

CRITICAL AREAS STUDY WESTHILL, INC. (LEAHY PROPERTY) CITY OF MERCER ISLAND TAX PARCEL #004610-0152

PREPARED FOR:

Westhill, Inc. Attn: Mr. Chuck Russell P.O. Box 306 Woodinville, WA 98072

PREPARED BY:

Wetlands & Wildlife, Inc. 19410--179th Court NE Woodinville, WA 98077 (425) 337-6450

Report Revision Date: May 25, 2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION AND BRIEF SITE DESCRIPTION	1
STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS TO CONDUCT THIS CRITICAL AREAS EVALUATION	1
PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT	2
METHODOLOGIES OF CRITICAL AREAS EVALUATION	3
RESULTS AND FINDINGS OF CRITICAL AREAS EVALUATION	4
EXISTING ECOLOGICAL FUNCTIONS AND VALUES ASSESSMENT	7
DISCUSSION REGARDING THE PROPOSED ADDITION WITHIN STANDARD CRITICAL AREA BUFFERS	8
DISCUSSION REGARDING POTENTIAL TEMPORARY BUFFER IMPACTS AND RELATED RESTORATION	9
PROJECT'S IMPACT DETERMINATIONS RELATED TO CRITICAL AREAS	10
LIMITATIONS AND USE OF THIS REPORT	10
REFERENCES AND LITERATURE REVIEWED	11
ATTACHMENTS: 1. WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORMS (6 DATA POINTS) 2. WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORMS (6 DATA POINTS)	

- 2. WETLAND RATING FORMS--WESTERN WASHINGTON (3 FORMS WITH REQUIRED FIGURES)
- 3. CRITICAL AREAS OVERVIEW MAP MAP SHEET CA1.00

INTRODUCTION AND BRIEF SITE DESCRIPTION

The subject property is located at 4340 East Mercer Way in the City of Mercer Island, Washington. The King County tax parcel number for the property follows: 004610-0152. Per the King County Assessor's office, the site encompasses approximately 0.49 acres and is currently owned by William Leahy. Vehicular site access to the subject property is gained by travelling west from a private road onto an existing concrete driveway located among the eastern portion of the property. The subject property is currently developed with a single-family residence and associated infrastructure normal to single-family residential properties in the region.

Wetlands & Wildlife, Inc. was retained by *Westhill, Inc.* to conduct detailed Critical Areas evaluations of the subject property and vicinity pursuant to the requirements outlined in Chapter 19.07 (Environment) of the Mercer Island City Code (MICC). Specifically, *Wetlands & Wildlife, Inc.* was retained to determine if any wetlands, streams, or associated protective buffer areas regulated by the MICC exist on or near the property. *Wetlands & Wildlife, Inc.* conducted detailed Critical Areas multiple site visits to the subject property during 2020. Please review the RESULTS AND FINDINGS OF CRITICAL AREAS EVALUATION section of this report for further information. Please also see the attached Critical Areas Overview Map (Map Sheet CA1.00).

STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS TO CONDUCT THIS CRITICAL AREAS EVALUATION

Per requirements outlined in Chapter 19.07 (Environment) of the MICC, a Critical Areas Study shall be prepared by a qualified professional using guidance based on the best available science consistent with the standards in Chapter 365-195 of the Washington Administrative Code (WAC). Therefore, the following provides a brief overview of my experience and credentials to conduct the detailed evaluations on the subject property. I am the Founder, Owner, and Principal Wetland and Wildlife Ecologist of Wetlands & Wildlife, Inc. I attended the University of Montana where I graduated cum laude with a degree in Wildlife Biology. As of 2021, I have 20 years of direct experience as a professional Biologist / Ecologist in western Washington and 24 years of overall experience completing natural resource assessments among many different ecosystems across the western United States. I have worked as a professional Biologist / Ecologist for federal, state, and county environmental agencies, as well as several private environmental consulting firms with specialties in wetlands, streams, rivers, lakes, and wildlife habitat. In my 24 years of biological / ecological experience, I have specialized in evaluations of proposed land use and building development permit applications as they pertain to Critical Areas (wetlands, rivers, streams, lakes, and habitats of protected fish and wildlife species). My professional employment experience includes working as a Senior Reviewing Ecologist for King County DDES / DPER and a Regulatory Biologist for Snohomish County PDS.

I am listed on several Preferred / Qualified Consultant Rosters throughout western Washington. I am highly experienced with the required U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and Washington State wetland delineation methods. In addition to the wetland delineation certification, I am trained by the Washington Department of Ecology and have 16 years of experience in the use of the required Wetland Rating Form for western Washington (since its inception). I am trained by the Washington Department of Ecology to determine

Ordinary High Water Mark (OHWM) locations for rivers, streams, and lakes. In addition to my expertise related to wetlands and streams, I have 24 years of experience conducting wildlife habitat assessments and / or wildlife surveys of special-status wildlife species and species of local importance in the western U.S. I received certifications from the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife for terrestrial wildlife habitat assessments and wildlife surveys of special-status wildlife species.

I have conducted over 2,000 biological / ecological assessments in different capacities on properties with many habitat types and zoning designations, from small, urban properties (0.25 acres) to large, rural properties (up to 2,000 acres in size). I have been selected by several local city jurisdictions to provide on-call 3rd-party environmental reviews of proposed development projects for compliance with local Critical Areas Ordinances and the FEMA Floodplain Habitat Assessment and Mitigation document.

PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

This report is intended to be submitted to the City of Mercer Island Permitting Division for the purpose of providing information related to any regulated wetlands, streams, and associated buffers that are located on or near the subject property. The property owner is proposing to construct a 2nd-story addition on the property, entirely located within the building footprint associated with the existing house. Lauren Anderson, Planner for the City of Mercer Island, wrote a letter dated March 31, 2021. In that letter, Ms. Anderson requested for the project team to provide information as to how the proposed is exempt from SEPA review per Washington Administrative Code (WAC) section 197-11-800. In accordance with WAC section 197-11-800(1), the proposed project is categorically exempt from SEPA review because the project includes minor new construction associated with a proposed 2nd-story addition to an existing single-family residence. The proposed 2nd-story addition will be located entirely within the building footprint of the existing single-family residence. Single-family residential projects are categorically exempt from SEPA review as long as none of the proposed project "Is undertaken wholly or partly on lands covered by water". As detailed later in this report, no proposed project activities are located among areas that are wholly or partly on lands covered by water. All proposed project activities are located more than 45 feet from the on-site stream and / or off-site wetlands. Therefore, the proposed single-family residential addition project meets all criteria to be considered categorically exempt from SEPA review.

Please see the attached Map Sheet CA1.00 for a general depiction of the proposed 2nd-story addition in relation to the existing site features. Per information obtained from Cindy Larsen, Architect from *Bassett Larsen Design, LLC*, the proposed 2nd-story addition would provide approximately 1,000 square feet of additional living space. The City of Mercer Island code section 19.16.010 defines the term "building footprint" as follows: "That portion of the lot that is covered by buildings." The proposed 2nd-story addition will be located entirely within the bounds of the existing roofline / overhangs associated with the existing house. Therefore, the proposed 2nd-story addition will not result in any increase to the existing "building footprint" as defined in the City's code section 19.16.010.

The proposed 2nd-story addition has been very carefully examined in accordance with the mitigation sequencing requirements outlined in MICC section 19.07.100. Due to the size of the property, location of the existing house, property line setbacks, and / or the site constraints associated with the on-site Critical

Areas detailed in this report, there is no opportunity to construct the 2nd-story addition outside of the standard 60-foot buffer width associated with the Type Ns stream located near the southern property line and / or the standard 60-foot buffer associated with Off-site Wetland C. Therefore, the property owner is proposing to construct the proposed 2nd-story addition partially within the standard stream and wetland buffer in accordance with MICC section 19.07.130 (Modifications). As stated in MICC section 19.07.130, "The activities in this section are exempt from the development standards in subsequent sections within this chapter; provided that additional measures to protect life and property or to protect environmental quality may be required." Please view the report section below titled DISCUSSION REGARDING THE PROPOSED ADDITION WITHIN STANDARD CRITICAL AREA BUFFERS which details how the proposed project adheres to the Mercer Island City Code.

Based on this information and our detailed evaluations related to the proposed project, it is the professional opinion that the proposed project meets the intent and requirements of the MICC. Please view the remainder of this report for more information regarding our findings and determinations.

METHODOLOGIES OF CRITICAL AREAS EVALUATION

Wetlands & Wildlife, Inc. used methodologies described in <u>Determining the Ordinary High Water Mark for</u> <u>Shoreline Management Act Compliance in Washington</u> State and definitions outlined in MICC19.16.010 to make a determination regarding any potential regulated streams, lakes, or rivers on or near the subject property in accordance with the MICC regulations.

Wetlands & Wildlife, Inc. also used the routine methodologies described in the <u>Washington State Wetlands</u> <u>Identification and Delineation Manual</u> (Washington State Department of Ecology Publication #96-94, March 1997) to make a determination regarding the presence of any regulated wetlands. In addition, *Wetlands & Wildlife, Inc.* evaluated the site using the <u>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual</u> produced in 1987 and the <u>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual</u> produced in 1987 and the <u>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual</u> produced in State Terferred to as the "Regional Supplement"). The Regional Supplement is designed for concurrent use with the 1987 Corps Wetland Delineation Manual and all subsequent versions. The Regional Supplement provides technical guidance and procedures for identifying and delineating wetlands that may be subject to regulatory jurisdiction under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Where differences in the two documents occur, this Regional Supplement takes precedence over the Corps Manual for applications in the Western Mountains, Valleys, and Coast Region.

According to the federal and state methodologies described above, identification of wetlands is based on a three-factor approach involving indicators of hydrophytic vegetation, hydric soils, and presence or evidence of persistent hydrology. Except where noted in the manuals, the three-factor approach discussed above requires positive indicators of hydrophytic vegetation, hydric soils, and wetland hydrology to make a determination that an area is a regulated wetland. Using the aforementioned manuals, the site characteristics for making a wetland determination include the following:

1.) Examination of the site for hydrophytic vegetation (species present/percent cover);

2.) Examination for the presence of hydric soils in areas where hydrophytic vegetation is present; and3.) Examination to determine if adequate hydrology exists for sufficient durations during the early part of the growing season in the same locations as the previous two steps.

Per City of Mercer Island requirements, *Wetlands & Wildlife, Inc.* examined the entire subject site and rated wetlands using the Washington State Wetland Rating System for Western Washington (Revised, Publication No. 14-06-029, October 2014). In addition to assessing the site characteristics on the subject property, *Wetlands & Wildlife, Inc.* also visually assessed the surrounding properties within approximately 300 feet of the subject property to the maximum extent practical without accessing adjacent private properties due to a lack of legal site access onto those other private properties. While a detailed assessment of Critical Areas on adjacent private properties was not possible due to lack of legal access, *Wetlands & Wildlife, Inc.* conducted a review of all readily available information to assess the potential properties is necessary to determine if any regulated Critical Areas exist off-site which would cause associated protective buffers to extend onto the property and potentially affect a future development proposal on the subject property.

In addition to on-site field evaluations, we also examined the Web Soil Survey maps produced by the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) maps produced by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), SalmonScape fish distribution maps produced by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW), and StreamNet fish distribution maps produced by Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission.

RESULTS AND FINDINGS OF CRITICAL AREAS EVALUATION

Based on our detailed evaluations of the subject property, one stream (Stream A) is located on-site among the southwest corner of the subject property and the stream is located in close proximity to the southern property boundary. In addition to the stream, three separate regulated wetlands are located off-site to the south of the property near the southern property line. Please view the attached Map Sheet CA1.00 for the location of the Critical Areas described above. No other regulated wetlands or streams were located on or near the subject site that would affect the proposed development

Cowardin Classifications:

According to the Cowardin System, as described in Classification of Wetlands and Deepwater Habitats of the United States, the classifications for the subject stream and wetlands follow:

Stream A: Riverine, Intermittent, Streambed, Cobble-Gravel (R4SB3) Off-site Wetland A: Palustrine, Emergent, Persistent, Saturated (PEM1B) Off-site Wetland B: Palustrine, Forested, Broad-Leaved Evergreen, Saturated (PFO3B) Off-site Wetland C: Palustrine, Emergent, Persistent, Saturated (PEM1B)

Classifications Pursuant to the City of Mercer Island Critical Areas Regulations:

Pursuant to Chapter 19.07 of the MICC, the classifications and regulations related to the stream and off-site

wetlands are described below.

Stream A transports hydrology generally from west to east. This stream is located on-site among the southwestern portion of the property, and then extends off-site but is located in close proximity to the southern property line as shown on Map Sheet CA1.00. Stream A is classified on the City of Mercer Island GIS Portal as a non-fish bearing stream and appears to be a seasonal / intermittent stream. Therefore, the stream is considered a Type Ns stream. Per MICC section 19.07.180.C.1, Type Ns streams in the City of Mercer Island typically receive 60-foot protective buffers. Therefore, the standard buffer width required for this stream on this site equals 60 feet. Please see the discussion below regarding overlapping buffer widths. Please also see the attached Map Sheet CA1.00 for a depiction of Stream A.

Off-site Wetland A is located off-site to the south of the property, near the southwest property corner as depicted on the attached Map Sheet CA1.00. Per the City of Mercer Island code requirements, Wetland A was rated using the Washington State Wetland Rating System for Western Washington (Revised, Publication No. 14-06-029, October 2014). The wetland slopes from south to north toward Stream A and was therefore rated as a "Slope" wetland on the Wetland Rating Form. Using the Wetland Rating Form, the subject wetland scored a total of 14 points (6 points for Water Quality Functions, 4 points for Hydrologic Functions, and 4 points for Habitat Functions) and is therefore considered a **Category IV wetland**. The rating form is attached to this report for viewing. Per the table shown MICC 19.07.090.C.1, Category IV wetlands typically require a protective buffer width of 40 feet to be applied parallel to the wetland boundary. **Therefore, the standard buffer width required for Wetland A equals 40 feet.** Please view the discussion below regarding overlapping buffer widths and the attached Map Sheet CA1.00 for a depiction of Wetland A and its associated protective buffer.

Off-site Wetland B is located off-site to the south of the property, south of the existing residence as depicted on the attached Map Sheet CA1.00. Per the City of Mercer Island code requirements, Wetland B was rated using the Washington State Wetland Rating System for Western Washington (Revised, Publication No. 14-06-029, October 2014). The wetland slopes from toward Stream A and was therefore rated as a "Slope" wetland on the Wetland Rating Form. Using the Wetland Rating Form, the subject wetland scored a total of 13 points (6 points for Water Quality Functions, 3 points for Hydrologic Functions, and 4 points for Habitat Functions) and is therefore considered a **Category IV wetland**. The rating form is attached to this report for viewing. Per the table shown MICC 19.07.090.C.1, Category IV wetlands typically require a protective buffer width of 40 feet to be applied parallel to the wetland boundary. **Therefore, the standard buffer width required for Wetland B equals 40 feet.** Please view the discussion below regarding overlapping buffer widths and the attached Map Sheet CA1.00 for a depiction of Wetland B and its associated protective buffer.

