Alternative wildlife protection approach Item 2-13c

Existing Regulation(s)	Proposed Amendment & Description
The existing wildlife habitat corridor regulations and fish and wildlife habitat conservation standards rely on maps prepared by King County. The maps were generated through the use of aerial photos and connect wetland and stream areas. The maps have not been updated in a significant way since their original adoption by King County and do not reflect development patterns in Sammamish.	Accomplish the protection of wildlife habitat corridors through the use of the site-by-site basis evaluations of connectivity to high value habitat areas. The proposed regulations would include mechanisms to allow additional flexibility in site design for protection of wildlife habitat connectivity balanced with land development goals.
Desired Result of Amendment: Improve the recognition of existing site conditions and surrounding area habitat features when providing for habitat connectivity and protection. Allow for improved balance between habitat protection / connectivity and site development design. Eliminate the use of outdated, prescriptive mapping that does not reflect current site conditions.	

Amendment Source:
Staff Review

Best Available Science Support: Supported
Best Available Science Report "Streams and Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas" by AMEC Environment & Infrastructure, Inc.

Relevant Information (includes technical papers and/or references):

- East Sammamish Draft EIS, King County Planning & Community Development, July 1992
- East Sammamish Basin and Non Point Action Plan, King County SWM Division, December 1994
- WDFW Species and Habitat Management Recommendations website: http://wdfw.wa.gov/conservation/phs/mgmt_recommendations/

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

- 21A.50.325 Fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas – Development standards
- 21A.50.327 Wildlife habitat corridors

Notes:

Alternative wildlife protection approach Item 2-13c

Ratings are either: large positive (P), small positive (p), neutral, large negative (N), small negative (n)			
Environmental	**P**	**Implementation**	**p**
• Increased on-site protection of wildlife habitat • Neutral protection of public assets and resources (e.g. streets, water quality) • Decreased cumulative impacts to wildlife habitat • Increased potential to restore damaged wildlife habitat • Decreased chance of damage to wildlife habitat • Decreased potential to damage high quality, unique wildlife habitat • Reduced loss of wildlife habitat The city would evaluate habitat protection as part of any development proposal associated with high value wetland or stream areas, in particular those areas that have high habitat scores. The proposal would move away from focusing just on mapped corridors and allow for better on site protection of habitat, often in combination with other required ECA protection		• Clearer regulations, less chance for unintended consequences • Neutral effect on ability for consistent, efficient implementation by the staff • Neutral effect on likelihood of support/approval by other agencies • Increased effect on effective mitigation, easier to monitor Identifying fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas as part of the overall critical areas review, will allow for simpler diagnosis of whether or not wildlife habitat protection is required, and will not require protection in situations where it is not warranted (i.e. because of mapping). Combined review of critical areas and wildlife protection will allow for improved site design review and mitigation.	
Property	**P**	**Overall Effect**	
• Increased flexibility and options for property owner's use of property • Decreased predictability for permit applicants and neighbors • Improved recognition of site improvements and existing uses in standards • Increased expense / time Fish and wildlife habitat protection will focus on providing connection between high value features, rather than the current mapping, which is based upon out of date information. Increased flexibility in providing connections and protection will allow for improved site design based upon site specific conditions.		**Positive**	

Alternative wildlife protection approach Item 2-13c

Existing Regulation(s)	Proposed Amendment & Description
The existing wildlife habitat corridor regulations and fish and wildlife habitat conservation standards rely on maps prepared by King County. The maps were generated through the use of aerial photos and connect wetland and stream areas. The maps have not been updated in a significant way since their original adoption by King County and do not reflect development patterns in Sammamish.	Accomplish the protection of wildlife habitat corridors through the use of the site-by-site basis evaluations of connectivity to high value habitat areas. The proposed regulations would include mechanisms to allow additional flexibility in site design for protection of wildlife habitat connectivity balanced with land development goals. Backyard habitat management would be a component of these regulations.
Desired Result of Amendment: Improve the recognition of existing site conditions and surrounding area habitat features when providing for habitat connectivity and protection. Allow for improved balance between habitat protection / connectivity and site development design. Eliminate the use of outdated, prescriptive mapping that does not reflect current site conditions.	

Amendment Source:
Staff Review

Best Available Science Support: Supported
Best Available Science Report "Streams and Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas" by AMEC Environment & Infrastructure, Inc.

Relevant Information (includes technical papers and/or references):

- East Sammamish Draft EIS, King County Planning & Community Development, July 1992
- East Sammamish Basin and Non Point Action Plan, King County SWM Division, December 1994
- WDFW Species and Habitat Management Recommendations website: http://wdfw.wa.gov/conservation/phs/mgmt_recommendations/

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

- 21A.50.325 Fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas – Development standards
- 21A.50.327 Wildlife habitat corridors

Notes:

Alternative wildlife protection approach Item 2-13c

Ratings are either: large positive (P), small positive (p), neutral, large negative (N), small negative (n)			
Environmental	**P**	**Implementation**	**p**
• Increased on-site protection of wildlife habitat • Neutral protection of public assets and resources (e.g. streets, water quality) • Decreased cumulative impacts to wildlife habitat • Increased potential to restore damaged wildlife habitat • Decreased chance of damage to wildlife habitat • Decreased potential to damage high quality, unique wildlife habitat • Reduced loss of wildlife habitat The city would evaluate habitat protection as part of any development proposal associated with high value wetland or stream areas, in particular those areas that have high habitat scores. The proposal would move away from focusing just on mapped corridors and allow for better on site protection of habitat, often in combination with other required ECA protection		• Clearer regulations, less chance for unintended consequences • Neutral effect on ability for consistent, efficient implementation by the staff • Neutral effect on likelihood of support/approval by other agencies • Increased effect on effective mitigation, easier to monitor Identifying fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas as part of the overall critical areas review, will allow for simpler diagnosis of whether or not wildlife habitat protection is required, and will not require protection in situations where it is not warranted (i.e. because of mapping). Combined review of critical areas and wildlife protection will allow for improved site design review and mitigation.	
Property	**P**	**Overall Effect**	
• Increased flexibility and options for property owner's use of property • Decreased predictability for permit applicants and neighbors • Improved recognition of site improvements and existing uses in standards • Increased expense / time Fish and wildlife habitat protection will focus on providing connection between high value features, rather than the current mapping, which is based upon out of date information. Increased flexibility in providing connections and protection will allow for improved site design based upon site specific conditions.		**Positive**	