative (N), small negative (n)			
<b>Environmental</b>	<b>P</b>	<b>Implementation</b>	<b>Neutral</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improved on-site protection of the ECA functions and values</li> <li>Increased protection of public assets and resources (e.g. streets, water quality)</li> <li>Reduced cumulative impacts to the ECA</li> <li>Increased potential to restore damaged ECA</li> <li>Increased potential to restore damaged stream channels or buffers</li> <li>Reduced chance of damage to ECA</li> <li>Better protects high quality, unique ECA features</li> <li>No net loss of ECA functions and values</li> </ul> <p>Eliminating the potential of relocation of Type F streams for public projects would provide increased on site and cumulative protections for Type F streams. It would not have an effect on restoration of damaged streams or net loss of functions and values since restoration would be required, but would better protect high quality features. Movement of a Type F stream for a public project would be expected to occur rarely. Some additional opportunity for restoration may result from the Public Agency / Utility Exception process.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased chances of unintended consequences</li> <li>Neutral effect on ability for consistent, efficient implementation by the staff</li> <li>Increased likelihood of support/approval by other agencies</li> <li>Neutral effect on mitigation success and monitoring</li> </ul> <p>Eliminating the allowance for disturbance of Type F streams would result in less chance for problems during construction. It would not affect the chances of mitigation success but may require less monitoring. There would be an increased chance of approval of other agencies, and no effect on consistency or efficient implementation by staff.</p>	
<b>Property</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Overall Effect</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduced flexibility and options for property owner's use of property</li> <li>Neutral effect on predictability for permit applicants and neighbors</li> <li>Decreased recognition of site improvements and existing uses in standards</li> <li>Increased expense / time if project must be redesigned to a more difficult location (e.g. street relocation through private property alternative route)</li> </ul> <p>The amendment would result in reduced flexibility for public infrastructure, and may increase costs to the public of alternative design, although alternative permitting processes (e.g. Public Agency / Utility Exceptions) may be available. Stream relocations are relatively rare, and are not expected to be an issue in the foreseeable future. Reduced recognition of existing corridors for utilities or streets. No effect on predictability would be expected.</p>		<b>Positive</b>	

## Evaluation Form – Public Hearing Version