Off-site Wetland C is located just off-site to the south of the property, south of the existing concrete driveway and near the existing asphalt road as depicted on the attached Map Sheet CA1.00. Per the City of Mercer Island code requirements, Wetland C was rated using the Washington State Wetland Rating System for Western Washington (Revised, Publication No. 14-06-029, October 2014). The wetland slopes from north to south toward Stream A and was therefore rated as a "Slope" wetland on the Wetland Rating Form .Using the Wetland Rating Form, the subject wetland scored a total of 16 points (7 points for Water

Quality Functions, 4 points for Hydrologic Functions, and 5 points for Habitat Functions) and is therefore considered a **Category III wetland**. The rating form is attached to this report for viewing. Per the table shown MICC 19.07.080(C)(1), Category III wetlands which receive 5 points on the habitat section of the Wetland Rating Form typically require a protective buffer width of 60 feet to be applied parallel to the wetland boundary. **Therefore, the standard buffer width required for Wetland C equals 60 feet**. Please view the discussion below regarding overlapping buffer widths and the attached Map Sheet CA1.00 for a depiction of Wetland C and its associated protective buffer.

Discussion Regarding Geologic Hazard Assessment:

Wetlands & Wildlife, Inc. does not conduct geologic hazard assessments to determine if project sites contain any regulated geologic hazard areas. However, the property owners retained Associated Earth Sciences, Inc. to evaluate the property for potential geologic hazard areas on the subject property in accordance with the City of Mercer Island's code requirements. Please view the letter dated January 22, 2021 which was prepared by Timothy Peter, Senior Engineering Geologist of Associated Earth Sciences, Inc., the southwestern portion of the subject property contains a regulated steep slope / landslide hazard area per the definitions in the City of Mercer Island's code. Based on the conditions present, Associated Earth Sciences, Inc. recommends a 25-foot buffer from the steep slope / landslide hazard area. Please view Map Sheet CA1.00 which depicts the steep slope / landslide hazard area and the recommended 25-foot buffer associated with the slope. Please also see the discussion below regarding overlapping buffers.

Discussion Regarding Overlapping Critical Areas Buffers:

As mentioned above, the subject properties contain multiple Critical Areas which are regulated pursuant to Chapter 19.07 of the MICC. When two or more Critical Area buffers overlap, the more restrictive buffer typically applies. On these particular properties, the resulting standard buffer line from overlapping buffer widths is shown on the attached Map Sheet CA1.00.

Discussion Regarding Building Setback Line:

In addition to the protective buffer widths described above, MICC section 19.07.180.C.7 states "...buildings and other structures shall be set back a minimum of ten feet from the edges of a watercourse buffer." However, per previous detailed email correspondence between Robin Proebsting (Senior Planner at the City of Mercer Island's Community Planning and Development Department) and Cindy Larsen of *Bassett Larsen Design, LLC,* an additional 10-foot building setback line is not required to accommodate the proposed 2nd-story addition in this scenario due to the existing residence in the buffer. Further, the proposed 2nd-story addition will be located farther from the stream and wetland than the existing residence and the addition will be constructed entirely within the building footprint associated with the existing residence. The attached Map Sheet CA1.00 depicts the standard 10-foot building setback line.

On-site Vegetation and Soils Data:

Wetlands & Wildlife, Inc. collected detailed vegetation and soils data at six (6) different locations to gain representative data regarding vegetative characteristics. Wetlands & Wildlife, Inc. did not have legal access to assess soils or hydrology for the off-site wetland data points because the wetlands are located off-site to the south of the property on an adjacent privately-owned property. However, per professional ecological standards and requirements, visual assessments were conducted while standing on the southern property

line to determine that the required wetland parameters are likely met among the off-site wetlands. Please view the six Wetland Determination Data Forms (produced by the Army Corps of Engineers) which describe the determinations at each data point location. The data forms are attached to this report, and are labeled as DP1 through DP6. Please also view the location of these data points (labeled as DP) shown on the attached Map Sheet CA1.00.

Natural Resource Conservation Service Soils Description:

The Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) mapped the soil on the entire subject property as Kitsap Silt Loam (15 to 30 percent slopes). Kitsap Silt Loam (15 to 30 percent slopes) is typically formed on Terraces with a parent material of Lacustrine deposits with minor amount of volcanic ash. The depth to restrictive feature is typically more than 80 inches below the soil surface. This soil type is moderately well drained and the frequency of flooding and ponding is none. Available water capacity is high. The typical soil profile is ashy silt loam from 0 to 40 inches below the surface and stratified silt to silty clay loam from 40 to 60 inches below the surface. Minor components include Bellingham soil series (1 percent), Seattle soil series (1 percent) and Tukwila soil series (1 percent).

EXISTING ECOLOGICAL FUNCTIONS AND VALUES ASSESSMENT

The methodologies for this functions and values analysis are based on professional opinion developed through past field analyses and interpretations. This analysis pertains specifically to the subject wetlands, stream and buffer characteristics, but is typical for assessments of similar systems throughout the Puget Sound region of western Washington.

The three main functions provided by wetlands include water quality, stormwater / hydrologic control, and wildlife habitat. These functions become increasingly important in an urbanizing environment. The subject wetlands are dominated by shrub and emergent vegetation. Established vegetation serves to intercept rainfall before it strikes the soil, thereby preventing erosion and improving water quality. In addition, a dense herbaceous layer provides greater resistance to surface water flow, thereby allowing more time for pollutants to settle out. The vegetation and adsorbent soils serve to trap sediment and pollutants and provide increased water quality functions to aid in a reduction of suspended sediment in surface water flows which results in cleaner water leaving the site. Among areas of steep gradient topography, the function of these characteristics is particularly important to decrease the water velocity of the associated down-gradient systems, which can reduce peak flood stages during heavy rainfall and increase water retention during dry periods. Water retained within the wetlands slowly infiltrates into the ground, thus recharging groundwater and helping to moderate groundwater levels and reduce down-gradient flows.

Wetlands often contain necessary habitat components such as hiding cover, thermal cover, water, and forage opportunities in close proximity. As evidenced by the scores of 4 and 5 for Habitat Functions on the attached Wetland Rating Forms, each of the subject wetlands provides a low level of habitat for wildlife species. The subject wetlands evaluated for this proposed project contain limited vegetation classes and water regimes and contain few special habitat features except for undercut banks, which provide limited functional habitat for wildlife because of the isolated characteristic and sizes of the off-site wetlands. The surrounding landscape also provides a low level of opportunity to support the potential for wildlife habitat

based on the proximity to undisturbed habitat and disturbed areas such as residential land use and roadways that support daily human traffic. The overall habitat functions among the wetlands is significantly reduced due to the residential land-use in the vicinity and proximity to roadways that support daily human-induced traffic.

Although the Type Ns stream located on and near the property does not provide habitat for fish species, the stream provides other important ecological functions to the surrounding environment such as hydrological transport and transport of solids (suspended and dissolved), among other functions. The portions of the site adjacent to the stream (vegetated wetland and associated upland buffers, etc.) are increasingly important to manage appropriately as these areas aid in water quality and hydrologic control, resulting in cleaner water entering the stream's channel. The adjacent wetlands have limited established vegetation among this riparian corridor and therefore provide diminished habitat for wildlife species. However, any overhanging vegetation present among the riparian corridor aids in the potential future recruitment of large woody debris and organic matter to the stream channel.

DISCUSSION REGARDING THE PROPOSED ADDITION WITHIN STANDARD CRITICAL AREA BUFFERS

Mercer Island City Code section 19.07.130.A states that one type of allowed modification is an "Addition to or reconstruction of an existing legally established structure or building within a critical area and/or buffer constructed on or before January 1, 2005, provided the following criteria are met:

1. The seasonal limitations on land clearing, grading, filling, and foundation work described in MICC 19.07.160(F)(2) shall apply.

2. Additions shall be allowed if all of the following criteria are met:

a. The structure is enlarged not more than a cumulative total of 200 square feet larger than its footprint as of January 1, 2005;

b. If the existing, legally established structure is located over or within a wetland or watercourse, no further expansion within the wetland or watercourse is allowed;

c. If the existing legally established structure is located within a wetland or watercourse buffer, the addition may be no closer to the wetland or watercourse than a distance equal to 75 percent of the applicable standard buffer and must also be no closer to the watercourse or wetland than the existing structure;

d. A critical area study approved by the city demonstrates that impacts have been avoided or minimized and mitigated consistent with MICC 19.07.100, Mitigation sequencing;

e. If the modification or addition is proposed within a geologically hazardous area or associated buffer, a qualified professional provides a statement of risk consistent with MICC 19.07.160(B)(3).

The proposed 2nd-story addition clearly meets all of the required criteria listed in MICC section 19.07.130.A. The proposed 2nd-story addition will not enlarge the existing building footprint at all, as it will be constructed entirely within the building footprint of the existing single-family residence. The existing, legally established residence is not located over or within a wetland or watercourse. The existing legally established residence is located partially within the standard 60-foot buffer associated with Stream A and partially within the standard 60-foot buffer associated with Off-site Wetland C. However, the proposed addition has been specifically designed to be no closer to the wetland or watercourse than a distance equal

to 75 percent of the applicable standard buffer (see the attached Map Sheet CA1.00 for specific distances which are indicated with arrows and text labels). Furthermore, the proposed 2nd-story addition is no closer to the watercourse or wetland than the existing structure, as depicted on the attached Map Sheet CA1.00. This Critical Areas Study demonstrates that the proposed 2nd-story addition will not result in any increase in impervious surfaces and would not adversely impact any of the primary ecological functions provided by streams and wetlands (water quality, hydrologic control, or wildlife habitat). Therefore, due to the proposed project avoiding any adverse ecological impacts, no compensatory mitigation is proposed or required. The proposed 2nd-story addition is not proposed within a geologically hazard area or its associated buffer. Please view the letter dated January 22, 2021 which was prepared by Timothy Peter, Senior Engineering Geologist of *Associated Earth Sciences, Inc.* for more information regarding the geological hazard assessments, and view Map Sheet CA1.00 which depicts the steep slope / landslide hazard area and the recommended 25-foot buffer associated with the slope. The proposed 2nd-story addition is located outside of the geologically hazardous area and its associated 25-foot buffer.

DISCUSSION REGARDING POTENTIAL TEMPORARY BUFFER IMPACTS AND RELATED RESTORATION

Any potential temporary buffer impacts created during the construction efforts associated with the proposed 2nd-story addition will avoid impacts to any trees or shrubs and would only occur among existing maintained lawn / landscaping or on top of existing hard surfaces such as concrete driveway surrounding the existing residence. The applicant will install temporary erosion and sediment control (TESC) best management practices (BMPs) prior to construction as required by the City of Mercer Island, and the soil stockpile will be located outside of the standard overriding Critical Area buffer line depicted on Map Sheet CA1.00 (likely near the NE corner of the existing house).

Any temporarily impacted buffer areas will be quickly and effectively restored to pre-disturbance vegetative conditions and soils among any temporarily impacted buffer areas will be stabilized by spreading grass seed among existing maintained lawn or landscaping that gets temporarily impacted during construction efforts. The following seed mixtures (or similar if these exact seed mixtures are not readily available) will be used among the temporary buffer impact areas / restoration areas:

Proposed Grass / Herb Seed Mixture for Buffer (Non-Wetland) Restoration Areas

Latin Name	lbs./1,000 s.f.
Lolium multiflorum	0.5
Trifolium repens	0.5
Phleum pratense	0.5
Dactylis glomerata	0.5
Festuca arundinacea	0.5
	Lolium multiflorum Trifolium repens Phleum pratense Dactylis glomerata

Following the proposed grass / herb mixtures being spread, weed-free straw shall be placed on top of the seed to aid in soil stabilization and erosion reduction while the seed mixture germinates and begins root growth. All TESC BMP's will remain in place until the soil is sufficiently stabilized to prevent erosion of soil in close proximity to Critical Areas and associated buffers.

PROJECT'S IMPACT DETERMINATIONS RELATED TO CRITICAL AREAS

As previously described in this report, the proposed 2nd-story addition will not result in any increase in impervious surfaces and will not adversely impact any of the primary ecological functions provided by streams and wetlands (water quality, hydrologic control, or wildlife habitat as discussed above in this report). The proposed 2nd-story addition will be located entirely within the building footprint of the existing legally established single-family residence. As detailed in this report, the proposed 2nd-story addition meets all code criteria listed in MICC section 19.07.130(A) related to proposed modifications to an existing structure located within a standard Critical Area buffer. Based on this information, it is the professional opinion that the proposed project meets the intent and requirements of Chapter 19.07 of the Mercer Island City Code. Therefore, no compensatory mitigation efforts are proposed or required for this project, since no adverse ecological impacts will result from the project proposal to add a 2nd-story addition entirely within the building footprint of the existing single-family residence.

LIMITATIONS AND USE OF THIS REPORT

This Critical Areas Study is supplied to *Westhill, Inc.* as a means of determining whether any wetlands, streams, and / or wildlife habitat conservation areas regulated by City of Mercer Island Critical Areas Regulations exist on the site or within close proximity of the site which would affect the permit requirements of the proposed development on the site. This report is intended to provide information deemed relevant in the applicant's attempt to comply with the codes and regulations currently in effect.

The work for this report has conformed to the standard of care employed by professional ecologists in the Puget Sound region. No other representation or warranty, expressed or implied, is made concerning the work or this report. This report is based largely on readily observable conditions and, to a lesser extent, on readily ascertainable conditions. No attempt has been made to determine hidden or concealed conditions. If hidden or concealed conditions arise, the information contained in this report may change based upon those conditions.

The laws applicable to Critical Areas are subject to varying interpretations. While *Wetlands & Wildlife, Inc.* upheld professional industry standards when completing this review, the information included in this report does not guarantee approval by any federal, state, and/or local permitting agencies. Therefore, the work associated with this proposal shall not commence until permits have been obtained from all applicable agencies.

If any questions arise, please contact me directly at (425) 337-6450.

Wetlands & Wildlife, Inc.

Scot Go

Scott Spooner Owner / Principal Wetland & Wildlife Ecologist

REFERENCES AND LITERATURE REVIEWED

Anderson, Paul S., Susan Meyer, Dr. Patricia Olson, and Erik Stockdale. Determining the Ordinary High Water Mark for Shoreline Management Act Compliance in Washington State. October 2016 Final Review. Washington State Department of Ecology, Shorelands & Environmental Assistance Program. Ecology Publication No. 16-06-029.

City of Mercer Island GIS Portal: Interactive Mapping Tool. City of Mercer Island Information and Geographic Services. <u>http://pubmaps.mercergov.org</u>.

Cowardin, et al, 1979. Classification of Wetlands and Deepwater Habitats of the United States. U.S.D.I. Fish and Wildlife Service. FWS/OBS-79/31. December 1979.

Forest Practices Application Mapping Tool. Maintained by the Washington State Department of Natural Resources. <u>https://fortress.wa.gov/dnr/protectiongis/fpamt/index.html</u>.

Hruby, T. 2014. *Washington State Wetland Rating System for Western Washington – 2014 Update*. (Publication #14-06-029). Olympia, WA: Washington Department of Ecology.

King County iMAP: Interactive Mapping Tool. Administered by the King County GIS Center. <u>http://www.kingcounty.gov/operations/gis/Maps/iMAP.aspx</u>.

Lichvar, R.W., D.L. Banks, W.N. Kirchner, and N.C. Melvin. 2016. The National Wetland Plant List: 2016 wetland ratings. Phytoneuron 2016-30: 1-17. Published 28 April 2016.

Mercer Island City Code (MICC). Chapter 19.07 (Environment). Mercer Island, Washington.

SalmonScape. Interactive Mapping website administered by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife. <u>http://wdfw.wa.gov/mapping/salmonscape/index.html</u>.

