

PC-1A

GENERAL INFORMATION

Project Name:	Patterson Creek Access Issues - Provide emergency access to residences served by 268th and 264th
Problems Addressed:	Flooding and blockage of emergency access.
Project Description:	Improve 264th and arrange emergency access for residents on 268th over to 264th.
Justification / Benefit:	Resolve public safety concerns tied to flooding. 14 residences on 268 th St.
Comments:	264th hwy and 202 intersection is dangerous and the community has been working hard to get that intersection improved for a long time.
Location:	Intersection of HWY 202 with 264th and 268th.
Estimated Cost:	> \$500K

RECOMMENDATION OVERALL SCORE
MODERATE HIGH

PLANNING LEVEL CRITERIA

Ecological Significance			SCORE: LOW
Ecological Processes/Indicators <small>(Add additional attribute to this list if indices or processes are missing.)</small>	Improve <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be improved.)</small>	Protect <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be protected.)</small>	Scale Reach/Site/Watershed
Hydrology	No change		
Sediment Regime	Minor improvement to sediment transport.		Site
LWD Function	No change, but potential improvement to transport of LWD if it were available at site.		
Channel Function	Minor improvement to the channel by widening the crossing to match the stream width. By widening the width at the site, stream velocities will be reduced at the crossing. Will create a natural velocity profile for the stream.		Site
Floodplain Function	Minor improvement to flood plain function, by widening the stream, which in turn will increase connectivity to flood plain. Creates a continuous floodplain.		Site
Groundwater Recharge	No change		
Water Quality	No change		
Riparian Connectivity	Minor, more areas downstream will be inundated. Minor restoration of native vegetation along the stream.		Site
Fish Migration	Minor, less stranding of fish.		
Anthropogenic Erosion	Minor to No change		
Others:			

Hazards To Life, Limb, And Property					SCORE: MODERATE
Hazard Type <small>(List the hazard type, e.g. flooding, landslide, emergency access)</small>	Safety/Threat <small>(Describe who or what is at risk if no action is taken.)</small>	Urgency <small>(How quickly do we need to respond to this hazard to prevent a problem from growing worse and requiring an increasingly costly solution?) (High, Medium, Low)</small>	Responsibility <small>(Does the problem relate to a County facility that King County has a legal commitment to maintain? Hazards associated with County facilities should be a higher priority than sites where no such commitment exists.)</small>	Frequency <small>(Describe the frequency of the hazard.)</small>	Scale Reach/Site/Watershed
Improving Emergency Access	14 residences will be stranded if an emergency occurs during a flooding event. Will limit emergency response.	Low, the danger is occasional. Danger more likely to occur infrequently.	264th is county road and 268 th is a private road.	264 th one day every few years. 268 th annually.	site

Note: Priorities should be set in the following order: 1. Threats to public health and safety. 2. Damage to public infrastructure and developed public property. 3. Damage to private structures. 4. Damage to significant natural resources

Solution Efficacy -- Part A				
List Recommended Action	Identified Problems <small>(What problems the recommendation should be addressing.)</small>	Does the recommendation address the problem? <small>(Yes or No)</small>	Does the recommendation address the problem source or treat a symptom?	Time frame for problem resolution <small>(e.g. immediate, 1yr, etc.)</small>
improve 264th (raise road and bigger culvert) and arrange emergency access for residents on 268th over to 264th.	Emergency Access	Yes	Symptom	Immediate benefit.

Solution Efficacy-- Part B				SCORE: HIGH
What is the longevity of the recommendation?	Recommendation Readiness <small>(e.g. need further study, ready for feasibility, ready to build. Also, include what else is needed.)</small>	What are the benefits on a Geographic Scale? Site/Reach/Watershed	Cost	
Indefinite.	Need floodplain analysis, biological assessment, need property owner permission, HPA, need extensive permitting and engineering.	Site	> \$500K	

PC-1B

GENERAL INFORMATION

Project Name:	Patterson Creek Access Issues - East Main and NE 4th
Problems Addressed:	Flooding and lack of emergency access
Project Description:	Try to find route to improve emergency egress for residents living on NE 4th and E Main. Improve access along one, by flood-proofing it and attempt to connect emergency egress to the improved road. 21 residences are affected.
Justification / Benefit:	Resolve public safety concerns tied to flooding. 21 residences affected
Comments:	
Location:	E Main ST and NE 4th. On the boarder of Basin 2B and 2C
Estimated Cost:	>\$500K

RECOMMENDATION OVERALL SCORE
MODERATE HIGH

PLANNING LEVEL CRITERIA

Ecological Significance			SCORE: LOW
Ecological Processes/Indicators <small>(Add additional attribute to this list if indices or processes are missing.)</small>	Improve <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be improved.)</small>	Protect <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be protected.)</small>	Scale Reach/Site/Watershed
Hydrology	No change		
Sediment Regime	Minor improvement to sediment transport.		Site
LWD Function	No change, but potential improvement to transport LWD if it were available at site.		
Channel Function	Minor improvement to the channel by widening the crossing to match the stream width. By widening the width at the site, stream velocities will be reduced at the crossing. Will create a natural velocity profile for the stream.		Site
Floodplain Function	Minor improvement to flood plain function, by widening the stream, which in turn will increase connectivity to flood plain. Creates a continuous flood plain.		Site
Groundwater Recharge	No change		
Water Quality	No change		
Riparian Connectivity	Minor, more areas downstream will be inundated. Minor restoration of native vegetation along the stream.		Site
Fish Migration	Minor, less stranding of fish.		
Anthropogenic Erosion	Minor to No change		
Others			

