

CITY RESPONSE FORM

RESPONSE PROVIDED ON July 20, 2018 CAO17-003

The right-hand column has intentionally been left blank for the city's response.

ESA/City of MI Comments	Response	City's Response
<p>1. The shoreline management requirements are separate from the wetland and stream buffer reduction requirements so the area within 20 feet of the Ordinary High Water Mark should not be included in the wetland and stream buffer calculations consistent with MICC 19.07.110(9)(d)(i). These areas shall be removed from the mitigation ratio calculations for buffer reduction.</p>	<p>Sheet 2 of 5 in the Critical Areas Study submitted on June 8, 2018 lists the mitigation enhancement area and ratio outside of the area 20 feet from the OHWM. The ratio is listed at 31:1, and 5,896 square feet, for the area more than 20 feet from the OHWM. Both information is shown, as the city previously stated the area must be planted, per the SMP. This is to ensure there is no confusion in future permits, such as the building permit. Further, we have updated the sheet to use a different key for the 20 feet SMP area for better clarification.</p>	<p>Ok Section of code that conflicts Comment</p>
<p>2. Sheet 5 of 5 shall be revised to include a performance standard specifically for the area 20-feet landward of Lake Washington. Native vegetation must meet or exceed 75 percent cover by Year 5 in the shoreline area.</p>	<p>An exhibit has been added that shows 75 percent coverage for the area, 0 to 20 feet from the OHWM. The following language has also been added to Sheet 5 of 5: <i>For the SMP planting requirement the following performance standard applies: there shall be 75% coverage 5 years after initial installation.</i></p>	<p>Ok Section of code that conflicts Comment</p>
<p>3. The 5-foot buffer proposed for the piped portion of the stream adjacent to the eastern side of the residence <u>could inhibit</u> future daylighting of the stream due to its narrowness. A minimum <u>10-foot</u> buffer shall be provided.</p>	<p>Best available science referenced by the City concludes that an open watercourse with a narrow buffer <u>may</u> provide beneficial functions over a piped watercourse with no buffer. I understand the City encourages daylighting per the best available science referenced above. I have analyzed the terrain on-site and positively concluded that the <u>20 foot</u> buffer and five foot setback provided <u>will not inhibit</u> future daylighting. I have analyzed the grade and depth of the watercourse as well as the overall size of the area in question. Please see details in the revised Critical Area Study report. (Today, there is no code requirement that require the ability to daylight a piped watercourse.)</p>	<p>Ok Section of code that conflicts Comment</p>

<p>4. Please provide additional detailed information for the proposed fish blockage removal. Provide the total area of excavation and grading within the stream, the proposed construction sequencing, the engineering design versus conceptual plan, and a statement that the remaining rocks in the stream channel will not block fish passage or removal of the remaining rocks.</p>	<p>a. The total area of excavation and grading of the watercourse has been added to Sheet 4 of 5. b. The details of construction sequencing has been added to Sheet 4 of 5. c. More detailed design has been added to sheet 4 of 5. d. The following statement has been added to Sheet 4 of 5: <i>The remaining rocks will not block fish passage or removal of the remaining rocks.</i></p>	<p>Ok Section of code that conflicts Comment</p>
<p>5. Given the location of the stream mouth at the transition from the hard stabilization structure and beach, please use soft shoreline stabilization for the shoreline structural stabilization proposed in Details 4.2a and 4.2b of the Buffer Reduction Mitigation Plan.</p>	<p>See above response 4c) where cedar logs have been chosen in the detailed design as soft shoreline stabilization.</p>	<p>Ok Section of code that conflicts Comment</p>