StreamNet. Fish Data for the Northwest. Administered by the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission. <u>http://www.streamnet.org/</u>.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (2010). "Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Western Mountains, Valleys, and Coast Region (Version 2.0)," <u>ERDC/EL TR-10-3</u>, U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center, Vicksburg, MS.

<u>Washington State Wetlands Identification and Delineation Manual.</u> Washington State Department of Ecology. Publication #96-94. March 1997.

Web Soil Survey. United States Department of Agriculture. Natural Resources Conservation Service. <u>http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/HomePage.htm</u>.

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM – Western Mountains, Valleys, and Coast Region

Project/Site: 4340 E Mercer Way (Tax Parcel #004610-0152)	City/County: Ci	ty of Mercer Island	Sampling Date: <u>10/29/2020</u>
Applicant/Owner: Westhill, Inc. (Leahy Property)			Sampling Point: DP1
Investigator(s): Scott Spooner (Wetlands & Wildlife, Inc.)	Section, Towns	hip, Range: <u>S18, T24N, R05E</u>	
Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Hillslope		ncave, convex, none): <u>None</u>	
Subregion (LRR): LRR-A La	t: 47.567802°	Long: -122.211259°	Datum: WGS84
Soil Map Unit Name: Kitsap silt loam (15 to 30 percent slopes	;)	NWI classific	ation: PEM1B
Are climatic / hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time	of year? Yes _ ✔	_ No (If no, explain in R	emarks.)
Are Vegetation, Soil, or Hydrology signific	cantly disturbed?	Are "Normal Circumstances" p	oresent? Yes _ 🗸 _ No
Are Vegetation, Soil, or Hydrology natura	Ily problematic?	(If needed, explain any answe	rs in Remarks.)

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS – Attach site map showing sampling point locations, transects, important features, etc.

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Hydric Soil Present? Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes _ ✔ No Yes _ ✔ No Yes _ ✔ No	Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?	Yes_✓_	No
Remarks:				

DATA POINT 1 (DP1) WAS VISUALLY ASSESSED ONLY AND IS LOCATED OFF-SITE; SEE MAP SHEET CA1.00

VEGETATION – Use scientific names of plants.

20 5-1	Absolute	Dominant		Dominance Test worksheet:
<u>Tree Stratum</u> (Plot size: <u>30 feet</u>) 1		Species?		Number of Dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: <u>3</u> (A)
2				Total Number of Dominant
3				Species Across All Strata: <u>3</u> (B)
4 Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 30 feet)		= Total Co		Percent of Dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 100 (A/B)
1. Rubus spectabilis	5	YES	FAC	Prevalence Index worksheet:
2				Total % Cover of:Multiply by:
3				OBL species x 1 =
4				FACW species x 2 =
5				FAC species x 3 =
	5	= Total Co	ver	FACU species x 4 =
Herb Stratum (Plot size: <u>10 feet</u>)	40	VEO	540	UPL species x 5 =
1. Urtica dioica	40	YES	FAC	Column Totals: (A) (B)
2. Equisetum pratense	20	YES	FACW	
3. Convolvulus arvensis	5	NO	FACU	Prevalence Index = B/A =
4				Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:
5				✓ Dominance Test is >50%
6				Prevalence Index is ≤3.0 ¹
7				Morphological Adaptations ¹ (Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)
9				Wetland Non-Vascular Plants ¹
				Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation ¹ (Explain)
10 11				¹ Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must
····	65	= Total Cov		be present, unless disturbed or problematic.
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 10 feet)		<u> </u>		
1				Hydrophytic
2				Vegetation Present? Yes _ ✓ _ No
% Bare Ground in Herb Stratum		= Total Cov		Present? Tes <u>v</u> No
Remarks:				

Profile Des	cription: (Descr	ibe to the de	oth needed to docu	nent the i	ndicator	or confirn	n the abs	ence of indicators.)
Depth	Matri	x	Redo	x Features				
<u>(inches)</u>	Color (moist)	%	Color (moist)	%	Type ¹	Loc ²	Textu	re Remarks
							. <u> </u>	
							. <u> </u>	
			I=Reduced Matrix, C			ed Sand G		² Location: PL=Pore Lining, M=Matrix.
Hydric Soil	Indicators: (App	olicable to al	I LRRs, unless othe	rwise not	ed.)		Inc	licators for Problematic Hydric Soils ³ :
Histoso	l (A1)		Sandy Redox (S5)				2 cm Muck (A10)
	pipedon (A2)		Stripped Matrix	· · ·				_ Red Parent Material (TF2)
	istic (A3)		Loamy Mucky			t MLRA 1))	Other (Explain in Remarks)
	en Sulfide (A4)		Loamy Gleyed)			
	d Below Dark Su	. ,	Depleted Matri	· · ·			31.	Restance Charles In Research Research
	ark Surface (A12)		Redox Dark Su	· · ·				dicators of hydrophytic vegetation and
	/lucky Mineral (S [.] Gleyed Matrix (S4		Depleted Dark Redox Depress	`	7)			wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.
-	Layer (if present	,	Redux Depres	SIONS (FO)				unless disturbed of problematic.
	• • •							
Type:	-1							
	ches):						Hydrid	c Soil Present? Yes _ ✔ No
Remarks:								
SOILS CC	ULD NOT BE	ASSESSE	ED SINCE WETL	AND IS	OFF-SI	TE; ASS	UMED	PER OTHER PARAMETERS
	0.1							
HYDROLO								
	drology Indicato							
		of one require	ed; check all that app					Secondary Indicators (2 or more required)
	Water (A1)		Water-Sta	ined Leave	es (B9) (e	xcept ML	RA _	Water-Stained Leaves (B9) (MLRA 1, 2,
High Wa	ater Table (A2)		1, 2, 4	A, and 4B))			4A, and 4B)
Saturati	on (A3)		Salt Crust	(B11)			-	Drainage Patterns (B10)
Water N	/larks (B1)		Aquatic In	vertebrate	s (B13)		-	Dry-Season Water Table (C2)
Sedime	nt Deposits (B2)		Hydrogen	Sulfide Od	dor (C1)		-	Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
Drift De	posits (B3)		Oxidized I	Rhizosphe	res along	Living Roo	ots (C3)	Geomorphic Position (D2)
Algal M	at or Crust (B4)		Presence	of Reduce	d Iron (C4	4)	_	Shallow Aquitard (D3)
Iron De	posits (B5)		Recent Iro	on Reduction	on in Tille	d Soils (Cé	6)	FAC-Neutral Test (D5)
Surface	Soil Cracks (B6)		Stunted o	Stressed	Plants (D	1) (LRR A	()	Raised Ant Mounds (D6) (LRR A)
Inundat	ion Visible on Aer	ial Imagery (E				, (,	Frost-Heave Hummocks (D7)
	y Vegetated Cond		, , ,		,			
Field Obser			()					
Surface Wat	er Present?	Yes	No Depth (in	ches).				
Water Table			No Depth (in					
Saturation P	resent? pillary fringe)	Yes	No Depth (in	cnes):		vveti	iand Hydi	rology Present? Yes _ ✓ _ No
		am gauge, m	onitoring well, aerial	photos, pr	evious ins	pections),	if availab	le:
		-	-			,		
Remarks:								
i tomarka.								
HYDROLO	OGY COULD I	NOT BE AS	SSESSED SINCE	E WETL/	AND IS	OFF-SI	TE; ASS	SUMED PER OTHER PARAMETERS
1								

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM – Western Mountains, Valleys, and Coast Region

roject/Site: 4340 E Mercer Way (Tax Parcel #004610-0152)			City/County:	City of Mercer	⁻ Island	_ Sampling Date:	10/29/2020	
Applicant/Owner: W	esthill, Inc.	(Leahy Property)				State: WA	_ Sampling Point	
Investigator(s): Scot	t Spooner (V	/etlands & Wildlife, Inc	.)	_ Section, Tow		S18, T24N, R05E		
Landform (hillslope, t						ex, none): <u>None</u>		lope (%): <u>3</u>
Subregion (LRR): LF	RR-A		Lat: _4	7.567920°	Lor	ng: <mark>-122.211191°</mark>	Dat	tum: WGS84
Soil Map Unit Name:	Kitsap si l t	loam (15 to 30 perce	nt slopes)			NWI classifi	cation: N/A	
Are climatic / hydrolo	gic conditior	ns on the site typical fo	r this time of y	/ear?Yes _ 🗸	No	_ (If no, explain in F	Remarks.)	
Are Vegetation _	_, Soil _	, or Hydrology _	significant	ly disturbed?	Are "Norm	nal Circumstances"	present? Yes _	✓ _ No
Are Vegetation	_, Soil _	, or Hydrology	naturally p	roblematic?	(If needed	, explain any answe	ers in Remarks.)	

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS – Attach site map showing sampling point locations, transects, important features, etc.

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Hydric Soil Present? Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes No _ ✔ Yes No _ ✔ Yes No _ ✔	Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?	Yes	No_√
Remarks:				

VEGETATION – Use scientific names of plants.

	Absolute	Dominant	Indicator	Dominance Test worksheet:
Tree Stratum (Plot size: <u>30 feet</u>)		Species?		Number of Dominant Species
1. Acer macrophyllum	40	YES	FACU	That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: (A)
2				Table all set of Developed
3				Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: 7 (B)
4	40			Percent of Dominant Species
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: <u>30 feet</u>)		= Total Co	ver	That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: <u>14</u> (A/B)
1. Prunus laurocerasus	40	YES	FACU	Prevalence Index worksheet:
2. Gaultheria shallon	20	YES	FACU	
3. Rubus spectabilis	10	NO	FAC	<u>Total % Cover of:</u> <u>Multiply by:</u>
				OBL species x 1 =
4. Sambucus racemosa	5	NO	FACU	FACW species x 2 =
5				FAC species x 3 =
	75	= Total Co	ver	FACU species x 4 =
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 10 feet)				UPL species x 5 =
1. Polystichum munitum	30	YES	FACU	Column Totals: (A) (B)
2. Hedera helix	30	YES	FACU	
3				Prevalence Index = B/A =
4				Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:
5				Dominance Test is >50%
6				Prevalence Index is ≤3.0 ¹
7				Morphological Adaptations ¹ (Provide supporting
				data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)
8				Wetland Non-Vascular Plants ¹
9				Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation ¹ (Explain)
10				¹ Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must
11				be present, unless disturbed or problematic.
10 fa at	60	= Total Cov	/er	
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 10 feet)	_			
1. Rubus armeniacus	5	YES	FAC	Hydrophytic
2. Rubus ursinus	5	YES	FACU	Vegetation
	10	= Total Cov	/er	Present? Yes No✓
% Bare Ground in Herb Stratum		-		
Remarks:				

SOIL

Profile Description: (Describe to the depth needed to document the indicator or confirm the absence of indicators.)									
Depth	Matrix		Red	ox Feature					
(inches)	Color (moist)	%	Color (moist)	%	Type ¹	Loc ²	Texture	Remarks	
0-3	2.5Y 3/3	100					SALO	MOIST DURING INVESTIGATION	
3-12	2.5Y 4/3	70	2.5Y 4/4	30			SALO	MOIST DURING INVESTIGATION	
¹ Type: C=Co	oncentration, D=D	epletion, RM	I=Reduced Matrix, C	S=Covere	d or Coate	d Sand G	rains. ² Lo	cation: PL=Pore Lining, M=Matrix.	
		•	I LRRs, unless oth					ors for Problematic Hydric Soils ³ :	
Histosol	(A1)		Sandy Redox	(S5)			2 c	m Muck (A10)	
Histic Ep	pipedon (A2)		Stripped Matri	x (S6)			Red Parent Material (TF2)		
Black His	stic (A3)		Loamy Mucky	Mineral (F	1) (except	MLRA 1)	Other (Explain in Remarks)		
Hydroge	n Sulfide (A4)		Loamy Gleyed	I Matrix (F	2)	,			
	Below Dark Surfa	ace (A11)	Depleted Matr	•	,				
	ark Surface (A12)	· · /	Redox Dark S	urface (F6)		³ Indicators of hydrophytic vegetation and		
Sandy M	lucky Mineral (S1)		Depleted Dark	Surface (, F7)		wetland hydrology must be present,		
-	ileyed Matrix (S4)		Redox Depres	•	,		unless disturbed or problematic.		
Restrictive L	_ayer (if present):								
Type:									
Depth (inc	ches):						Hydric Soi	I Present? Yes No∕	
Remarks:									
IYDROLOGY									

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:					
Primary Indicators (minimum of one required; che	Secondary Indicators (2 or more required)				
Surface Water (A1)	pt MLRA	Water-Stained Leaves (B9) (MLRA 1, 2,			
High Water Table (A2)	1, 2, 4A, and 4B)		4A, and 4B)		
Saturation (A3)	Salt Crust (B11)		Drainage Patterns (B10)		
Water Marks (B1)	Aquatic Invertebrates (B13)		Dry-Season Water Table (C2)		
Sediment Deposits (B2)	Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1)		Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)		
Drift Deposits (B3)	Oxidized Rhizospheres along Livi	ng Roots (C3)	Geomorphic Position (D2)		
Algal Mat or Crust (B4)	Presence of Reduced Iron (C4)		Shallow Aquitard (D3)		
Iron Deposits (B5)	Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Second	oils (C6)	FAC-Neutral Test (D5)		
Surface Soil Cracks (B6)	Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1) (LRR A)	Raised Ant Mounds (D6) (LRR A)		
Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)	Other (Explain in Remarks)		Frost-Heave Hummocks (D7)		
Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8)					
Field Observations:					
Surface Water Present? Yes No	✓ _ Depth (inches):				
Water Table Present? Yes No	✓ _ Depth (inches):				
Saturation Present? Yes No (includes capillary fringe)	Wetland Hy	drology Present? Yes No√			
Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitori	ng well, aerial photos, previous inspec	tions), if availa	able:		
Remarks:					

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM – Western Mountains, Valleys, and Coast Region

Project/Site: 4340 E Mercer Way (Tax Parcel #004610-0152)	City/County: City	y of Mercer Island	Sampling Date: <u>10/29/2020</u>
Applicant/Owner: Westhill, Inc. (Leahy Property)			Sampling Point: DP3
Investigator(s): <u>Scott Spooner (Wetlands & Wildlife, Inc.)</u>	Section, Townsh	ip, Range: <u>S18, T24N, R05E</u>	
Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Hillslope		cave, convex, none): <u>None</u>	Slope (%): <u>3</u>
Subregion (LRR): LRR-A	Lat: 47.567881°	Long: <u>-121.211175</u> °	Datum: WGS84
Soil Map Unit Name: <u>Kitsap silt loam (15 to 30 percent slo</u>	opes)	NWI classific	ation: PFO3B
Are climatic / hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this	time of year? Yes _ ✔	No (If no, explain in R	emarks.)
Are Vegetation, Soil, or Hydrology sig	gnificantly disturbed?	Are "Normal Circumstances" p	oresent? Yes _ 🗸 _ No
Are Vegetation, Soil, or Hydrology na	aturally problematic?	(If needed, explain any answe	rs in Remarks.)

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS – Attach site map showing sampling point locations, transects, important features, etc.

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Hydric Soil Present? Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes _ ✔ No Yes _ ✔ No Yes _ ✔ No	Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?	Yes_✓	No
Remarks:				

DATA POINT 3 (DP3) WAS VISUALLY ASSESSED ONLY AND IS LOCATED OFF-SITE; SEE MAP SHEET CA1.00

VEGETATION – Use scientific names of plants.