Hazards To Life, Limb, And Property					SCORE: MODERATE
Hazard Type <small>(List the hazard type, e.g. flooding, landslide, emergency access)</small>	Safety/Threat <small>(Describe who or what is at risk if no action is taken.)</small>	Urgency <small>(How quickly do we need to respond to this hazard to prevent a problem from growing worse and requiring an increasingly costly solution?)</small>	Responsibility <small>(Does the problem relate to a County facility that King County has a legal commitment to maintain? Hazards associated with County facilities should be a higher priority than sites where no such commitment exists.)</small>	Frequency <small>(Describe the frequency of the hazard.)</small>	Scale Reach/Site/Watershed
Improving Emergency Access	21 residences will be stranded if an emergency occurs during a flooding event. Will limit emergency response.	Low - Medium, the danger is occasional.	Private Roads?	More frequent than 1A	site

Note: Priorities should be set in the following order: 1. Threats to public health and safety. 2. Damage to public infrastructure and developed public property. 3. Damage to private structures. 4. Damage to significant natural resources

Solution Efficacy -- Part A				
List Recommended Action	Identified Problems <small>(What problems the recommendation should be addressing.)</small>	Does the recommendation address the problem?	Does the recommendation address the problem source or treat a symptom?	Time frame for problem resolution <small>(e.g. immediate, 1yr, etc.)</small>
Try to find route to improve emergency egress for residents living on NE 4th and E Main. Improve access along one, by flood proofing it and attempt to connect emergency egress to the improved road. 21 residences are affected.	Emergency Access	Yes	Symptom	Immediate benefit.

Solution Efficacy-- Part B				SCORE: HIGH
What is the longevity of the recommendation?	Recommendation Readiness <small>(e.g. need further study, ready for feasibility, ready to build. Also, include what else is needed.)</small>	What are the benefits on a Geographic Scale? Site/Reach/Watershed	Cost	
Indefinite.	Need floodplain analysis, biological assessment, need property owner permission, HPA, need extensive permitting and engineering.	Site	> \$500K	

PC-1C

GENERAL INFORMATION

Project Name:	Patterson Creek Access Issues - Condit and Crittenden Access
Problems Addressed:	Flooding and lack of emergency egress
Project Description:	There is an existing road that crosses the Aldarra Golf Course property that is not affected by floods. If access is granted to this road for those residents the emergency egress issue would be resolved.
Justification / Benefit:	Resolve public safety concerns tied to flooding. 4 residences are affected.
Comments:	
Location:	Subbasin 2C
Estimated Cost:	

RECOMMENDATION OVERALL SCORE
MODERATE MODERATE

PLANNING LEVEL CRITERIA

Ecological Significance			SCORE: LOW
Ecological Processes/Indicators <small>(Add additional attribute to this list if indices or processes are missing.)</small>	Improve <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be improved.)</small>	Protect <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be protected.)</small>	Scale Reach/Site/Watershed
Hydrology	No change		
Sediment Regime	No change		
LWD Function	No change		
Channel Function	No change		
Floodplain Function	No change		
Groundwater Recharge	No change		
Water Quality	No change		
Riparian Connectivity	No change		
Fish Migration	No change		
Anthropogenic Erosion	No change		
Others	No change		

Hazards To Life, Limb, And Property					SCORE: MODERATE
Hazard Type <small>(List the hazard type, e.g. flooding, landslide, emergency access)</small>	Safety/Threat <small>(Describe who or what is at risk if no action is taken.)</small>	Urgency <small>(How quickly do we need to respond to this hazard to prevent a problem from growing worse and requiring an increasingly costly solution?)</small>	Responsibility <small>(Does the problem relate to a County facility that King County has a legal commitment to maintain? Hazards associated with County facilities should be a higher priority than sites where no such commitment exists.)</small>	Frequency <small>(Describe the frequency of the hazard.)</small>	Scale Reach/Site/Watershed
Improving Emergency Access	4 residences will be stranded if an emergency occurs during a flooding event. Will limit emergency response.	Low - Medium, the danger is occasional.	Private Roads	More frequent than 1A	site

Note: Priorities should be set in the following order: 1. Threats to public health and safety. 2. Damage to public infrastructure and developed public property. 3. Damage to private structures. 4. Damage to significant natural resources

Solution Efficacy -- Part A				
List Recommended Action	Identified Problems <small>(What problems the recommendation should be addressing.)</small>	Does the recommendation address the problem?	Does the recommendation address the problem source or treat a symptom?	Time frame for problem resolution <small>(e.g. immediate, 1yr, etc.)</small>
There is an existing road that crosses the Aldarra Golf Course property that is not affected by flood. If access is granted to this road for those residents the emergency egress issue would be resolved.	Emergency Access	Yes	Symptom	Immediate benefit.

Solution Efficacy-- Part B				SCORE: HIGH
What is the longevity of the recommendation?	Recommendation Readiness <small>(e.g. need further study, ready for feasibility, ready to build. Also, include what else is needed.)</small>	What are the benefits on a Geographic Scale? Site/Reach/Watershed	Cost	
Indefinite.	Landowner willingness	Site	> \$50K (Potentially a no cost solution to the County.)	

