



**CITY OF BLACK DIAMOND**  
**November 20, 2008 Workstudy Agenda**  
25510 Lawson St., Black Diamond, Washington

**6:00 P.M. – CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL**

**1.) Department of Ecology Presentation of Sensitive Areas Ordinance**

Richard K. Robohm,  
Department of Ecology

**2.) Adjournment**

**Black Diamond City Council  
Critical Areas Ordinance  
November 20, 2008**

**Wetland Ratings, Buffers,  
and Best Available Science**

Richard Robohm  
Wetland Specialist  
**Department of Ecology  
Shorelands & Environmental  
Assistance Program**





# Washington State Wetland Rating System for Western Washington

*Revised*



Ecology Publication # 04-06-025

# Wetland Rating System

- Developed in early 90s, updated 2004.
- 4 Categories (I to IV) reflecting the level of protection and management needed.
- Used to prescribe criteria for avoidance, buffer widths, and mitigation ratios.
- Qualifies as “best available science.”

# Wetland Rating System (cont.)

- Assesses wetland functions in three main groups:
  - **Habitat** (for the many wetland-dependent plant and animal species).
  - **Water quality improvement** (removing sediments, nutrients, toxicants).
  - **Hydrologic functions** (reducing flooding & erosion, recharging groundwater, supporting baseflow).

# Wetlands in Washington State

*Volume 2: Guidance for Protecting  
and Managing Wetlands*



# Management Options

- Analyzing wetlands & the landscape
- Characterizing risk
- Managing wetlands
  - ✓ Plans & policies
  - ✓ Nonregulatory tools
  - ✓ Adaptive management
- Regulatory tools
  - ✓ Avoiding impacts
  - ✓ Buffers
  - ✓ Mitigation ratios

# BAS & Buffers

- Scientific literature very consistent
- Buffers perform many key functions and are critical to maintaining wetlands
- Factors that should determine buffer widths:
  - Wetland type & functions (category)
  - Intensity of impacts from land use
  - Character of buffer (slope, soils, vegetation)

# BAS & Buffers

## ➤ Scientific literature reports ranges for different buffer functions:

- Removing coarse sediment → 10 - 50 ft.
- Removing fine sediment → 100 - 300 ft.
- Removing Nitrogen or Phosphorus → 30 - 200 ft.
- Screening wildlife → 50 - 150 ft.
- Habitat for wetland-dependent spp. → 100 - 1200 ft.

## ➤ “Within the range of BAS”

- Meaningful only when you ask: For what functions? What level of risk is acceptable?



# Regulating Buffers

- Challenge for local governments is to choose an approach based on:
  - Reliance on buffers (vs. other means) to protect functions
  - Level of risk
  - Balancing predictability and flexibility

# Alternative 1: Buffers based only on rating

Wetland Category	Buffer Width
IV	50 ft
III	150 ft
II	300 ft
I	300 ft

NOTE: Wider buffers needed for only some wetlands within each rating

# Impacts of adjacent land use

High	Commercial, industrial, residential >1 unit/acre, High-intensity recreation
Moderate	Residential $\leq$ 1 unit/acre Moderate-intensity recreation Paved trails
Low	Forestry Low-intensity recreation

Jurisdiction can use zoning designations & basin conditions to refine land use impacts

# Alternative 2: Buffers based on rating & intensity of impacts

Category of Wetland	Low-Impact Land Use	Moderate-Impact Land Use	High-Impact Land Use
IV	25 ft	40 ft	50 ft
III	75 ft	110 ft	150 ft
II	100 ft	150 ft	300 ft
I	150 ft	225 ft	300 ft

# Alternative 3:

**Buffers based on rating, intensity of impacts, & wetland functions or sensitivity**

- **Offers flexibility & predictability**
- **Includes criteria to increase, decrease & average buffers**
- **Represents moderate risk**
- **Developed with input from guidance group**

# Alternative 3

## Category I & II

### Intensity of Impact

<b>High habitat score</b> (29-36 pts)	High - 300 ft
	Mod - 225 ft
	Low - 150 ft
<b>Mod habitat score</b> (20-28 pts)	High - 150 ft
	Mod - 110 ft
	Low - 75 ft
<b>Low habitat score</b> (<20 pts)	High - 100 ft
	Mod - 75 ft
	Low - 50 ft

# Alternative 3

## Category 3 & 4

	Intensity of Impact		
<b>Category 3</b> Mod habitat score (20-28 pts)	High	-	150 ft
	Mod	-	110 ft
	Low	-	75 ft
<b>Category 3</b> Low habitat score ( $< 20$ pts)	High	-	80 ft
	Mod	-	60 ft
	Low	-	40 ft
<b>Category 4</b>	High	-	50 ft
	Mod	-	40 ft
	Low	-	25 ft

# Alternative 3

## Examples of reducing land use impacts

Examples of disturbance	Land uses that cause disturbance	Measures to minimize impacts
Lights	Parking lots, residential, warehouses, commercial	Shield & direct lights away from wetland
Noise	Parking lots, residential, warehouses, commercial	Locate noisy activities away from wetland, build fence or berm
Runoff	Parking lots, residential, warehouses, commercial	Low-impact devlpmt, treat & infiltrate runoff, reduce watering & use of pesticides & fertilizers





Runoff from poor erosion control during construction...

Yellow Lake, Klahanie Master Planned Development



bypasses buffers and fouls downstream waters.

# Buffers work *in conjunction with* stormwater management & other programs

Lewis Creek discharge into Lake Sammamish



Photo by Tim Heneghan Jan 1, 1990

# Summary

- **Baseline: Protect existing functions.**
- **Goal is not to eliminate nonconforming uses, but to avoid increasing them.**
- **Setting buffer widths is an exercise in risk management.**
- **Buffer Alternative 3:**
  - ✓ **Big scary buffers apply only in limited circumstances.**
  - ✓ **Flexible & site specific; developed in collaboration with local governments, planners, and consultants.**