	Absolute	Dominant	Indicator	Dominance Test worksheet:	
Tree Stratum (Plot size: <u>30 feet</u>)		Species?		Number of Dominant Species	
1. Thuja plicata	15	YES	FAC	That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: (A	A)
2. Prunus emarginata	10	YES	FACU	Total Number of Dominant	
3				Species Across All Strata: 7 (E	B)
4					_,
	25	= Total Co	vor	Percent of Dominant Species	
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: <u>30 feet</u>)		<u>-</u> 10tai 00	vei	That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 60 (A	A/B)
1. Rubus spectabilis	20	YES	FAC	Prevalence Index worksheet:	
2. Acer circinatum	10	YES	FAC	Total % Cover of:Multiply by:	
3				OBL species x 1 =	
4				FACW species x 2 =	
5				FAC species x 3 =	
	30	= Total Co		FACU species x 4 =	
Herb Stratum (Plot size: <u>10 feet</u>)		10tai 00	VCI	UPL species x 5 =	
1. Ranunculus repens	15	YES	FAC	Column Totals:	(D)
2. Lysichiton americanus	15	YES	OBL		(D)
3. Athyrium cyclosorum	15	YES	FAC	Prevalence Index = B/A =	
4				Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:	
5				✓ Dominance Test is >50%	
6				Prevalence Index is ≤3.0 ¹	
7				Morphological Adaptations ¹ (Provide supporting	g
8				data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)	
9				Wetland Non-Vascular Plants ¹	
10				Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation ¹ (Explain)	
11				¹ Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology mus	st
11	45	TUUO		be present, unless disturbed or problematic.	
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 10 feet)		= Total Cov	er		
1				Hydrophytic	
				Vegetation	
2				Present? Yes _ Vo	
% Bare Ground in Herb Stratum		= Total Cov	er		
Remarks:				<u> </u>	

Profile Desc	cription: (Descri	be to the dep	th needed to docu	ment the	indicator	or confirm	n the abs	ence of indicators.)
Depth	Matri			ox Feature	S1	. 2		
<u>(inches)</u>	Color (moist)	%	Color (moist)	%	Type ¹	Loc ²	<u> </u>	re Remarks
				_				
			Reduced Matrix, C			ed Sand Gr		² Location: PL=Pore Lining, M=Matrix.
_		blicable to all	LRRs, unless othe		ea.)			licators for Problematic Hydric Soils ³ :
Histosol			Sandy Redox (2 cm Muck (A10)
	pipedon (A2) istic (A3)		Stripped Matrix	· · /	1) (22020		、	Red Parent Material (TF2)
	en Sulfide (A4)		Loamy Mucky Loamy Gleyed)	Other (Explain in Remarks)
	d Below Dark Sur	face (A11)	Depleted Matri		-)			
	ark Surface (A12)		Redox Dark Su)		³ Inc	dicators of hydrophytic vegetation and
	/lucky Mineral (S1		Depleted Dark	•				wetland hydrology must be present,
-	Sleyed Matrix (S4		Redox Depress		,			unless disturbed or problematic.
-	Layer (if present		· · ·	. ,				•
Type:								
Depth (in	ches):						Hvdrid	Soil Present? Yes _ ✔ _ No
Remarks:							,	
i tomanto.								
		A 000000				TE. ACC		
301L3 CO		ASSESSE	D SINCE WEIL	AND 15	066-31	IE, A33		PER OTHER PARAMETERS
HYDROLO	GY							
Wetland Hy	drology Indicato	rs:						
Primary India	cators (minimum	of one required	; check all that app	ly)				Secondary Indicators (2 or more required)
Surface	Water (A1)		Water-Sta	ined Leav	ves (B9) (e	xcept MLF	RA	Water-Stained Leaves (B9) (MLRA 1, 2,
	ater Table (A2)			A, and 4B		•	-	4A, and 4B)
Saturatio			Salt Crust		,			Drainage Patterns (B10)
Water N	· · /		Aquatic In		es (B13)			Dry-Season Water Table (C2)
	nt Deposits (B2)		Hydrogen		. ,			Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
	posits (B3)					Living Roc	-	Geomorphic Position (D2)
	at or Crust (B4)		Presence		-	-		Shallow Aquitard (D3)
Iron Dep	. ,		Recent Iro		•			FAC-Neutral Test (D5)
	Soil Cracks (B6)					1) (LRR A	,	Raised Ant Mounds (D6) (LRR A)
	on Visible on Aer	ial Imagery (B [.]					•)	Frost-Heave Hummocks (D7)
	y Vegetated Conc		, ,		smanoj			
Field Obser	-		50)					
Surface Wat		Vee	No Dooth (in	choo);				
			No Depth (in					
Water Table			No Depth (in					
Saturation P		Yes	No Depth (in	ches):		_ Wetla	land Hydr	rology Present? Yes _ ✓ _ No
Describe Re	(includes capillary fringe) Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspections), if available:							
	Describe recorded Data (siteant yauge, monitoring well, aenai photos, previous inspections), il available.							
Remarks:								
itemarks.								
HYDROLC	OGY COULD I	NOT BE AS	SESSED SINCE	E WETL	AND IS	OFF-SIT	TE; ASS	SUMED PER OTHER PARAMETERS

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM – Western Mountains, Valleys, and Coast Region

Project/Site: 4340 E Mercer Way (Tax Parcel #004610-0152)	City/County:	City of Mercer	Island	Sampling Date:	10/29/2020	
Applicant/Owner: Westhill, Inc. (Leahy Property)				Sampling Point:		
Investigator(s): Scott Spooner (Wetlands & Wildlife, Inc.)	Section, Tow	_ Section, Township, Range: S18, T24N, R05E				
Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Hillslope			, none): None		ope (%): <u>3</u>	
Subregion (LRR): LRR-A Lat:	47.567881°	Long	: <u>-122.211165°</u>	Dati	um: <u>WGS84</u>	
Soil Map Unit Name: Kitsap silt loam (15 to 30 percent slopes)			NWI classific	ation: N/A		
Are climatic / hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of	of year? Yes 🗹	No	(If no, explain in R	emarks.)		
Are Vegetation, Soil, or Hydrology significa	antly disturbed?	Are "Norma	ll Circumstances" p	oresent? Yes _	✓ _ No	
Are Vegetation, Soil, or Hydrology naturally	y problematic?	(If needed,	explain any answe	rs in Remarks.)		

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS – Attach site map showing sampling point locations, transects, important features, etc.

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Hydric Soil Present? Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes No _ ✔ Yes No _ ✔ Yes No _ ✔	Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?	Yes	No_√
Remarks:				

VEGETATION – Use scientific names of plants.

20 ft	Absolute	Dominant	Indicator	Dominance Test worksheet:
Tree Stratum (Plot size: <u>30 feet</u>)		Species?		Number of Dominant Species
1. Thuja plicata	30	YES	FAC	That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 2 (A)
2. Acer macrophyllum	30	YES	FACU	Total Number of Dominant
3				Species Across All Strata: 9 (B)
4				
	60	= Total Co	ver	Percent of Dominant Species
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: <u>30 feet</u>)				That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 22 (A/B)
_{1.} Prunus laurocerasus	30	YES	FACU	Prevalence Index worksheet:
2. Ilex aquifolium	15	YES	FACU	Total % Cover of: Multiply by:
3 Corylus cornuta	15	YES	FACU	OBL species x 1 =
4 Rubus spectabilis	5	NO	FAC	FACW species x 2 =
5				FAC species x 3 =
···	65	= Total Co	vor	FACU species x 4 =
Herb Stratum (Plot size: <u>10 feet</u>)		10tai 00	VCI	UPL species x 5 =
1. Hedera helix	40	YES	FACU	Column Totals: (A) (B)
2. Polystichum munitum	20	YES	FACU	(A)(B)
3. Trillium ovatum	5	NO	FACU	Prevalence Index = B/A =
4				Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:
5				Dominance Test is >50%
6				Prevalence Index is ≤3.0 ¹
7				Morphological Adaptations ¹ (Provide supporting
8				data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)
9				Wetland Non-Vascular Plants ¹
10				Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation ¹ (Explain)
11				¹ Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must
····	6E	= Total Cov		be present, unless disturbed or problematic.
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 10 feet)		_ 10tai 00t		
1. Ranunculus repens	5	YES	FAC	Hydrophytic
2. Rubus ursinus	5	YES	FACU	Vegetation
	10	= Total Cov	/er	Present? Yes No _ ✓
% Bare Ground in Herb Stratum				
Remarks:				

SOIL

Profile Desc	ription: (Describe	e to the de	oth needed to docu	ment the	indicator of	or confirm	n the absence	e of indicators.)		
Depth	Matrix			ox Feature						
<u>(inches)</u>	Color (moist)	%	Color (moist)	%	Type ¹	Loc ²	Texture	Remarks		
0-6	10YR 3/2	100					SALO	DRY DURING INVESTIGATION		
6-12	2.5Y 5/5	50	2.5Y 4/4	50			SALO	DRY DURING INVESTIGATION		
			-							
17 0.0							. 2,			
		•	I=Reduced Matrix, C			d Sand G		cation: PL=Pore Lining, M=Matrix.		
-		cable to al	I LRRs, unless othe		iea.)			ors for Problematic Hydric Soils ³ :		
Histosol	· /		Sandy Redox	. ,				m Muck (A10)		
	pipedon (A2)		Stripped Matri	. ,				d Parent Material (TF2)		
Black His	stic (A3)		Loamy Mucky	Mineral (F	1) (except	MLRA 1)) Oth	Other (Explain in Remarks)		
Hydroge	n Sulfide (A4)		Loamy Gleyed	l Matrix (F2	2)					
Depleted	l Below Dark Surfa	ce (A11)	Depleted Matr	ix (F3)						
Thick Da	rk Surface (A12)		Redox Dark S	urface (F6)		³ Indicators of hydrophytic vegetation and			
Sandy M	lucky Mineral (S1)		Depleted Dark	Surface (I	F7)		wetland hydrology must be present,			
Sandy G	leyed Matrix (S4)		Redox Depres	sions (F8)			unle	ss disturbed or problematic.		
Restrictive L	.ayer (if present):									
Type:										
Depth (inc	ches):						Hydric Soi	I Present? Yes No _✓		
Remarks:										
	GY									

Wetland Hydrology Indicate	ors:			
Primary Indicators (minimum	Secondary Indicators (2 or more required)			
Surface Water (A1)	Surface Water (A1) Water-Stained Leaves (B9) (except MLRA			
High Water Table (A2)		1, 2, 4A, and 4B)		4A, and 4B)
Saturation (A3)		Salt Crust (B11)		Drainage Patterns (B10)
Water Marks (B1)		Aquatic Invertebrates (B13)		Dry-Season Water Table (C2)
Sediment Deposits (B2)		Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1)		Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
Drift Deposits (B3)		Oxidized Rhizospheres along Livi	ng Roots (C3)	Geomorphic Position (D2)
Algal Mat or Crust (B4)		Shallow Aquitard (D3)		
Iron Deposits (B5)		FAC-Neutral Test (D5)		
Surface Soil Cracks (B6) Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1) (LRR A)				Raised Ant Mounds (D6) (LRR A)
Inundation Visible on Aer	rial Imagery (B7)		Frost-Heave Hummocks (D7)	
Sparsely Vegetated Cone	cave Surface (B8)			
Field Observations:				
Surface Water Present?	Yes No _ ✔ _	_ Depth (inches):		
Water Table Present?	Yes No _✔_	_ Depth (inches):		
Saturation Present? (includes capillary fringe)	Yes No _✔_	_ Depth (inches):	Wetland Hy	drology Present? Yes No _√
Describe Recorded Data (stre	eam gauge, monitoring	well, aerial photos, previous inspec	tions), if availa	able:
Remarks:				

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM – Western Mountains, Valleys, and Coast Region

Project/Site: 4340	y (Tax Parcel #004610-	City/County: C	ity of Merce	er Island	Sampling Date	; <u>10/29/2020</u>		
Applicant/Owner:	Nesthill, Inc.	(Leahy Property)				_ State: WA		
	Wetlands & Wildlife, Inc	Section, Township, Range: S18, T24N, R05E						
Landform (hillslope						ex, none): <u>None</u>		Slope (%): <u>3</u>
			Lat: <u>47</u>	7.567872°		ng: -122.210714°		atum: WGS84
Soil Map Unit Name	_{e:} _Kitsap sil	t loam (15 to 30 perce	ent slopes)			NWI classif	fication: PEM1B	
Are climatic / hydro	logic conditio	ons on the site typical fo	or this time of ye	ear? Yes _ ✔	No	(If no, explain in	Remarks.)	
Are Vegetation _	_, Soil _	, or Hydrology	_ significantly	/ disturbed?	Are "Nor	mal Circumstances"	' present? Yes _	✓ No
Are Vegetation	, Soil	, or Hydrology	naturally pr	oblematic?	(If neede	d, explain any answ	vers in Remarks.)	

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS – Attach site map showing sampling point locations, transects, important features, etc.

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Hydric Soil Present? Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes _ ✔ No Yes _ ✔ No Yes _ ✔ No	Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?	Yes_√	No
Remarks:				

DATA POINT 5 (DP5) WAS VISUALLY ASSESSED ONLY AND IS LOCATED OFF-SITE; SEE MAP SHEET CA1.00

VEGETATION – Use scientific names of plants.