PC-2

GENERAL INFORMATION

Project Name:	Flooding Near Endeavour School and Issaquah Fall City Rd.
Problems Addressed:	Flooding—Ponding on Issaquah Fall City Rd adjacent to Endeavour Elem. School. Ponding is thought to be caused by school's detention pond discharging into wetland between road and school property. Surface water is then trapped within wetland with no outlet. (Source: Citizen questionnaire responses)
Project Description:	1. The detention pond access rd. splits wetland, culvert could be installed under access rd. creating additional storage. 2. Install new culvert crossing underneath Fall City Rd., currently no culvert exists.
Justification / Benefit:	Ponding on roadway is a potential life safety hazard. Ponding occurs on a low spot near a blind corner. Vehicles will drive into the other lane to avoid ponding.
Comments:	It is estimated that roadway overtops when there has been 2-3" of rainfall in 24-hours. Work may have already been done by Steve Foley with King County The area appears to be in the SWM service area, according to our GIS maps. Need to check with Road to see if a design has been completed. (Doug Brown will research.)
Location:	North of Endeavor Elem. on Fall City Rd. (2000 Thomas Bros. Map pg. 598-F4)
Estimated Cost:	\$419,700

RECOMMENDATION OVERALL SCORE
MODERATE MODERATE

PLANNING LEVEL CRITERIA

Ecological Significance			SCORE: LOW
Ecological Processes/Indicators <small>(Add additional attribute to this list if indices or processes are missing.)</small>	Improve <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be improved.)</small>	Protect <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be protected.)</small>	Scale Reach/Site/Watershed
Hydrology	No change		
Sediment Regime	No change		
LWD Function	No change		
Channel Function	No change		
Floodplain Function	No change		
Groundwater Recharge	No change		
Water Quality	No change		
Riparian Connectivity	No change		
Fish Migration	No change		
Anthropogenic Erosion	No change		
Others	No change		

Hazards To Life, Limb, And Property					SCORE: MODERATE
Hazard Type <small>(List the hazard type, e.g. flooding, landslide, emergency access)</small>	Safety/Threat <small>(Describe who or what is at risk if no action is taken.)</small>	Urgency <small>(How quickly do we need to respond to this hazard to prevent a problem from growing worse and requiring an increasingly costly solution?)</small>	Responsibility <small>(Does the problem relate to a County facility that King County has a legal commitment to maintain? Hazards associated with County facilities should be a higher priority than sites where no such commitment exists.)</small>	Frequency <small>(Describe the frequency of the hazard.)</small>	Scale Reach/Site/Watershed
Roadway Flooding	Potential traffic hazard.	Low-Medium, the ponding of water cause traffic hazard.	King County, Roads or joint with RDP	Infrequent, once every couple of years.	Site

Note: Priorities should be set in the following order: 1. Threats to public health and safety. 2. Damage to public infrastructure and developed public property. 3. Damage to private structures. 4. Damage to significant natural resources

Solution Efficacy -- Part A				
List Recommended Action	Identified Problems <small>(What problems the recommendation should be addressing.)</small>	Does the recommendation address the problem?	Does the recommendation address the problem source or treat a symptom?	Time frame for problem resolution <small>(e.g. immediate, 1yr, etc.)</small>
1. The detention pond access rd. splits wetland, culvert could be installed under access rd. creating additional storage. 2. Install new culvert crossing underneath Fall City Rd., currently no culvert exists.	Traffic Hazard	Yes. Further investigation is needed.	Symptom	Immediate

Solution Efficacy-- Part B				SCORE: MODERATE
What is the longevity of the recommendation?	Recommendation Readiness <small>(e.g. need further study, ready for feasibility, ready to build. Also, include what else is needed.)</small>	What are the benefits on a Geographic Scale? Site/Reach/Watershed	Cost	
Indefinite	Needs permitting, engineering, and further study.	Site.	\$419,700	

PC-3

GENERAL INFORMATION

Project Name:	Hirsovescu / Dry Creek Fish Passage
Problems Addressed:	Habitat/Erosion—Near the confluence of Dry Creek and Patterson Creek, along the entire reach along this property (about 300'), Dry Creek has been armored by rock and mortar with log weirs. Several of these weirs have blown out and created fish passage problems. Additionally, there is a 100' diameter pond in line with Dry Creek on the property that has been collecting sediment. (Source: County Drainage Complaint Log)
Project Description:	1. Construct low and high flow channels for length of property. 2. New bed controls should be placed and pond outlet weir should be replaced. 3. Bank Armoring should be removed and riparian area should be densely planted.
Justification / Benefit:	In addition to eliminating sedimentation concerns, this could provide the County. an opportunity to enhance fish habitat within this corridor.
Comments:	Laird O'Rowlins with SWEES and Ron Whitney with WDFW have been working with the property owner to correct this problem No land owner willingness.
Location:	25455 Redmond Fall City Rd. (2000 Thomas Bros. Map pg. 568-E3)
Estimated Cost:	\$188,000

RECOMMENDATION OVERALL SCORE
HIGH LOW

PLANNING LEVEL CRITERIA

Ecological Significance			SCORE: HIGH
Ecological Processes/Indicators <small>(Add additional attribute to this list if indices or processes are missing.)</small>	Improve <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be improved.)</small>	Protect <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be protected.)</small>	Scale <small>Reach/Site/Watershed</small>
Hydrology			
Sediment Regime			
LWD Function			
Channel Function			
Floodplain Function			
Groundwater Recharge			
Water Quality			
Riparian Connectivity			
Fish Migration			
Anthropogenic Erosion			
Others			

Hazards To Life, Limb, And Property					SCORE: LOW
Hazard Type <small>(List the hazard type, e.g. flooding, landslide, emergency access)</small>	Safety/Threat <small>(Describe who or what is at risk if no action is taken.)</small>	Urgency <small>(How quickly do we need to respond to this hazard to prevent a problem from growing worse and requiring an increasingly costly solution?)</small>	Responsibility <small>(Does the problem relate to a County facility that King County has a legal commitment to maintain? Hazards associated with County facilities should be a higher priority than sites where no such commitment exists.)</small>	Frequency <small>(Describe the frequency of the hazard.)</small>	Scale <small>Reach/Site/Watershed</small>

