



| Ratings are either: large positive (P), small positive (p), neutral, large negative (N), small negative (n)   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|
| Environmental   | N | Implementation  | N |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decreased on-site protection of streams</li> <li>• Neutral protection of public assets and resources (e.g. streets, water quality)</li> <li>• Increased cumulative impacts to streams</li> <li>• Negative potential to restore damaged stream channels or buffers</li> <li>• Increased chance of damage to streams</li> <li>• Increased potential to damage high quality, unique streams</li> <li>• Net loss of stream functions and values</li> </ul> <p>This amendment is based upon the premise that buffers serve no value if separated from the stream by a physical barrier. A review of BAS indicates this is not an accurate premise. The proposed amendment will result in the elimination of buffer areas, decreasing the protection of on-site streams and increasing the cumulative impacts to streams and buffers. In the case of some low value buffer functions, BAS would suggest increasing buffers rather than elimination. The proposed amendment creates an increase in unpermitted alterations, which increases the risk of damage to streams, including unique streams corridors, and results in a net loss to stream functions and values. The amendment also reduces options for restoration of degraded buffer areas.</p> |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less clear regulations, increased chance for unintended consequences</li> <li>• Decreased ability for consistent, efficient implementation by the staff</li> <li>• Decreased likelihood of support/approval by other agencies</li> <li>• Neutral on mitigation, neutral on monitor</li> </ul> <p>There is inherent variability in the quality of stream buffer analysis and review, which increases the chance for unintended consequences, and decreases the city's ability to ensure consistent and efficient implementation. The proposed amendment also appears to create a possible incentive for property owners to not obtain city approval prior to alterations to stream buffers; creating additional demands on resources for code compliance. Further, as this amendment does not appear to be supported by Best Available Science, there is a decreased likelihood of support or approval by other agencies.</p> |   |
| Property  | p | Overall Effect  |   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased flexibility and options for property owner's use of property</li> <li>• Decreased predictability for permit applicants and neighbors</li> <li>• Increased recognition of site improvements and existing uses in standards</li> <li>• More expensive / more time</li> </ul> <p>The proposed amendment will generally increase the flexibility and options for property owners in the use of their property by basing the stream buffer on the site improvements and existing uses. Location of buffers will be highly dependent on each site's conditions, which decreases the predictability and equity in permitting for property owners and neighboring properties. The permit review requirements will be increased and will require additional expert review to minimize issues with consistency and possible mis-location of stream buffer areas.</p>   |   | <h2>Negative</h2>   |   |