20 6 - 1	Absolute	Dominant		Dominance Test worksheet:
<u>Tree Stratum</u> (Plot size: <u>30 feet</u>) 1		Species?		Number of Dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: <u>2</u> (A)
2				Total Number of Dominant
3				Species Across All Strata: <u>2</u> (B)
4		= Total Co		Percent of Dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: <u>100</u> (A/B)
1				Prevalence Index worksheet:
2				Total % Cover of:Multiply by:
3				OBL species x 1 =
4				FACW species x 2 =
5				FAC species x 3 =
		= Total Co		FACU species x 4 =
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 10 feet)				UPL species x 5 =
1. Ranunculus repens	20	YES	FAC	Column Totals: (A) (B)
2. Nasturtium officinale	20	YES	OBL	、 ,
3. Lysichiton americanus	10	NO	OBL	Prevalence Index = B/A =
4. Agrostis capillaris	5	NO	FAC	Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:
5				✓ Dominance Test is >50%
6				Prevalence Index is $\leq 3.0^1$
7				Morphological Adaptations ¹ (Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)
8				Wetland Non-Vascular Plants ¹
9				Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation ¹ (Explain)
10			·	¹ Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must
11				be present, unless disturbed or problematic.
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 10 feet)	55	= Total Cov	/er	
1				Hydrophytic
2				Vegetation
% Bare Ground in Herb Stratum		= Total Cov	/er	Present? Yes _ ✓ No
Remarks:				1

Profile Desc	cription: (Descri	be to the dep	th needed to docu	nent the	indicator	or confirm	n the abso	ence of indicators.)
Depth	Matri			x Feature	S 1	2	_	
<u>(inches)</u>	Color (moist)	%	Color (moist)	%	Type ¹	Loc ²	Textu	re Remarks
					·			
					. <u> </u>			
							_	
					·			
<u> </u>								
			Reduced Matrix, CS			ed Sand Gr		² Location: PL=Pore Lining, M=Matrix.
_		Discussion to all	LRRs, unless othe		ea.)			icators for Problematic Hydric Soils ³ :
Histosol			Sandy Redox (,			—	2 cm Muck (A10)
	pipedon (A2) istic (A3)		Stripped Matrix	· · /	1) (avaant			Red Parent Material (TF2)
	en Sulfide (A4)		Loamy Mucky I Loamy Gleyed			INILKA I)		Other (Explain in Remarks)
	d Below Dark Sur	face (A11)	Depleted Matrix	•	-)			
	ark Surface (A12)		Redox Dark Su				³ Inc	licators of hydrophytic vegetation and
	/lucky Mineral (S ²		Depleted Dark	. ,				wetland hydrology must be present,
-	Sleyed Matrix (S4		Redox Depress		,			unless disturbed or problematic.
-	Layer (if present			()				·
Type:								
Depth (in	ches):						Hvdric	Soil Present? Yes _ ✓ _ No
Remarks:								
i tomanto.								
		A 000000				TE. ACO		
301L3 CO		ASSESSE		AND IS	066-31	IE, A33		PER OTHER PARAMETERS
HYDROLO	GY							
Wetland Hy	drology Indicato	rs:						
Primary India	cators (minimum	of one required	; check all that appl	y)				Secondary Indicators (2 or more required)
Surface	Water (A1)		Water-Sta	ined Leav	res (B9) (e	xcept MLF	RA	Water-Stained Leaves (B9) (MLRA 1, 2,
	ater Table (A2)			A, and 4B		•	-	4A, and 4B)
Saturatio			Salt Crust		,			Drainage Patterns (B10)
Water M	()		Aquatic In		es (B13)			Dry-Season Water Table (C2)
	nt Deposits (B2)		Hydrogen		. ,			Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
	posits (B3)				• •	Living Roo		Geomorphic Position (D2)
	at or Crust (B4)		Presence	•	-	-	. ,	Shallow Aquitard (D3)
Iron Dep	. ,		Recent Irc		•			FAC-Neutral Test (D5)
	Soil Cracks (B6)					1) (LRR A)	,	Raised Ant Mounds (D6) (LRR A)
	on Visible on Aer	ial Imagery (B					-)	Frost-Heave Hummocks (D7)
	y Vegetated Cond		,		inanto)			
Field Obser			50)					
Surface Wat		Vee	No Dopth (in					
			No Depth (in					
Water Table			No Depth (in					
Saturation P (includes cap		Yes I	No Depth (in	ches):		_ Wetla	and Hydr	ology Present? Yes _ ✓ _ No
Describe Re	corded Data (stre	am gauge, mo	nitoring well, aerial	ohotos, pr	evious ins	pections).	if availabl	e:
		J = 1 J = , 1 H	J , U	, , . .		,,		
Remarks:								
Nomarita.								
HYDROLC	OGY COULD I	NOT BE AS	SESSED SINCE	E WETL	AND IS	OFF-SIT	ΓE; ASS	UMED PER OTHER PARAMETERS

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM – Western Mountains, Valleys, and Coast Region

Project/Site: 4340 E Mercer Way (Tax Parcel #004610-0152)	City/County: Cit	y of Mercer Island	Sampling Date: 10/29/2020
Applicant/Owner: Westhill, Inc. (Leahy Property)			Sampling Point: DP6
Investigator(s): Scott Spooner (Wetlands & Wildlife, Inc.)	Section, Townsł	nip, Range: S18, T24N, R05E	
Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Hillslope		icave, convex, none): <u>None</u>	
	47.567919°	Long: -122.210795°	Datum: WGS84
Soil Map Unit Name: <u>Kitsap silt loam (15 to 30 percent slopes)</u>		NWI classific	ation: <u>N/A</u>
Are climatic / hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time o	of year? Yes 🖌	No (If no, explain in R	emarks.)
Are Vegetation, Soil, or Hydrology significa	ntly disturbed?	Are "Normal Circumstances" p	oresent? Yes _ 🗸 _ No
Are Vegetation, Soil, or Hydrology naturally	y problematic?	(If needed, explain any answe	rs in Remarks.)

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS – Attach site map showing sampling point locations, transects, important features, etc.

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Hydric Soil Present? Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes No _ ✔ Yes No _ ✔ Yes No _ ✔	Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland? Yes No _ ✓
Remarks:		

VEGETATION – Use scientific names of plants.

00	Absolute	Dominant	lndicator	Dominance Test worksheet:
<u>Tree Stratum</u> (Plot size: <u>30 feet</u>) 1. <u>Acer macrophyll</u> um	<u>% Cover</u> 60	<u>Species?</u> YES	Status FACU	Number of Dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 0 (A)
2 3				Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: <u>3</u> (B)
4	60	_= Total Co		Percent of Dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 0 (A/B)
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: <u>30 feet</u>)				Prevalence Index worksheet:
1				
2				Total % Cover of: Multiply by:
3				OBL species x 1 =
4				FACW species x 2 =
5			·	FAC species x 3 =
10 foot		= Total Co	over	FACU species x 4 =
Herb Stratum (Plot size: <u>10 feet</u>)	30	YES	FACU	UPL species x 5 =
1. Hedera helix				Column Totals: (A) (B)
2. Polystichum munitum	10	YES	FACU	
3				Prevalence Index = B/A =
4				Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:
5				Dominance Test is >50%
6				Prevalence Index is ≤3.0 ¹
7			·	Morphological Adaptations ¹ (Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)
8				Wetland Non-Vascular Plants ¹
9				Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation ¹ (Explain)
10			·	¹ Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must
11			·	be present, unless disturbed or problematic.
10 fact	40	= Total Co	ver	
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 10 feet)				
1			·	Hydrophytic
2			·	Vegetation Present? Yes No _ ✓ _
% Bare Ground in Herb Stratum		= Total Co	ver	
Remarks:				

SOIL

Profile Des	cription: (Describe	e to the de	pth needed to docu	ment the	indicator	or confirr	n the absence	e of indicators.)		
Depth	Matrix			ox Feature						
<u>(inches)</u>	Color (moist)	%	Color (moist)	%	Type ¹	Loc ²	Texture	Remarks		
0-6	10YR 2/2	100					SALO	SLIGHTLY MOIST DURING INVESTIGATION		
6-12	2.5Y 4/3	80	2.5Y 3/3	20			SALO	DRY DURING INVESTIGATION		
			·							
		_		_						
21	,		/I=Reduced Matrix, C			d Sand G		cation: PL=Pore Lining, M=Matrix.		
Hydric Soil	Indicators: (Appli	cable to a	ll LRRs, unless othe	rwise no	ted.)		Indicate	ors for Problematic Hydric Soils ³ :		
Histosol	l (A1)		Sandy Redox	(S5)				m Muck (A10)		
Histic E	pipedon (A2)		Stripped Matrix	(S6)			Re	Red Parent Material (TF2)		
Black H	istic (A3)		Loamy Mucky	Mineral (F	1) (except	MLRA 1) Oth	ner (Explain in Remarks)		
Hydroge	en Sulfide (A4)		Loamy Gleyed	Matrix (F	2)					
Deplete	d Below Dark Surfa	ce (A11)	Depleted Matri	x (F3)						
Thick D	ark Surface (A12)		Redox Dark Su	urface (F6)		³ Indicat	ors of hydrophytic vegetation and		
Sandy M	Mucky Mineral (S1)		Depleted Dark	Surface (F7)		wetla	and hydrology must be present,		
Sandy C	Gleyed Matrix (S4)		Redox Depres	sions (F8)			unle	ss disturbed or problematic.		
Restrictive	Layer (if present):									
Туре:										
	ches):						Hydric Soi	I Present? Yes No∕		
Remarks:										
HYDROLO	GY									

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:	:			
Primary Indicators (minimum of c	<u>one required; check a</u>	all that apply)		Secondary Indicators (2 or more required)
Surface Water (A1)		Water-Stained Leaves (B9) (exce	pt MLRA	Water-Stained Leaves (B9) (MLRA 1, 2,
High Water Table (A2)		1, 2, 4A, and 4B)		4A, and 4B)
Saturation (A3)		Salt Crust (B11)		Drainage Patterns (B10)
Water Marks (B1)		Aquatic Invertebrates (B13)		Dry-Season Water Table (C2)
Sediment Deposits (B2)		Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1)		Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
Drift Deposits (B3)		Oxidized Rhizospheres along Livi	ng Roots (C3)	Geomorphic Position (D2)
Algal Mat or Crust (B4)		Presence of Reduced Iron (C4)		Shallow Aquitard (D3)
Iron Deposits (B5)		Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled So	oils (C6)	FAC-Neutral Test (D5)
Surface Soil Cracks (B6)		Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1) (I	LRR A)	Raised Ant Mounds (D6) (LRR A)
Inundation Visible on Aerial	Imagery (B7)	Other (Explain in Remarks)		Frost-Heave Hummocks (D7)
Sparsely Vegetated Concav	e Surface (B8)			
Field Observations:				
Surface Water Present? Y	rés No _ ✔ _	Depth (inches):		
Water Table Present? Y	res No _ ✔	Depth (inches):		
Saturation Present? Y (includes capillary fringe)	Yes No _ ✔	Depth (inches):	Wetland Hy	drology Present? Yes No∕
Describe Recorded Data (stream	n gauge, monitoring v	vell, aerial photos, previous inspec	tions), if availa	ible:
Remarks:				

RATING SUMMARY – Western Washington

Name of wetland (or ID #): Off-Site Wetland A (Westhill Inc.--Leahy Property) Date of site visit: 2/12/2020 Rated by Scott Spooner (Wetlands & Wildlife, Inc.) Trained by Ecology? Yes ____ No Date of training 10/05 & 4/15

HGM Class used for rating Slope Wetland has multiple HGM classes? Y V

NOTE: Form is not complete without the figures requested (figures can be combined). Source of base aerial photo/map <u>Google Earth</u>

OVERALL WETLAND CATEGORY ____ (based on functions ____ or special characteristics____)

1. Category of wetland based on FUNCTIONS

Category I – Total score = 23 - 27

Category II – Total score = 20 - 22

Category III – Total score = 16 - 19

Category IV – Total score = 9 - 15

FUNCTION		npro ter Q	ving uality	H	ydrologic		Habitat	
					Circle the ap	prop	riate ratings	
Site Potential	Н	Μ	(L)	Н	M (L)	Н	M (L)	
Landscape Potential	Н	M	L	Н	ML	Н	ML	
Value	H	Μ	L	Н	ML	Н	ML	ΤΟΤΑ
Score Based on Ratings		6			4		4	14

Score for each function based on three ratings (order of ratings is not important)

9 = H,H,H 8 = H,H,M 7 = H,H,L 7 = H,M,M 6 = H,M,L 6 = M,M,M 5 = H,L,L 5 = M,M,L 4 = M,L,L

3 = L,L,L

2. Category based on SPECIAL CHARACTERISTICS of wetland

CHARACTERISTIC	CATEGORY	
Estuarine	Ι	II
Wetland of High Conservation Value	I	
Bog	I	
Mature Forest	I	
Old Growth Forest	I	
Coastal Lagoon	Ι	II
Interdunal	I II	III IV
None of the above	\checkmark	

Maps and figures required to answer questions correctly for Western Washington

Depressional Wetlands

Map of:	To answer questions:	Figure #
Cowardin plant classes	D 1.3, H 1.1, H 1.4	
Hydroperiods	D 1.4, H 1.2	
Location of outlet (can be added to map of hydroperiods)	D 1.1, D 4.1	
Boundary of area within 150 ft of the wetland (can be added to another figure)	D 2.2, D 5.2	
Map of the contributing basin	D 4.3, D 5.3	
1 km Polygon: Area that extends 1 km from entire wetland edge - including	H 2.1, H 2.2, H 2.3	
polygons for accessible habitat and undisturbed habitat		
Screen capture of map of 303(d) listed waters in basin (from Ecology website)	D 3.1, D 3.2	
Screen capture of list of TMDLs for WRIA in which unit is found (from web)	D 3.3	

Riverine Wetlands

Map of:	To answer questions:	Figure #
Cowardin plant classes	H 1.1, H 1.4	
Hydroperiods	H 1.2	
Ponded depressions	R 1.1	
Boundary of area within 150 ft of the wetland (can be added to another figure)	R 2.4	
Plant cover of trees, shrubs, and herbaceous plants	R 1.2, R 4.2	
Width of unit vs. width of stream (can be added to another figure)	R 4.1	
Map of the contributing basin	R 2.2, R 2.3, R 5.2	
1 km Polygon: Area that extends 1 km from entire wetland edge - including polygons for accessible habitat and undisturbed habitat	H 2.1, H 2.2, H 2.3	
Screen capture of map of 303(d) listed waters in basin (from Ecology website)	R 3.1	
Screen capture of list of TMDLs for WRIA in which unit is found (from web)	R 3.2, R 3.3	

Lake Fringe Wetlands

Map of:	To answer questions:	Figure #
Cowardin plant classes	L 1.1, L 4.1, H 1.1, H 1.4	
Plant cover of trees, shrubs, and herbaceous plants	L 1.2	
Boundary of area within 150 ft of the wetland (can be added to another figure)	L 2.2	
1 km Polygon: Area that extends 1 km from entire wetland edge - including polygons for accessible habitat and undisturbed habitat	H 2.1, H 2.2, H 2.3	
Screen capture of map of 303(d) listed waters in basin (from Ecology website)	L 3.1, L 3.2	
Screen capture of list of TMDLs for WRIA in which unit is found (from web)	L 3.3	

Slope Wetlands

Map of:	To answer questions:	Figure #
Cowardin plant classes	H 1.1, H 1.4	1
Hydroperiods	H 1.2	2
Plant cover of dense trees, shrubs, and herbaceous plants	S 1.3	3
Plant cover of dense, rigid trees, shrubs, and herbaceous plants (can be added to figure above)	S 4.1	3
Boundary of 150 ft buffer (can be added to another figure)	S 2.1, S 5.1	1
1 km Polygon: Area that extends 1 km from entire wetland edge - including polygons for accessible habitat and undisturbed habitat	H 2.1, H 2.2, H 2.3	4
Screen capture of map of 303(d) listed waters in basin (from Ecology website)	S 3.1, S 3.2	5
Screen capture of list of TMDLs for WRIA in which unit is found (from web)	S 3.3	6

Wetland Rating System for Western WA: 2014 Update Rating Form – Effective January 1, 2015

SLOPE WETLANDS		
Water Quality Functions - Indicators that the site functions to impr	ove water quality	
S 1.0. Does the site have the potential to improve water quality?		
S 1.1. Characteristics of the average slope of the wetland: (a 1% slope has a 1 ft vertical drop in e 100 ft of horizontal distance)	levation for every	
Slope is 1% or less	points = 3	
Slope is > 1%-2%	points = 2	1
Slope is > 2%-5%	points = 1	
Slope is greater than 5%	points = 0	
S 1.2. <u>The soil 2 in below the surface (or duff layer)</u> is true clay or true organic <i>(use NRCS definitio</i>	<i>ns</i>): Yes = 3 No = 0	0
 S 1.3. Characteristics of the plants in the wetland that trap sediments and pollutants: Choose the points appropriate for the description that best fits the plants in the wetland. <i>have trouble seeing the soil surface (>75% cover), and uncut means not grazed or mowed a</i> <i>than 6 in.</i> Dense, uncut, herbaceous plants > 90% of the wetland area Dense, uncut, herbaceous plants > ½ of area Dense, uncut, herbaceous plants > ¼ of area 	points = 6 points = 6 points = 3 points = 2 points = 1 points = 0	1
Total for S 1 Add the points	in the boxes above	2
Rating of Site Potential If score is: $12 = H$ 6-11 = M0-5 = L S 2.0. Does the landscape have the potential to support the water quality function of the	Record the rating on t	he first page
5 2.0. Does the landscape have the potential to support the water quality function of the		
S 2.1. Is > 10% of the area within 150 ft on the uphill side of the wetland in land uses that genera	te pollutants?	1