Note: Priorities should be set in the following order: 1. Threats to public health and safety. 2. Damage to public infrastructure and developed public property. 3. Damage to private structures. 4. Damage to significant natural resources

Solution Efficacy -- Part A				
List Recommended Action	Identified Problems <small>(What problems the recommendation should be addressing.)</small>	Does the recommendation address the problem?	Does the recommendation address the problem source or treat a symptom?	Time frame for problem resolution <small>(e.g. immediate, 1yr, etc.)</small>
1. Construct low and high flow channels for length of property. 2. New bed controls should be placed and pond outlet weir should be replaced. 3. Bank Armoring should be removed and riparian area should be densely planted.				

Solution Efficacy-- Part B				SCORE: MODERATE
What is the longevity of the recommendation?	Recommendation Readiness <small>(e.g. need further study, ready for feasibility, ready to build. Also, include what else is needed.)</small>	What are the benefits on a Geographic Scale? <small>Site/Reach/Watershed</small>	Cost	
			\$188,000	

PC-4

GENERAL INFORMATION

Project Name:	Pond Berm on Canyon Creek Tributary
Problems Addressed:	Habitat/Flooding/Erosion—15' high illegally installed earthen berm is blocking fish passage and is in potential danger of failing due to sheet flow over the top during high flows weakening the structure. (Source: County Drainage Complaint Log, Complaint No. 17S)
Project Description:	Remove earthen dam
Justification / Benefit:	dam failure would cause severe damage to Canyon Creek
Comments:	Pond is located on private property.
Location:	28305 Issaquah Fall City Rd. (2000 Thomas Bros. Map pg. 598-H4)
Estimated Cost:	\$379,700

RECOMMENDATION OVERALL SCORE
HIGH MODERATE

PLANNING LEVEL CRITERIA

Ecological Significance			SCORE: HIGH/MODERATE
Ecological Processes/Indicators <small>(Add additional attribute to this list if indices or processes are missing.)</small>	Improve <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be improved.)</small>	Protect <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be protected.)</small>	Scale Reach/Site/Watershed
Hydrology	NC		
Sediment Regime	Significant restoration of sediment transport processes. Sediment regime has been completely disrupted by dam		Reach
LWD Function	Significant restoration of LWD delivery/transport potential		Reach
Channel Function	Restoration of 100 feet of channel and restoration of continuity of channel morphology and hydraulics		Site-Reach
Floodplain Function	Minor, the existing condition probably increases floodplain area over natural conditions. However, the existing condition could lead to a dam failure		Site-Reach
Groundwater Recharge	NC		
Water Quality	Potential temperature improvement if pond is eliminated		Site-Reach
Riparian Connectivity	Minor, site scale improvement with planting		Site
Fish Migration	Should restore access to ½ mile or more of fish habitat		Reach
Anthropogenic Erosion	Dam failure would cause severe erosion/scour		Reach
Others			

Hazards To Life, Limb, And Property

SCORE: MODERATE

Hazard Type <small>(List the hazard type, e.g. flooding, landslide, emergency access)</small>	Safety/Threat <small>(Describe who or what is at risk if no action is taken.)</small>	Urgency <small>(How quickly do we need to respond to this hazard to prevent a problem from growing worse and requiring an increasingly costly solution?)</small>	Responsibility <small>(Does the problem relate to a County facility that King County has a legal commitment to maintain? Hazards associated with County facilities should be a higher priority than sites where no such commitment exists.)</small>	Frequency <small>(Describe the frequency of the hazard.)</small>	Scale Reach/Site/Watershed
Dam failure	Stream habitat, perhaps roads	Dam is in bad condition and deteriorating	Property owner		Reach

Note: Priorities should be set in the following order: 1. Threats to public health and safety. 2. Damage to public infrastructure and developed public property. 3. Damage to private structures. 4. Damage to significant natural resources

Solution Efficacy -- Part A

List Recommended Action	Identified Problems <small>(What problems the recommendation should be addressing.)</small>	Does the recommendation address the problem?	Does the recommendation address the problem source or treat a symptom?	Time frame for problem resolution <small>(e.g. immediate, 1yr, etc.)</small>
Remove earthen dam				
Remove dam	Unsafe dam, fish passage barrier	Yes	Source	immediate

Solution Efficacy-- Part B

SCORE: HIGH

What is the longevity of the recommendation?	Recommendation Readiness <small>(e.g. need further study, ready for feasibility, ready to build. Also, include what else is needed.)</small>	What are the benefits on a Geographic Scale? Site/Reach/Watershed	Cost
Permanent	Landowner willingness is an issue	Reach	\$379,700

PC-5

GENERAL INFORMATION

Project Name:	NE 52nd Street Culvert
Problems Addressed:	Habitat—Patterson Creek flows through an undersized 3' diameter perched culvert passing underneath NE 52nd Pl. (Source: County Drainage Complaint Log, Complaint No. 29S)
Project Description:	The existing culvert could be replaced with a box culvert to allow salmonids access to good habitat further upstream. This will also allow high flows not to overtop road and to allow debris pass. Appropriate culvert sizing and design of slope will be determined during King County project design.
Justification / Benefit:	Allowing juvenile and adult fish access further upstream on Patterson Creek accessing a greater area for habitat.
Comments:	Owner has recently expressed willingness to King County to correct problem.
Location:	Intersection of NE 52nd Street and Patterson Creek (2000 Thomas Bros. Map pg. 538-D7)
Estimated Cost:	\$495,400

