Alternative wetland mosaic study Item 3-22c

Existing Regulation(s)	Proposed Amendment & Description
A critical area study is prepared evaluating the wetland category of wetlands as part of a development proposal. The evaluation of a wetland as part of a wetland mosaic is not explicitly identified in SMC 21A.50.130. Identification of a wetland as part of a mosaic is required as part of the wetland designation mandated by the federal 1987 Wetland Delineation Manual (Environmental Laboratory, 1987) and the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Interim Regional Supplement for Western Mountains, Valleys, and Coast Region (USACE	Critical areas studies must include the area off-site a specified distance of 215-feet beyond the project area boundary and evaluate whether or not wetlands in that area are part of a mosaic. The proposed amendment would, in part, include clarification of the wetland designation process.
Desired Result of Amendment: The proposed amendment would add consistency to the existing regulation, requiring a standard 215 distance for evaluation of off-site critical areas and clarify that wetlands should be designated, in part, based upon their being located in a wetland mosaic.	

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

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

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

- 21A.50.100(1) Disclosure by applicant
- 21A.50.130 Contents of critical areas study.

Notes:

Alternative wetland mosaic study Item 3-22c

Ratings are either: large positive (P), small positive (p), neutral, large negative (N), small negative (n)

Environmental	Neutral	Implementation	Neutral
• Neutral effect related to on-site protection of the ECA functions and values (F&V) • Neutral protection of public assets and resources (e.g. streets, water quality) • Neutral cumulative impacts to the ECA F&V • Neutral effect on restoration of damaged ECA • Neutral chance of damage to ECA F&V • Neutral effect on protection of high quality, unique ECA features • Neutral effect on net loss of ECA F&V There would be a neutral effect on critical area protection as a result of this amendment. An applicant is currently required to identify off site critical areas within the greatest potential buffer area and to evaluate whether wetlands are part of a wetland mosaic.		• Clearer regulations, less chance for unintended consequences • Neutral effect on consistent, efficient implementation by the staff • Neutral effect on increased likelihood of support/approval by other agencies • Neutral effect on effective mitigation and monitoring Providing a set distance for an applicant to examine for off-site critical areas provides for a clearer, more standard regulation. Similarly evaluating the wetland mosaic status of a wetland is currently required, and the amendment would clarify this requirement further. There would be no effect on likelihood of approval by other agencies as these items are currently required (although not explicitly).	

Property	n	Overall Effect
• Neutral effect on flexibility and options for property owner's use of property • Increased predictability for permit applicants, no effect on predictability for neighbors • Neutral effect on recognition of site improvements and existing uses in standards • Increase in expense There would be no effect on property owner's use of property since the end result related to buffer size and protection of the critical area would be the same. There would be a slightly increased predictability with a standard and increased distance specified for the critical areas study. The increased distance of the study would likely significantly increase the cost.		**Negative**