Yes = 1 No = 0	·
S 2.2. Are there other sources of pollutants coming into the wetland that are not listed in question S 2.1?	0
Other sources Yes = 1 No = 0	Ũ
Total for S 2 Add the points in the boxes above	1

Rating of Landscape Potential If score is: 1-2 = M ____0 = L

Record the rating on the first page

S 3.0. Is the water quality improvement provided by the site valuable to society?	
S 3.1. Does the wetland discharge directly (i.e., within 1 mi) to a stream, river, lake, or marine water that is on the 303(d) list? Yes = 1 No = 0	0
S 3.2. Is the wetland in a basin or sub-basin where water quality is an issue? At least one aquatic resource in the basin is on the 303(d) list. Yes = 1 No = 0	1
S 3.3. Has the site been identified in a watershed or local plan as important for maintaining water quality? Answer YES if there is a TMDL for the basin in which unit is found.Yes = 2No = 0	2
Total for S 3 Add the points in the boxes above	3

Rating of Value If score is: 2-4 = H ___1 = M ___0 = L

Record the rating on the first page

SLOPE WETLANDS				
Hydrologic Functions - Indicators that the site functions to reduce flooding and stream erosion				
S 4.0. Does the site have the potential to reduce flooding and stream erosion?				
S 4.1. Characteristics of plants that reduce the velocity of surface flows during storms: Choose the points appropriate for the description that best fits conditions in the wetland. <i>Stems of plants should be thick enough (usually > ¹/₈</i> <i>in), or dense enough, to remain erect during surface flows.</i> Dense, uncut, rigid plants cover > 90% of the area of the wetland All other conditions	0			
Rating of Site Potential If score is: $1 = M$ $\sqrt{0} = L$ Record the rating on	the first page			

S 5.0. Does the landscape have the potential to support the hydrologic functions of the site?			
S 5.1. Is more than 25% of the area within 150 ft upslope of wetland in land uses or cover that generate excess			
surface runoff?	Yes = 1 No = 0	•	

Rating of Landscape Potential If score is: 1 = M ____0 = L

Record the rating on the first page

S 6.0. Are the hydrologic functions provided by the site valuable to socie	ty?	
S 6.1. Distance to the nearest areas downstream that have flooding problems: The sub-basin immediately down-gradient of site has flooding problems that result in damage to human or natural resources (e.g., houses or salmon redds) points = 2 Surface flooding problems are in a sub-basin farther down-gradient points = 1 No flooding problems anywhere downstream points = 0		0
S 6.2. Has the site been identified as important for flood storage or flood convey	vance in a regional flood control plan? Yes = 2 No = 0	0
Total for S 6	Add the points in the boxes above	0
Rating of Value If score is: $2-4 = H$ $1 = M$ $\sqrt{0} = L$	Record the rating on t	he first page

NOTES and FIELD OBSERVATIONS:

H 1.0. Does the site have the p	otential to provide habitat?		
Cowardin plant classes in th of ¼ ac or more than 10% of Aquatic bed Emergent Scrub-shrub (areas wh Forested (areas where If the unit has a Forest The Forested class has	e wetland. Up to 10 patches may be co the unit if it is smaller than 2.5 ac. Ad ere shrubs have > 30% cover) trees have > 30% cover) ed class, check if: 3 out of 5 strata (canopy, sub-canopy,	I strata within the Forested class. Check the ombined for each class to meet the threshold d the number of structures checked. 4 structures or more: points = 4 3 structures: points = 2 2 structures: points = 1 1 structure: points = 0 shrubs, herbaceous, moss/ground-cover)	0
H 1.2. Hydroperiods Check the types of water remore than 10% of the wetla Permanently flooded of Seasonally flooded or i Occasionally flooded o Saturated only Permanently flowing st	nd or ¼ ac to count (<i>see text for descri</i> r inundated nundated r inundated ream or river in, or adjacent to, the we am in, or adjacent to, the wetland	4 or more types present: points = 3 3 types present: points = 2 2 types present: points = 1 1 type present: points = 0	1
Different patches of the sam the species. Do not includ If you counted: > 19 species 5 - 19 spec < 5 species	e Eurasian milfoil, reed canarygrass, p	e size threshold and you do not have to name	1
the classes and unvegetated		wardin plants classes (described in H 1.1), or dflats) is high, moderate, low, or none. <i>If you</i> <i>he rating is always high</i> . Woderate = 2 points	1

H 1.5. Special habitat features:			
Check the habitat features that are present in the wetland. The number of checks is the number of points.			
Large, downed, woody debris within the wetland (> 4 in diameter and 6 ft long).			
Standing snags (dbh > 4 in) within the wetland			
Undercut banks are present for at least 6.6 ft (2 m) and/or overhanging plants extends at least 3.3 ft (1 m) over a stream (or ditch) in, or contiguous with the wetland, for at least 33 ft (10 m)			
Stable steep banks of fine material that might be used by beaver or muskrat for denning (> 30 degree slope) OR signs of recent beaver activity are present (cut shrubs or trees that have not yet weathered where wood is exposed)			
At least ¼ ac of thin-stemmed persistent plants or woody branches are present in areas that are			
permanently or seasonally inundated (structures for egg-laying by amphibians)			
Invasive plants cover less than 25% of the wetland area in every stratum of plants (see H 1.1 for list of strata)			
Total for H 1 Add the points in the boxes above	5		
Rating of Site Potential If score is: $15-18 = H$ $7-14 = M$ $\sqrt{0-6} = L$ Record the rating on the second t	he first page		

H 2.0. Does the landscape have the potential to support the habitat functions of the	site?	
H 2.1. Accessible habitat (include only habitat that directly abuts wetland unit).		
Calculate: % undisturbed habitat <u>0</u> + [(% moderate and low intensity land us	ses)/2] <u>0</u> =0_%	
If total accessible habitat is:		
> ¹ / ₃ (33.3%) of 1 km Polygon	points = 3	0
20-33% of 1 km Polygon	points = 2	
10-19% of 1 km Polygon	points = 1	
< 10% of 1 km Polygon	points = 0	
H 2.2. Undisturbed habitat in 1 km Polygon around the wetland.		
Calculate: % undisturbed habitat_0_ + [(% moderate and low intensity land us	ses)/2] <u>0.75</u> = <u>0.75</u> %	
Undisturbed habitat > 50% of Polygon	points = 3	0
Undisturbed habitat 10-50% and in 1-3 patches	points = 2	
Undisturbed habitat 10-50% and > 3 patches	points = 1	
Undisturbed habitat < 10% of 1 km Polygon	points = 0	
H 2.3. Land use intensity in 1 km Polygon: If		
> 50% of 1 km Polygon is high intensity land use	points = (- 2)	-2
≤ 50% of 1 km Polygon is high intensity	points = 0	
Total for H 2 Add the po	pints in the boxes above	-2
Pating of Landscape Detential of score is: A 6 - H 1 2 - M V < 1 - L	Becard the rating on the	first nage

Rating of Landscape Potential If score is: ____4-6 = H ____1-3 = M ___<1 = L

Record the rating on the first page

H 3.0. Is the habitat provided by the site valuable to society?	
H 3.1. Does the site provide habitat for species valued in laws, regulations, or policies? Choose only the highest score	2
that applies to the wetland being rated.	
Site meets ANY of the following criteria: points = 2	2
 It has 3 or more priority habitats within 100 m (see next page) 	
— It provides habitat for Threatened or Endangered species (any plant or animal on the state or federal lists	;)
 It is mapped as a location for an individual WDFW priority species 	1
 It is a Wetland of High Conservation Value as determined by the Department of Natural Resources 	
— It has been categorized as an important habitat site in a local or regional comprehensive plan, in a	
Shoreline Master Plan, or in a watershed plan	
Site has 1 or 2 priority habitats (listed on next page) within 100 m points = 1	-
Site does not meet any of the criteria above points = 0)
Rating of Value If score is: 2 = H 1 = M 0 = L Record the rating	on the first page

WDFW Priority Habitats

<u>Priority habitats listed by WDFW</u> (see complete descriptions of WDFW priority habitats, and the counties in which they can be found, in: Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2008. Priority Habitat and Species List. Olympia, Washington. 177 pp. <u>http://wdfw.wa.gov/publications/00165/wdfw00165.pdf</u> or access the list from here: <u>http://wdfw.wa.gov/conservation/phs/list/</u>)

Count how many of the following priority habitats are within 330 ft (100 m) of the wetland unit: **NOTE:** This question is independent of the land use between the wetland unit and the priority habitat.

- Aspen Stands: Pure or mixed stands of aspen greater than 1 ac (0.4 ha).
- **Biodiversity Areas and Corridors**: Areas of habitat that are relatively important to various species of native fish and wildlife (*full descriptions in WDFW PHS report*).
- Herbaceous Balds: Variable size patches of grass and forbs on shallow soils over bedrock.
- Old-growth/Mature forests: <u>Old-growth west of Cascade crest</u> Stands of at least 2 tree species, forming a multi-layered canopy with occasional small openings; with at least 8 trees/ac (20 trees/ha) > 32 in (81 cm) dbh or > 200 years of age. <u>Mature forests</u> Stands with average diameters exceeding 21 in (53 cm) dbh; crown cover may be less than 100%; decay, decadence, numbers of snags, and quantity of large downed material is generally less than that found in old-growth; 80-200 years old west of the Cascade crest.
- **Oregon White Oak:** Woodland stands of pure oak or oak/conifer associations where canopy coverage of the oak component is important (*full descriptions in WDFW PHS report p. 158 see web link above*).
- **Riparian**: The area adjacent to aquatic systems with flowing water that contains elements of both aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems which mutually influence each other.
- Westside Prairies: Herbaceous, non-forested plant communities that can either take the form of a dry prairie or a wet prairie (*full descriptions in WDFW PHS report p. 161 see web link above*).
- **Instream:** The combination of physical, biological, and chemical processes and conditions that interact to provide functional life history requirements for instream fish and wildlife resources.
- Nearshore: Relatively undisturbed nearshore habitats. These include Coastal Nearshore, Open Coast Nearshore, and Puget Sound Nearshore. (*full descriptions of habitats and the definition of relatively undisturbed are in WDFW report see web link on previous page*).
- **Caves:** A naturally occurring cavity, recess, void, or system of interconnected passages under the earth in soils, rock, ice, or other geological formations and is large enough to contain a human.
- **Cliffs:** Greater than 25 ft (7.6 m) high and occurring below 5000 ft elevation.
- **Talus:** Homogenous areas of rock rubble ranging in average size 0.5 6.5 ft (0.15 2.0 m), composed of basalt, andesite, and/or sedimentary rock, including riprap slides and mine tailings. May be associated with cliffs.
- Snags and Logs: Trees are considered snags if they are dead or dying and exhibit sufficient decay characteristics to enable cavity excavation/use by wildlife. Priority snags have a diameter at breast height of > 20 in (51 cm) in western Washington and are > 6.5 ft (2 m) in height. Priority logs are > 12 in (30 cm) in diameter at the largest end, and > 20 ft (6 m) long.

Note: All vegetated wetlands are by definition a priority habitat but are not included in this list because they are addressed elsewhere.

RATING SUMMARY – Western Washington

Name of wetland (or ID #): Off-Site Wetland B (Westhill Inc.--Leahy Property) Date of site visit: 2/12/2020 Rated by Scott Spooner (Wetlands & Wildlife, Inc.) Trained by Ecology? Yes ____ No Date of training 10/05 & 4/15

HGM Class used for rating Slope Wetland has multiple HGM classes? Y V N

NOTE: Form is not complete without the figures requested (figures can be combined). Source of base aerial photo/map <u>Google Earth</u>

OVERALL WETLAND CATEGORY ____ (based on functions ____ or special characteristics____)

1. Category of wetland based on FUNCTIONS

Category I – Total score = 23 - 27

Category II – Total score = 20 - 22

Category III – Total score = 16 - 19

Category IV – Total score = 9 - 15

FUNCTION	Improving Hydrologic Water Quality		Habitat						
					Circle	the ap	oropi	riate ratings	
Site Potential	Н	Μ		Н	Μ	(l)	Н	M (L)	
Landscape Potential	Н	M	L	Н	Μ		Н	ML	
Value	H	М	L	Н	Μ	\bigcirc	Н	ML	ΤΟΤΑ
Score Based on Ratings		6			3			4	13

Score for each function based on three ratings (order of ratings is not important)

9 = H,H,H 8 = H,H,M 7 = H,H,L 7 = H,M,M 6 = H,M,L 6 = M,M,M 5 = H,L,L 5 = M,M,L 4 = M,L,L

3 = L,L,L

2. Category based on SPECIAL CHARACTERISTICS of wetland

CHARACTERISTIC	CATEGORY			
Estuarine	I II			
Wetland of High Conservation Value	I			
Bog	Ι			
Mature Forest	I			
Old Growth Forest	I			
Coastal Lagoon	Ι	II		
Interdunal	I II	III IV		
None of the above	\checkmark			

Maps and figures required to answer questions correctly for Western Washington

Depressional Wetlands

Map of:	To answer questions:	Figure #
Cowardin plant classes	D 1.3, H 1.1, H 1.4	
Hydroperiods	D 1.4, H 1.2	
Location of outlet (can be added to map of hydroperiods)	D 1.1, D 4.1	
Boundary of area within 150 ft of the wetland (can be added to another figure)	D 2.2, D 5.2	
Map of the contributing basin	D 4.3, D 5.3	
1 km Polygon: Area that extends 1 km from entire wetland edge - including	H 2.1, H 2.2, H 2.3	
polygons for accessible habitat and undisturbed habitat		
Screen capture of map of 303(d) listed waters in basin (from Ecology website)	D 3.1, D 3.2	
Screen capture of list of TMDLs for WRIA in which unit is found (from web)	D 3.3	

Riverine Wetlands

Map of:	To answer questions:	Figure #
Cowardin plant classes	Н 1.1, Н 1.4	
Hydroperiods	H 1.2	
Ponded depressions	R 1.1	
Boundary of area within 150 ft of the wetland (can be added to another figure)	R 2.4	
Plant cover of trees, shrubs, and herbaceous plants	R 1.2, R 4.2	
Width of unit vs. width of stream (can be added to another figure)	R 4.1	
Map of the contributing basin	R 2.2, R 2.3, R 5.2	
1 km Polygon: Area that extends 1 km from entire wetland edge - including polygons for accessible habitat and undisturbed habitat	H 2.1, H 2.2, H 2.3	
Screen capture of map of 303(d) listed waters in basin (from Ecology website)	R 3.1	
Screen capture of list of TMDLs for WRIA in which unit is found (from web)	R 3.2, R 3.3	

Lake Fringe Wetlands

Map of:	To answer questions:	Figure #
Cowardin plant classes	L 1.1, L 4.1, H 1.1, H 1.4	
Plant cover of trees, shrubs, and herbaceous plants	L 1.2	
Boundary of area within 150 ft of the wetland (can be added to another figure)	L 2.2	
1 km Polygon: Area that extends 1 km from entire wetland edge - including polygons for accessible habitat and undisturbed habitat	H 2.1, H 2.2, H 2.3	
Screen capture of map of 303(d) listed waters in basin (from Ecology website)	L 3.1, L 3.2	
Screen capture of list of TMDLs for WRIA in which unit is found (from web)	L 3.3	