RECOMMENDATION OVERALL SCORE
HIGH HIGH

PLANNING LEVEL CRITERIA

Ecological Significance			SCORE: HIGH
Ecological Processes/Indicators <small>(Add additional attribute to this list if indices or processes are missing.)</small>	Improve <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be improved.)</small>	Protect <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be protected.)</small>	Scale Reach/Site/Watershed
Hydrology	No change		
Sediment Regime	Significant, restores sediment transport.		Reach
LWD Function	Significant to moderate potential for recruitment and transport of woody debris in the area.		Reach
Channel Function	Significant, restoration of natural channel functions. Geomorphic integrity will be restored.		Site
Floodplain Function	Minor improvement to flood plain function and floodplain connectivity.		Site
Groundwater Recharge	No change		
Water Quality	Reduce erosion and scour at base of culvert.		Reach
Riparian Connectivity	No change		Site
Fish Migration	Significant restores approximately 1 mile to 1.5 miles of fish habitat.		Reach
Anthropogenic Erosion	See water quality		
Others: reintroduces nutrient to upstream areas.	Increases biomass upstream.		Reach

Hazards To Life, Limb, And Property					SCORE: MODERATE
Hazard Type <small>(List the hazard type, e.g. flooding, landslide, emergency access)</small>	Safety/Threat <small>(Describe who or what is at risk if no action is taken.)</small>	Urgency <small>(How quickly do we need to respond to this hazard to prevent a problem from growing worse and requiring an increasingly costly solution?)</small>	Responsibility <small>(Does the problem relate to a County facility that King County has a legal commitment to maintain? Hazards associated with County facilities should be a higher priority than sites where no such commitment exists.)</small>	Frequency <small>(Describe the frequency of the hazard.)</small>	Scale Reach/Site/Watershed
Potential failure of road prism.	NE 52 nd Place, debris dam failure. Potential for residence stranding.	Low probability. Complete blockage of culvert could induce road failure.	Private Road	Once a decade.	Site

Note: Priorities should be set in the following order: 1. Threats to public health and safety. 2. Damage to public infrastructure and developed public property. 3. Damage to private structures. 4. Damage to significant natural resources

Solution Efficacy -- Part A				
List Recommended Action	Identified Problems <small>(What problems the recommendation should be addressing.)</small>	Does the recommendation address the problem?	Does the recommendation address the problem source or treat a symptom?	Time frame for problem resolution <small>(e.g. immediate, 1yr, etc.)</small>
The existing culvert could be replaced with a box culvert to allow salmonids access to good habitat further upstream. This will also allow high flows not to overtop road and to allow debris pass.	Fish passage, stream function, potential road failure.	Yes	Source	Immediate for road failure and fish passage.

Solution Efficacy-- Part B				SCORE: HIGH
What is the longevity of the recommendation?	Recommendation Readiness <small>(e.g. need further study, ready for feasibility, ready to build. Also, include what else is needed.)</small>	What are the benefits on a Geographic Scale? Site/Reach/Watershed	Cost	
Indefinite	Needs Engineering, Permits, Easements	Site and Reach	\$495,400	

PC-6

GENERAL INFORMATION

Project Name:	SE 40th Street Culvert
Problems Addressed:	Fish passage barrier/Habitat—Patterson Creek flows through 5 stacked culverts (3 on top of 2).
Project Description:	The existing culverts should be replaced with a box culvert to allow salmonids access to good habitat further upstream and to restore continuity to stream processes and functions. This will also allow high flows not to overtop road and to allow debris to pass. Appropriate culvert sizing and design of slope will be determined during King County project design.
Justification / Benefit:	Allowing juvenile and adult fish access further upstream on Patterson Creek accessing a greater area for habitat.
Comments:	This barrier is the lowest in the extensive Mitchell Hill system
Location:	Intersection of SE 40th Street and Patterson Creek (2000 Thomas Bros. Map pg. 599-C4 or D4)
Estimated Cost:	\$150,000

RECOMMENDATION OVERALL SCORE
HIGH HIGH

PLANNING LEVEL CRITERIA

Ecological Significance			SCORE: HIGH
Ecological Processes/Indicators <small>(Add additional attribute to this list if indices or processes are missing.)</small>	Improve <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be improved.)</small>	Protect <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be protected.)</small>	Scale Reach/Site/Watershed
Hydrology	NC		
Sediment Regime	Significant, restores sediment transport.		Reach
LWD Function	Significant to moderate potential for recruitment and transport of woody debris in the area.		Reach
Channel Function	Significant, restoration of natural channel functions. Geomorphic integrity will be restored.		Site
Floodplain Function	Minor improvement to flood plain function and floodplain connectivity.		Site
Groundwater Recharge	NC		
Water Quality	Reduce erosion and scour at base of culvert.		Reach
Riparian Connectivity	NC		Site
Fish Migration	Significant restores approximately 6 miles of fish habitat.		Reach
Anthropogenic Erosion	See water quality		
Others: reintroduces nutrient to upstream areas.	Increases biomass upstream.		Reach

Hazards To Life, Limb, And Property

SCORE: MODERATE/LOW

Hazard Type <small>(List the hazard type, e.g. flooding, landslide, emergency access)</small>	Safety/Threat <small>(Describe who or what is at risk if no action is taken.)</small>	Urgency <small>(How quickly do we need to respond to this hazard to prevent a problem from growing worse and requiring an increasingly costly solution?)</small>	Responsibility <small>(Does the problem relate to a County facility that King County has a legal commitment to maintain? Hazards associated with County facilities should be a higher priority than sites where no such commitment exists.)</small>	Frequency <small>(Describe the frequency of the hazard.)</small>	Scale Reach/Site/Watershed
Potential failure of road prism.	SE 40 th Street, debris dam failure. Potential for residence stranding.	Low probability. Complete blockage of culvert could induce road failure.	Private Road	Once a decade.	Site

Note: Priorities should be set in the following order: 1. Threats to public health and safety. 2. Damage to public infrastructure and developed public property. 3. Damage to private structures. 4. Damage to significant natural resources

Solution Efficacy -- Part A

List Recommended Action	Identified Problems <small>(What problems the recommendation should be addressing.)</small>	Does the recommendation address the problem?	Does the recommendation address the problem source or treat a symptom?	Time frame for problem resolution <small>(e.g. immediate, 1yr, etc.)</small>
The existing culvert could be replaced with a box culvert	Fish passage, steam function, potential road failure.	Yes	Source	Immediate for road failure and fish passage.

Solution Efficacy-- Part B

SCORE: HIGH

What is the longevity of the recommendation?	Recommendation Readiness <small>(e.g. need further study, ready for feasibility, ready to build. Also, include what else is needed.)</small>	What are the benefits on a Geographic Scale? Site/Reach/Watershed	Cost
Indefinite	Needs Engineering, Permits, Easements	Site and Reach	\$150,000

PC-7

GENERAL INFORMATION

Project Name:	Remove Access road (NE 36th Place) and culvert
Problems Addressed:	A dead end road has been constructed to potentially serve a housing development if WA DNR land were to be sold to a private party. There is a 60" diameter long culvert that conveys Dry Creek. This tributary contains fish. Remove access road and culvert completely. (refer to detailed write up.) Reestablishing fish habitat in the footprint of the culvert.
Project Description:	Remove access road and culvert (correct this in the table Nathan)
Justification / Benefit:	Restoring stream habitat and improving fish passage
Comments:	
Location:	NE 36th Place (2000 Thomas Bros. Map pg. 568-F1)
Estimated Cost:	

RECOMMENDATION OVERALL SCORE
HIGH LOW

PLANNING LEVEL CRITERIA

Ecological Significance			SCORE: MODERATE
Ecological Processes/Indicators <small>(Add additional attribute to this list if indices or processes are missing.)</small>	Improve <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be improved.)</small>	Protect <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be protected.)</small>	Scale Reach/Site/Watershed
Hydrology	No change		
Sediment Regime	Will restore natural sediment transport and recruitment processes.		Site-Reach
LWD Function	Will restore LWD transport and recruitment processes.		Site-Reach
Channel Function	Significant, will restore 150 feet to a natural channel function.		Site-Reach
Floodplain Function	Restore and reconnect 100 feet of natural floodplain area.		Site-Reach
Groundwater Recharge	No change		
Water Quality	Minor improvement in turbidity.		Reach
Riparian Connectivity	Significant, will restore ¾ acres of forest.		Site
Fish Migration	Significant, will improve migration for several life stages of salmonids. (Dry Creek)		Reach
Anthropogenic Erosion			
Others			

Hazards To Life, Limb, And Property					SCORE: LOW
Hazard Type <small>(List the hazard type, e.g. flooding, landslide, emergency access)</small>	Safety/Threat <small>(Describe who or what is at risk if no action is taken.)</small>	Urgency <small>(How quickly do we need to respond to this hazard to prevent a problem from growing worse and requiring an increasingly costly solution?)</small>	Responsibility <small>(Does the problem relate to a County facility that King County has a legal commitment to maintain? Hazards associated with County facilities should be a higher priority than sites where no such commitment exists.)</small>	Frequency <small>(Describe the frequency of the hazard.)</small>	Scale Reach/Site/Watershed
None					

Note: Priorities should be set in the following order: 1. Threats to public health and safety. 2. Damage to public infrastructure and developed public property. 3. Damage to private structures. 4. Damage to significant natural resources

Solution Efficacy -- Part A				
List Recommended Action	Identified Problems <small>(What problems the recommendation should be addressing.)</small>	Does the recommendation address the problem?	Does the recommendation address the problem source or treat a symptom?	Time frame for problem resolution <small>(e.g. immediate, 1yr, etc.)</small>
Remove road and culvert.	Loss of stream habitat.	yes	Source	Immediate to long term

Solution Efficacy-- Part B				SCORE: HIGH
What is the longevity of the recommendation?	Recommendation Readiness <small>(e.g. need further study, ready for feasibility, ready to build. Also, include what else is needed.)</small>	What are the benefits on a Geographic Scale? Site/Reach/Watershed	Cost	
permanent	Design, permitting, landowner willingness	Site-Reach	>\$600K	

PC-8

GENERAL INFORMATION

Project Name:	Erosion Along Dry Cr. and Ames Lake Rd.
Problems Addressed:	Erosion—Ames Lake Road and a steep slope pinch Dry creek. The creek has begun to undercut the steep slopes causing them to fail sending sediment into Patterson Creek. This undercutting also has a potential of under cutting Ames Lake Road causing it to fail. Additionally excessive seepage and erosion on a steep slope below an existing R/D pond has been reported. (Source: County Drainage Complaint Log)
Project Description:	1. Stabilize banks for approx 2500 ft. 2. Line detention pond with impermeable layer
Justification / Benefit:	Eliminate slope failure along Dry Creek.
Comments:	Not a lot of room for habitat mitigation, although stabilization of steep slopes will protect the <u>downstream habitat from being damaged. This problem has been ongoing for years.</u>
Location:	5507 258th Avenue NE Redmond (2000 Thomas Bros. Map pg. 538-E6)
Estimated Cost:	>\$600,000