Slope Wetlands

Map of:	To answer questions:	Figure #
Cowardin plant classes	H 1.1, H 1.4	1
Hydroperiods	H 1.2	2
Plant cover of dense trees, shrubs, and herbaceous plants	S 1.3	3
Plant cover of dense, rigid trees, shrubs, and herbaceous plants (can be added to figure above)	S 4.1	3
Boundary of 150 ft buffer (can be added to another figure)	S 2.1, S 5.1	1
1 km Polygon: Area that extends 1 km from entire wetland edge - including polygons for accessible habitat and undisturbed habitat	H 2.1, H 2.2, H 2.3	4
Screen capture of map of 303(d) listed waters in basin (from Ecology website)	S 3.1, S 3.2	5
Screen capture of list of TMDLs for WRIA in which unit is found (from web)	S 3.3	6

Wetland Rating System for Western WA: 2014 Update Rating Form – Effective January 1, 2015

S 1.0. Does the site have the potential to improve water quality?		
S 1.1. Characteristics of the average slope of the wetland: (a 1% slope has a 1 ft ve 100 ft of horizontal distance)		
Slope is 1% or less	points = 3	4
Slope is > 1%-2%	points = 2	I
Slope is > 2%-5%	points = 1	
Slope is greater than 5%	points = 0	
S 1.2. The soil 2 in below the surface (or duff layer) is true clay or true organic (use		0
S 1.3. Characteristics of the plants in the wetland that trap sediments and pollutar Choose the points appropriate for the description that best fits the plants in have trouble seeing the soil surface (>75% cover), and uncut means not graz than 6 in.	the wetland. Dense means you	
Dense, uncut, herbaceous plants > 90% of the wetland area	points = 6	1
Dense, uncut, herbaceous plants > ½ of area	points = 3	
Dense, woody, plants > ½ of area	points = 2	
Dense, uncut, herbaceous plants > ¼ of area	points = 1	
Does not meet any of the criteria above for plants	points = 0	
Total for S 1	Add the points in the boxes above	1

S 2.0. Does the landscape have the potential to support the water quality function of the site?	
S 2.1. Is > 10% of the area within 150 ft on the uphill side of the wetland in land uses that generate pollutants?	
Yes = 1 No = 0	
S 2.2. Are there other sources of pollutants coming into the wetland that are not listed in question S 2.1?	
Other sources Yes = 1 No = 0	Ũ
Total for S 2 Add the points in the boxes above	1

Rating of Landscape Potential If score is: 1-2 = M ___0 = L

Record the rating on the first page

S 3.0. Is the water quality improvement provided by the site valuable to society?	
S 3.1. Does the wetland discharge directly (i.e., within 1 mi) to a stream, river, lake, or marine water that is on the 303(d) list? Yes = 1 No = 0	0
S 3.2. Is the wetland in a basin or sub-basin where water quality is an issue? At least one aquatic resource in the basin is on the 303(d) list. Yes = 1 No = 0	1
S 3.3. Has the site been identified in a watershed or local plan as important for maintaining water quality? Answer YES if there is a TMDL for the basin in which unit is found.Yes = 2No = 0	2
Total for S 3 Add the points in the boxes above	3

Rating of Value If score is: $\sqrt{2-4} = H$ ___1 = M ___0 = L

Record the rating on the first page

SLOPE WETLANDS	
Hydrologic Functions - Indicators that the site functions to reduce flooding and stream eros	ion
S 4.0. Does the site have the potential to reduce flooding and stream erosion?	
S 4.1. Characteristics of plants that reduce the velocity of surface flows during storms: Choose the points appropriate for the description that best fits conditions in the wetland. Stems of plants should be thick enough (usually $> \frac{1}{8}$ in), or dense enough, to remain erect during surface flows.	0
Dense, uncut, rigid plants cover > 90% of the area of the wetland points = 1	
All other conditions points = 0	
Rating of Site Potential If score is: $1 = M \sqrt{0} = L$ Record the rating on	the first page

S 5.0. Does the landscape have the potential to support the hydrologic functions of the site?		
S 5.1. Is more than 25% of the area within 150 ft upslope of wetland in land uses or cover that generate excess		0
surface runoff?	Yes = 1 No = 0	U U

Rating of Landscape Potential If score is: <u>1</u> = M <u>V</u>0 = L

Record the rating on the first page

S 6.0. Are the hydrologic functions provided by the site valuable to society?	
S 6.1. Distance to the nearest areas downstream that have flooding problems: The sub-basin immediately down-gradient of site has flooding problems that result in damage to human or natural resources (e.g., houses or salmon redds) Surface flooding problems are in a sub-basin farther down-gradient points = 1 points = 1 No flooding problems anywhere downstream	0
S 6.2. Has the site been identified as important for flood storage or flood conveyance in a regional flood control plan? Yes = 2 No = 0	0
Total for S 6 Add the points in the boxes above	0

Rating of Value If score is: 2-4 = H 1 = M 0 = L

Record the rating on the first page

NOTES and FIELD OBSERVATIONS:

IABITAT FUNCTIONS - Indicators that site functions to pro		
I 1.0. Does the site have the potential to provide habitat?		
 1.1. Structure of plant community: Indicators are Cowardin classes ar Cowardin plant classes in the wetland. Up to 10 patches may be of ¼ ac or more than 10% of the unit if it is smaller than 2.5 ac. A Aquatic bed Emergent Scrub-shrub (areas where shrubs have > 30% cover) Forested (areas where trees have > 30% cover) If the unit has a Forested class, check if: The Forested class has 3 out of 5 strata (canopy, sub-canopy that each cover 20% within the Forested polyaon 	combined for each class to meet the threshold dd the number of structures checked. 4 structures or more: points = 4 3 structures: points = 2 2 structures: points = 1 1 structure: points = 0	1
that each cover 20% within the Forested polygon 1.2. Hydroperiods		
Check the types of water regimes (hydroperiods) present within more than 10% of the wetland or ¼ ac to count (<i>see text for desc</i> Permanently flooded or inundated Seasonally flooded or inundated Saturated only Permanently flowing stream or river in, or adjacent to, the wetland Seasonally flowing stream in, or adjacent to, the wetland	riptions of hydroperiods). 4 or more types present: points = 3 3 types present: points = 2 2 types present: points = 1 1 type present: points = 0	1
 1.3. Richness of plant species Count the number of plant species in the wetland that cover at led Different patches of the same species can be combined to meet to the species. Do not include Eurasian milfoil, reed canarygrass, If you counted: > 19 species 5 - 19 species 5 species 	he size threshold and you do not have to name	1
 I.4. Interspersion of habitats Decide from the diagrams below whether interspersion among C the classes and unvegetated areas (can include open water or minhave four or more plant classes or three classes and open water, None = 0 points Low = 1 point If three diagrams in this row re HIGH = 3points	Cowardin plants classes (described in H 1.1), or udflats) is high, moderate, low, or none. <i>If you</i> <i>the rating is always high</i> .	1

 Check the habitat features that are present in the wetland. The number of checks is the number of points. Large, downed, woody debris within the wetland (> 4 in diameter and 6 ft long). Standing snags (dbh > 4 in) within the wetland Undercut banks are present for at least 6.6 ft (2 m) and/or overhanging plants extends at least 3.3 ft (1 m) over a stream (or ditch) in, or contiguous with the wetland, for at least 33 ft (10 m) Stable steep banks of fine material that might be used by beaver or muskrat for denning (> 30 degree slope) OR signs of recent beaver activity are present (cut shrubs or trees that have not yet weathered where wood is exposed) At least ¼ ac of thin-stemmed persistent plants or woody branches are present in areas that are 	2
permanently or seasonally inundated <i>(structures for egg-laying by amphibians)</i> Invasive plants cover less than 25% of the wetland area in every stratum of plants (<i>see H 1.1 for list of</i>	
strata) Add the points in the boxes above	6

H 2.0. Does the landscape have the potential to support the habitat function	ns of the site?	
H 2.1. Accessible habitat (include <i>only habitat that directly abuts wetland unit</i>). <i>Calculate:</i> % undisturbed habitat_0 + [(% moderate and low intens If total accessible habitat is:	sity land uses)/2] $\frac{0}{2} = \frac{0}{3}$ %	
$> \frac{1}{3}$ (33.3%) of 1 km Polygon	points = 3	0
20-33% of 1 km Polygon	points = 2	
10-19% of 1 km Polygon	points = 1	
< 10% of 1 km Polygon	points = 0	
H 2.2. Undisturbed habitat in 1 km Polygon around the wetland.		
Calculate: % undisturbed habitat 0 + [(% moderate and low intens	sity land uses)/2] <u>0.75</u> = <u>0.75</u> %	
Undisturbed habitat > 50% of Polygon	points = 3	0
Undisturbed habitat 10-50% and in 1-3 patches	points = 2	
Undisturbed habitat 10-50% and > 3 patches	points = 1	
Undisturbed habitat < 10% of 1 km Polygon	points = 0	
H 2.3. Land use intensity in 1 km Polygon: If		
> 50% of 1 km Polygon is high intensity land use	points = (- 2)	-2
≤ 50% of 1 km Polygon is high intensity	points = 0	
Total for H 2 A	add the points in the boxes above	-2
Pating of Landscape Potential If score is: 4-6 - H 1-3 - M V < 1 - 1	Record the rating on the	o first page

Rating of Landscape Potential If score is: ____4-6 = H ____1-3 = M ___<1 = L

Record the rating on the first page

H 3.0. Is the habitat provided by the site valuable to society?		
H 3.1. Does the site provide habitat for species valued in laws, regulations, or policies? <i>Choo that applies to the wetland being rated.</i> Site meets ANY of the following criteria:	se only the highest score points = 2	
 It has 3 or more priority habitats within 100 m (see next page) It provides habitat for Threatened or Endangered species (any plant or animal on It is mapped as a location for an individual WDFW priority species It is a Wetland of High Conservation Value as determined by the Department of N It has been categorized as an important habitat site in a local or regional compret Shoreline Master Plan, or in a watershed plan Site has 1 or 2 priority habitats (listed on next page) within 100 m Site does not meet any of the criteria above 	Natural Resources	1
Rating of Value If score is:2 = H1 = M0 = L	Record the rating on th	ne first page

WDFW Priority Habitats

<u>Priority habitats listed by WDFW</u> (see complete descriptions of WDFW priority habitats, and the counties in which they can be found, in: Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2008. Priority Habitat and Species List. Olympia, Washington. 177 pp. <u>http://wdfw.wa.gov/publications/00165/wdfw00165.pdf</u> or access the list from here: <u>http://wdfw.wa.gov/conservation/phs/list/</u>)

Count how many of the following priority habitats are within 330 ft (100 m) of the wetland unit: **NOTE:** This question is independent of the land use between the wetland unit and the priority habitat.

- Aspen Stands: Pure or mixed stands of aspen greater than 1 ac (0.4 ha).
- **Biodiversity Areas and Corridors**: Areas of habitat that are relatively important to various species of native fish and wildlife (*full descriptions in WDFW PHS report*).
- Herbaceous Balds: Variable size patches of grass and forbs on shallow soils over bedrock.
- Old-growth/Mature forests: <u>Old-growth west of Cascade crest</u> Stands of at least 2 tree species, forming a multi-layered canopy with occasional small openings; with at least 8 trees/ac (20 trees/ha) > 32 in (81 cm) dbh or > 200 years of age. <u>Mature forests</u> Stands with average diameters exceeding 21 in (53 cm) dbh; crown cover may be less than 100%; decay, decadence, numbers of snags, and quantity of large downed material is generally less than that found in old-growth; 80-200 years old west of the Cascade crest.
- **Oregon White Oak:** Woodland stands of pure oak or oak/conifer associations where canopy coverage of the oak component is important (*full descriptions in WDFW PHS report p. 158 see web link above*).
- **Riparian**: The area adjacent to aquatic systems with flowing water that contains elements of both aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems which mutually influence each other.
- Westside Prairies: Herbaceous, non-forested plant communities that can either take the form of a dry prairie or a wet prairie (*full descriptions in WDFW PHS report p. 161 see web link above*).
- **Instream:** The combination of physical, biological, and chemical processes and conditions that interact to provide functional life history requirements for instream fish and wildlife resources.
- Nearshore: Relatively undisturbed nearshore habitats. These include Coastal Nearshore, Open Coast Nearshore, and
 Puget Sound Nearshore. (*full descriptions of habitats and the definition of relatively undisturbed are in WDFW report –
 see web link on previous page*).
- **Caves:** A naturally occurring cavity, recess, void, or system of interconnected passages under the earth in soils, rock, ice, or other geological formations and is large enough to contain a human.
- **Cliffs:** Greater than 25 ft (7.6 m) high and occurring below 5000 ft elevation.
- **Talus:** Homogenous areas of rock rubble ranging in average size 0.5 6.5 ft (0.15 2.0 m), composed of basalt, andesite, and/or sedimentary rock, including riprap slides and mine tailings. May be associated with cliffs.
- Snags and Logs: Trees are considered snags if they are dead or dying and exhibit sufficient decay characteristics to enable cavity excavation/use by wildlife. Priority snags have a diameter at breast height of > 20 in (51 cm) in western Washington and are > 6.5 ft (2 m) in height. Priority logs are > 12 in (30 cm) in diameter at the largest end, and > 20 ft (6 m) long.

Note: All vegetated wetlands are by definition a priority habitat but are not included in this list because they are addressed elsewhere.