RECOMMENDATION OVERALL SCORE
MODERATE HIGH

PLANNING LEVEL CRITERIA

Ecological Significance			SCORE: MODERATE/LOW
Ecological Processes/Indicators <small>(Add additional attribute to this list if indices or processes are missing.)</small>	Improve <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be improved.)</small>	Protect <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be protected.)</small>	Scale Reach/Site/Watershed
Hydrology	No change		
Sediment Regime	Moderate; Should reduce fine and coarse sediment delivery to stream.		Reach
LWD Function	Minor; decrease contribution of woody debris contribution from this reach.		Site
Channel Function	Moderate; Potentially reduce habitat functions of channel due to bank hardening (depending on design).		Site
Floodplain Function	Minor decrease in floodplain function; lack of floodplain function is the source of problem.		Reach
Groundwater Recharge	No change		
Water Quality	Moderate; Will reduce turbidity.		Reach
Riparian Connectivity	No change		
Fish Migration	No change		
Anthropogenic Erosion	Significant; Erosion will be reduced		Site/Reach
Others			

Hazards To Life, Limb, And Property					SCORE: MODERATE
Hazard Type <small>(List the hazard type, e.g. flooding, landslide, emergency access)</small>	Safety/Threat <small>(Describe who or what is at risk if no action is taken.)</small>	Urgency <small>(How quickly do we need to respond to this hazard to prevent a problem from growing worse and requiring an increasingly costly solution?)</small>	Responsibility <small>(Does the problem relate to a County facility that King County has a legal commitment to maintain? Hazards associated with County facilities should be a higher priority than sites where no such commitment exists.)</small>	Frequency <small>(Describe the frequency of the hazard.)</small>	Scale Reach/Site/Watershed
Potential road failure hazard.	Failure of road. Ames Lake Road, is a high volume rural road.	It's been an issue for decades and no catastrophic failure has resulted. Therefore, the urgency is questionable.	It is a King County Road. Potentially a collaborative project with Roads and DNRP.	Continual gradual erosion occurring at site. Potential exacerbation of erosion effect could occur during high volume events.	Reach.

Note: Priorities should be set in the following order: 1. Threats to public health and safety. 2. Damage to public infrastructure and developed public property. 3. Damage to private structures. 4. Damage to significant natural resources

Solution Efficacy -- Part A				
List Recommended Action	Identified Problems <small>(What problems the recommendation should be addressing.)</small>	Does the recommendation address the problem?	Does the recommendation address the problem source or treat a symptom?	Time frame for problem resolution (e.g. immediate, 1yr, etc.)
1. Stabilize banks. 2. If necessary, line detention pond with impermeable layer	Slope failures near Ames Lake Road and within associated canyon feature.	Stabilizing the banks would address the slope failures. But would result in impacts to other natural stream functions. It's questionable whether the detention ponds are contributing to the erosion problem.	Symptom	Bank stabilization would be immediate. Pond lining is unknown. There could be immediate negative consequences caused by the bank stabilization (loss of channel functions).

Solution Efficacy-- Part B				SCORE: MODERATE
What is the longevity of the recommendation?	Recommendation Readiness <small>(e.g. need further study, ready for feasibility, ready to build. Also, include what else is needed.)</small>	What are the benefits on a Geographic Scale? Site/Reach/Watershed	Cost	
indefinite	Need design, permitting, engineering.	reach	>\$600K	

PC-9

GENERAL INFORMATION

Project Name:	Patterson Creek at SR 202
Problems Addressed:	Habitat/Flooding—A 4' X 4' box culvert under SR 202 is seriously undersized. As a result water pools upstream and drops gravel and sediment out of the water column. In large events, water flows over the road (Source: County Drainage Complaint Log, Complaint No. 22S)
Project Description:	Replace box culvert with larger box culvert
Justification / Benefit:	eliminate sedimentation and reduce flooding in area
Comments:	Does not appear to be a fish barrier. Houses downstream may be flooded if culvert upsized. Refer to WSDOT. Encourage the State to take action.
Location:	Patterson Creek at SR202 (2000 Thomas Bros. Map pg. 568-D2 & E2)
Estimated Cost:	\$177,000

RECOMMENDATION OVERALL SCORE
HIGH LOW

PLANNING LEVEL CRITERIA

Ecological Significance			SCORE: MODERATE
Ecological Processes/Indicators <small>(Add additional attribute to this list if indices or processes are missing.)</small>	Improve <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be improved.)</small>	Protect <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be protected.)</small>	Scale Reach/Site/Watershed
Hydrology	No change		
Sediment Regime	Significant restoration of sediment transport.		Reach
LWD Function	Significant to moderate potential for recruitment and transport of LWD.		Reach
Channel Function	Significant, restoration of natural channel functions. Geomorphic integrity will be restored.		Site
Floodplain Function	Minor improvement to floodplain function and floodplain connectivity.		Site
Groundwater Recharge	No change		
Water Quality	Minor reduction of erosion.		Reach
Riparian Connectivity	No change		Site
Fish Migration	No change-minor at high velocities.		Reach
Anthropogenic Erosion	See water quality		
Others:			