RATING SUMMARY – Western Washington

Name of wetland (or ID #): Off-Site Wetland C (Westhill Inc.--Leahy Property) Date of site visit: 2/12/2020 Rated by Scott Spooner (Wetlands & Wildlife, Inc.) Trained by Ecology? Yes _____ No Date of training 10/05 & 4/15

HGM Class used for rating Slope Wetland has multiple HGM classes? Y V

NOTE: Form is not complete without the figures requested (figures can be combined). Source of base aerial photo/map <u>Google Earth</u>

OVERALL WETLAND CATEGORY (based on functions vor special characteristics)

1. Category of wetland based on FUNCTIONS

Category I – Total score = 23 - 27

Category II – Total score = 20 - 22

Category III – Total score = 16 - 19

Category IV – Total score = 9 - 15

FUNCTION		mprov ater Qu	•	Н	ydrologic	ł	labit	at	
					Circle the a	opropri	iate r	atings	
Site Potential	Н	M	L	Н	M (L)	Н	Μ	(L)	
Landscape Potential	Н	M	L	Н	ML	Н	Μ		
Value	H	Μ	L	Н	ML	H	Μ	Ĺ	TOTA
Score Based on Ratings		7			4		5		16

Score for each function based on three ratings (order of ratings is not important)

9 = H,H,H 8 = H,H,M 7 = H,H,L 7 = H,M,M 6 = H,M,L 6 = M,M,M 5 = H,L,L 5 = M,M,L 4 = M,L,L

3 = L,L,L

2. Category based on SPECIAL CHARACTERISTICS of wetland

CHARACTERISTIC	CATEGORY		
Estuarine	I II		
Wetland of High Conservation Value	I		
Bog	I		
Mature Forest	I		
Old Growth Forest	I		
Coastal Lagoon	Ι	II	
Interdunal	I II III IV		
None of the above	\checkmark		

Maps and figures required to answer questions correctly for Western Washington

Depressional Wetlands

Map of:	To answer questions:	Figure #
Cowardin plant classes	D 1.3, H 1.1, H 1.4	
Hydroperiods	D 1.4, H 1.2	
Location of outlet (can be added to map of hydroperiods)	D 1.1, D 4.1	
Boundary of area within 150 ft of the wetland (can be added to another figure)	D 2.2, D 5.2	
Map of the contributing basin	D 4.3, D 5.3	
1 km Polygon: Area that extends 1 km from entire wetland edge - including	H 2.1, H 2.2, H 2.3	
polygons for accessible habitat and undisturbed habitat		
Screen capture of map of 303(d) listed waters in basin (from Ecology website)	D 3.1, D 3.2	
Screen capture of list of TMDLs for WRIA in which unit is found (from web)	D 3.3	

Riverine Wetlands

Map of:	To answer questions:	Figure #
Cowardin plant classes	Н 1.1, Н 1.4	
Hydroperiods	H 1.2	
Ponded depressions	R 1.1	
Boundary of area within 150 ft of the wetland (can be added to another figure)	R 2.4	
Plant cover of trees, shrubs, and herbaceous plants	R 1.2, R 4.2	
Width of unit vs. width of stream (can be added to another figure)	R 4.1	
Map of the contributing basin	R 2.2, R 2.3, R 5.2	
1 km Polygon: Area that extends 1 km from entire wetland edge - including polygons for accessible habitat and undisturbed habitat	H 2.1, H 2.2, H 2.3	
Screen capture of map of 303(d) listed waters in basin (from Ecology website)	R 3.1	
Screen capture of list of TMDLs for WRIA in which unit is found (from web)	R 3.2, R 3.3	

Lake Fringe Wetlands

Map of:	To answer questions:	Figure #
Cowardin plant classes	L 1.1, L 4.1, H 1.1, H 1.4	
Plant cover of trees, shrubs, and herbaceous plants	L 1.2	
Boundary of area within 150 ft of the wetland (can be added to another figure)	L 2.2	
1 km Polygon: Area that extends 1 km from entire wetland edge - including polygons for accessible habitat and undisturbed habitat	H 2.1, H 2.2, H 2.3	
Screen capture of map of 303(d) listed waters in basin (from Ecology website)	L 3.1, L 3.2	
Screen capture of list of TMDLs for WRIA in which unit is found (from web)	L 3.3	

Slope Wetlands

Map of:	To answer questions:	Figure #
Cowardin plant classes	H 1.1, H 1.4	1
Hydroperiods	H 1.2	2
Plant cover of dense trees, shrubs, and herbaceous plants	S 1.3	3
Plant cover of dense, rigid trees, shrubs, and herbaceous plants	S 4.1	3
(can be added to figure above) Boundary of 150 ft buffer (can be added to another figure)	S 2.1, S 5.1	1
1 km Polygon: Area that extends 1 km from entire wetland edge - including polygons for accessible habitat and undisturbed habitat	H 2.1, H 2.2, H 2.3	4
Screen capture of map of 303(d) listed waters in basin (from Ecology website)	S 3.1, S 3.2	5
Screen capture of list of TMDLs for WRIA in which unit is found (from web)	S 3.3	6

Wetland Rating System for Western WA: 2014 Update Rating Form – Effective January 1, 2015

SLOPE WETLANDS		
Water Quality Functions - Indicators that the site functions t	o improve water quality	
S 1.0. Does the site have the potential to improve water quality?		
S 1.1. Characteristics of the average slope of the wetland: (a 1% slope has a 1 ft vertical a 100 ft of horizontal distance)		
Slope is 1% or less	points = 3	1
Slope is > 1%-2% Slope is > 2%-5%	points = 2	
-	points = 1	
Slope is greater than 5%	points = 0	0
S 1.2. The soil 2 in below the surface (or duff layer) is true clay or true organic (use NRCS of 1.2. Characteristics of the plants in the wetland that transcription and not wetland the surface of the plants in the wetland that transcription and not wetland the surface of the plants in the wetland the surface of the plants in the wetland the surface of the plants in the surface of the surface	$\frac{definitions}{definitions}: \text{ Yes} = 3 \text{ NO} = 0$	0
S 1.3. Characteristics of the plants in the wetland that trap sediments and pollutants:		
Choose the points appropriate for the description that best fits the plants in the we have trouble seeing the soil surface (>75% cover), and uncut means not grazed or n than 6 in.	2	
Dense, uncut, herbaceous plants > 90% of the wetland area	points = 6	6
Dense, uncut, herbaceous plants > ½ of area	points = 3	
Dense, woody, plants > $\frac{1}{2}$ of area	points = 2	
Dense, uncut, herbaceous plants > ¼ of area	points = 1	
Does not meet any of the criteria above for plants	points = 0	
Total for S 1 Add the	e points in the boxes above	7
Rating of Site Potential If score is: 12 = H 46-11 = M 6-5 = L	Record the rating on th	ne first pa
S 2.0. Does the landscape have the potential to support the water quality functio	n of the site?	
S 2.1. Is > 10% of the area within 150 ft on the uphill side of the wetland in land uses that	generate pollutants? Yes = 1 No = 0	1
S 2.2. Are there other sources of pollutants coming into the wetland that are not listed in Other sources	question S 2.1? Yes = 1 No = 0	0
Total for S 2 Add the	e points in the boxes above	1
Rating of Landscape Potential If score is: 1-2 = M0 = L	Record the rating on th	ne first pa
S 3.0. Is the water quality improvement provided by the site valuable to society?		
S 3.1. Does the wetland discharge directly (i.e., within 1 mi) to a stream, river, lake, or ma 303(d) list?	rine water that is on the Yes = 1 No = 0	0
S 3.2. Is the wetland in a basin or sub-basin where water quality is an issue? At least one of an the 202/d) list	equatic resource in the basin is $Y_{05} = 1$ No = 0	1

on the 303(d) list.Yes = 1 No = 0S 3.3. Has the site been identified in a watershed or local plan as important for maintaining water quality? Answer YES
if there is a TMDL for the basin in which unit is found.2Total for S 3Add the points in the boxes above3

Rating of Value If score is: 2-4 = H ___1 = M ___0 = L

Record the rating on the first page

SLOPE WETLANDS	
Hydrologic Functions - Indicators that the site functions to reduce flooding and stream eros	sion
S 4.0. Does the site have the potential to reduce flooding and stream erosion?	
S 4.1. Characteristics of plants that reduce the velocity of surface flows during storms: Choose the points appropriate for the description that best fits conditions in the wetland. Stems of plants should be thick enough (usually > $^{1}/_{8}$ in), or dense enough, to remain erect during surface flows.	0
Dense, uncut, rigid plants cover > 90% of the area of the wetland points = 1	
All other conditions points = 0	
Rating of Site Potential If score is: $1 = M \sqrt{0} = L$ Record the rating on	the first page

S 5.0. Does the landscape have the potential to support the hydrologic functions of the site?			
S 5.1. Is more than 25% of the area within 150 ft upslope of wetland in land uses or cover that generate excess surface runoff? Yes = 1 No = 0		1	
Rating of Landscape Potential If score is: 1 = M0 = L	Record the rating on	Record the rating on the first page	

S 6.0. Are the hydrologic functions provided by the site valuable to society?	
S 6.1. Distance to the nearest areas downstream that have flooding problems:The sub-basin immediately down-gradient of site has flooding problems that result in damage to human or natural resources (e.g., houses or salmon redds)Surface flooding problems are in a sub-basin farther down-gradientpoints = 1 points = 1 points = 0	0
S 6.2. Has the site been identified as important for flood storage or flood conveyance in a regional flood control plan? Yes = 2 No = 0	0
Total for S 6 Add the points in the boxes above	0
Rating of Value If score is: $2-4 = H$ $1 = M$ $\sqrt{0} = L$ Record the rating on	the first page

NOTES and FIELD OBSERVATIONS:

ABITAT FUNCTIONS - Indicators that site	tions to provide important habitat
1 1.0. Does the site have the potential to provid	
Cowardin plant classes in the wetland. Up to 1 of ¼ ac or more than 10% of the unit if it is smo Aquatic bed Emergent Scrub-shrub (areas where shrubs have > 3 Forested (areas where trees have > 30% of If the unit has a Forested class, check if: The Forested class has 3 out of 5 strata (co	1 structure: points = 0 y, sub-canopy, shrubs, herbaceous, moss/ground-cover)
that each cover 20% within the Forested 1.2. Hydroperiods	
more than 10% of the wetland or ¼ ac to counPermanently flooded or inundatedSeasonally flooded or inundatedOccasionally flooded or inundatedSaturated onlyPermanently flowing stream or river in, orSeasonally flowing stream in, or adjacentLake Fringe wetlandFreshwater tidal wetland	4 or more types present: points = 3 3 types present: points = 2 2 types present: points = 1 1 type present: points = 0 1 cent to, the wetland
	hat cover at least 10 ft ² . hed to meet the size threshold and you do not have to name canarygrass, purple loosestrife, Canadian thistle points = 2 points = 1
< 5 species	points = 0
	sion among Cowardin plants classes (described in H 1.1), or n water or mudflats) is high, moderate, low, or none. <i>If you</i> open water, the rating is always high.

H 1.5. Special habitat features:	
Check the habitat features that are present in the wetland. The number of checks is the number of points.	
Large, downed, woody debris within the wetland (> 4 in diameter and 6 ft long).	
Standing snags (dbh > 4 in) within the wetland	
Undercut banks are present for at least 6.6 ft (2 m) and/or overhanging plants extends at least 3.3 ft (1 m) over a stream (or ditch) in, or contiguous with the wetland, for at least 33 ft (10 m)	
Stable steep banks of fine material that might be used by beaver or muskrat for denning (> 30 degree slope) OR signs of recent beaver activity are present (cut shrubs or trees that have not yet weathered where wood is exposed)	1
At least ¼ ac of thin-stemmed persistent plants or woody branches are present in areas that are permanently or seasonally inundated <i>(structures for egg-laying by amphibians)</i>	
Invasive plants cover less than 25% of the wetland area in every stratum of plants (see H 1.1 for list of strata)	
Total for H 1Add the points in the boxes above	4

Rating of Site Potential If score is: ____15-18 = H ____7-14 = M ____0-6 = L

Record the rating on the first page

H 2.0. Does the landscape have the potential to support the habitat functions of the s	site?	
H 2.1. Accessible habitat (include <i>only habitat that directly abuts wetland unit</i>). <i>Calculate:</i> % undisturbed habitat_0_+ [(% moderate and low intensity land us	es)/2] <u>0</u> = <u>0</u> %	
If total accessible habitat is: > $\frac{1}{3}$ (33.3%) of 1 km Polygon	points = 3	0
20-33% of 1 km Polygon	points = 3	C C
10-19% of 1 km Polygon	points = 1	
< 10% of 1 km Polygon	points = 0	
H 2.2. Undisturbed habitat in 1 km Polygon around the wetland.		
Calculate: % undisturbed habitat <u>0</u> + [(% moderate and low intensity land us	es)/2] <u>0.75</u> = <u>0.75</u> %	
Undisturbed habitat > 50% of Polygon	points = 3	0
Undisturbed habitat 10-50% and in 1-3 patches	points = 2	
Undisturbed habitat 10-50% and > 3 patches	points = 1	
Undisturbed habitat < 10% of 1 km Polygon	points = 0	
H 2.3. Land use intensity in 1 km Polygon: If		
> 50% of 1 km Polygon is high intensity land use	points = (- 2)	-2
≤ 50% of 1 km Polygon is high intensity	points = 0	
Total for H 2 Add the poi	nts in the boxes above	-2
Rating of Landscape Potential If score is:4-6 = H1-3 = M<1 = L	Record the rating on the	first pag

H 3.0. Is the habitat provided by the site valuable to society? H 3.1. Does the site provide habitat for species valued in laws, regulations, or policies? Choose only the highest score that applies to the wetland being rated. Site meets ANY of the following criteria: points = 2It has 3 or more priority habitats within 100 m (see next page) — It provides habitat for Threatened or Endangered species (any plant or animal on the state or federal lists) 2 — It is mapped as a location for an individual WDFW priority species — It is a Wetland of High Conservation Value as determined by the Department of Natural Resources — It has been categorized as an important habitat site in a local or regional comprehensive plan, in a Shoreline Master Plan, or in a watershed plan Site has 1 or 2 priority habitats (listed on next page) within 100 m points = 1Site does not meet any of the criteria above points = 0**Rating of Value** If score is: $\sqrt{2} = H$ 1 = M 0 = L*Record the rating on the first page*

Wetland Rating System for Western WA: 2014 Update Rating Form – Effective January 1, 2015

WDFW Priority Habitats

<u>Priority habitats listed by WDFW</u> (see complete descriptions of WDFW priority habitats, and the counties in which they can be found, in: Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2008. Priority Habitat and Species List. Olympia, Washington. 177 pp. <u>http://wdfw.wa.gov/publications/00165/wdfw00165.pdf</u> or access the list from here: <u>http://wdfw.wa.gov/conservation/phs/list/</u>)

Count how many of the following priority habitats are within 330 ft (100 m) of the wetland unit: **NOTE:** This question is independent of the land use between the wetland unit and the priority habitat.

- Aspen Stands: Pure or mixed stands of aspen greater than 1 ac (0.4 ha).
- **Biodiversity Areas and Corridors**: Areas of habitat that are relatively important to various species of native fish and wildlife (*full descriptions in WDFW PHS report*).
- Herbaceous Balds: Variable size patches of grass and forbs on shallow soils over bedrock.
- Old-growth/Mature forests: <u>Old-growth west of Cascade crest</u> Stands of at least 2 tree species, forming a multi-layered canopy with occasional small openings; with at least 8 trees/ac (20 trees/ha) > 32 in (81 cm) dbh or > 200 years of age. <u>Mature forests</u> Stands with average diameters exceeding 21 in (53 cm) dbh; crown cover may be less than 100%; decay, decadence, numbers of snags, and quantity of large downed material is generally less than that found in old-growth; 80-200 years old west of the Cascade crest.
- **Oregon White Oak:** Woodland stands of pure oak or oak/conifer associations where canopy coverage of the oak component is important (*full descriptions in WDFW PHS report p. 158 see web link above*).
- **Riparian**: The area adjacent to aquatic systems with flowing water that contains elements of both aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems which mutually influence each other.
- Westside Prairies: Herbaceous, non-forested plant communities that can either take the form of a dry prairie or a wet prairie (*full descriptions in WDFW PHS report p. 161 see web link above*).
- **Instream:** The combination of physical, biological, and chemical processes and conditions that interact to provide functional life history requirements for instream fish and wildlife resources.
- Nearshore: Relatively undisturbed nearshore habitats. These include Coastal Nearshore, Open Coast Nearshore, and Puget Sound Nearshore. (*full descriptions of habitats and the definition of relatively undisturbed are in WDFW report see web link on previous page*).
- **Caves:** A naturally occurring cavity, recess, void, or system of interconnected passages under the earth in soils, rock, ice, or other geological formations and is large enough to contain a human.
- **Cliffs:** Greater than 25 ft (7.6 m) high and occurring below 5000 ft elevation.
- Talus: Homogenous areas of rock rubble ranging in average size 0.5 6.5 ft (0.15 2.0 m), composed of basalt, andesite, and/or sedimentary rock, including riprap slides and mine tailings. May be associated with cliffs.
- Snags and Logs: Trees are considered snags if they are dead or dying and exhibit sufficient decay characteristics to enable cavity excavation/use by wildlife. Priority snags have a diameter at breast height of > 20 in (51 cm) in western Washington and are > 6.5 ft (2 m) in height. Priority logs are > 12 in (30 cm) in diameter at the largest end, and > 20 ft (6 m) long.

Note: All vegetated wetlands are by definition a priority habitat but are not included in this list because they are addressed elsewhere.

