Hazards To Life, Limb, And Property					SCORE: MODERATE
Hazard Type <small>(List the hazard type, e.g. flooding, landslide, emergency access)</small>	Safety/Threat <small>(Describe who or what is at risk if no action is taken.)</small>	Urgency <small>(How quickly do we need to respond to this hazard to prevent a problem from growing worse and requiring an increasingly costly solution?)</small>	Responsibility <small>(Does the problem relate to a County facility that King County has a legal commitment to maintain? Hazards associated with County facilities should be a higher priority than sites where no such commitment exists.)</small>	Frequency <small>(Describe the frequency of the hazard.)</small>	Scale Reach/Site/Watershed
Road flooding	High speed, high volume State HWY	Moderate due high severity of risk and low frequency	WA State (potential collaboration with County for habitat issues.)	Once every 5 years.	Site

Note: Priorities should be set in the following order: 1. Threats to public health and safety. 2. Damage to public infrastructure and developed public property. 3. Damage to private structures. 4. Damage to significant natural resources

Solution Efficacy -- Part A				
List Recommended Action	Identified Problems <small>(What problems the recommendation should be addressing.)</small>	Does the recommendation address the problem?	Does the recommendation address the problem source or treat a symptom?	Time frame for problem resolution <small>(e.g. immediate, 1yr, etc.)</small>
Replace box culvert with larger box culvert	Road flooding and discontinuity of stream processes and features.	Yes	Source	Immediate

Solution Efficacy-- Part B				SCORE: HIGH
What is the longevity of the recommendation?	Recommendation Readiness <small>(e.g. need further study, ready for feasibility, ready to build. Also, include what else is needed.)</small>	What are the benefits on a Geographic Scale? Site/Reach/Watershed	Cost	
Indefinite	Needs engineering and permitting. May also need coordination with downstream landowners who may be impacted by the installation of a larger culvert. Needs coordination with State DOT	Site	\$177K	

PC-10

GENERAL INFORMATION

Project Name:	NE 67th Place Culvert
Problems Addressed:	Habitat/Flooding—NE 67th Place culvert on Patterson Creek is undersized and filled with debris. The debris limits fish passage. (Source: Habitat Assessment)
Project Description:	Replace the culvert.
Justification / Benefit:	Improve fish access to habitat and alleviate flooding.
Comments:	Residents indicated that the beaver dam upstream frequently breaks, causing flooding in this reach. No emergency access problems. There is a downstream barrier that needs to be addressed. See PC-5.
Location:	NE 67th Place, culvert on Patterson Creek (2000 Thomas Bros. Map pg. 538-D5)
Estimated Cost:	<\$100,000

RECOMMENDATION OVERALL SCORE
HIGH LOW

PLANNING LEVEL CRITERIA

Ecological Significance			SCORE: HIGH/MODERATE
Ecological Processes/Indicators <small>(Add additional attribute to this list if indices or processes are missing.)</small>	Improve <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be improved.)</small>	Protect <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be protected.)</small>	Scale Reach/Site/Watershed
Hydrology	No change		
Sediment Regime	Significant, restores sediment transport.		Reach
LWD Function	Significant to moderate potential for recruitment and transport of woody debris in the area.		Reach
Channel Function	Significant, restoration of natural channel functions. Geomorphic integrity will be restored.		Site
Floodplain Function	Minor improvement to floodplain function and floodplain connectivity.		Site
Groundwater Recharge	No change		
Water Quality	Reduce erosion resulting from flooding across dirt road.		Reach
Riparian Connectivity	No change		Site
Fish Migration	Restores approximately 1/2 mile of fish habitat. This project should be sequenced after PC5.		Reach
Anthropogenic Erosion	See water quality		
Others: reintroduces nutrient to upstream areas.	Moderate, Increases biomass upstream.		Reach

Hazards To Life, Limb, And Property

SCORE: MODERATE

Hazard Type <small>(List the hazard type, e.g. flooding, landslide, emergency access)</small>	Safety/Threat <small>(Describe who or what is at risk if no action is taken.)</small>	Urgency <small>(How quickly do we need to respond to this hazard to prevent a problem from growing worse and requiring an increasingly costly solution?)</small>	Responsibility <small>(Does the problem relate to a County facility that King County has a legal commitment to maintain? Hazards associated with County facilities should be a higher priority than sites where no such commitment exists.)</small>	Frequency <small>(Describe the frequency of the hazard.)</small>	Scale Reach/Site/Watershed
Flooding of an access road.	Not a sole access route. Flooding of neighboring property occurs when stream flows over street.	nuisance flooding	King County Road, may be opportunity for joint project because ecological significant benefits.	Annual to biannual.	Site

Note: Priorities should be set in the following order: 1. Threats to public health and safety. 2. Damage to public infrastructure and developed public property. 3. Damage to private structures. 4. Damage to significant natural resources

Solution Efficacy -- Part A

List Recommended Action	Identified Problems <small>(What problems the recommendation should be addressing.)</small>	Does the recommendation address the problem?	Does the recommendation address the problem source or treat a symptom?	Time frame for problem resolution <small>(e.g. immediate, 1yr, etc.)</small>
Replace the culvert.	Alleviates fish passage barrier and road flooding, improves water quality.	Yes	Source	Immediate for all identified problems.

Solution Efficacy-- Part B

SCORE: HIGH

What is the longevity of the recommendation?	Recommendation Readiness <small>(e.g. need further study, ready for feasibility, ready to build. Also, include what else is needed.)</small>	What are the benefits on a Geographic Scale? Site/Reach/Watershed	Cost
Indefinite	Needs engineering and permitting; coordinate with KC Roads	Site-Reach	<\$100K

PC-11

GENERAL INFORMATION

Project Name:	Restoration of Tributary to Canyon Creek
Problems Addressed:	Habitat—Degradation and channelization of the right bank tributary to Canyon Creek at Issaquah-Fall City Road. (Source: Habitat Assessment)
Project Description:	Re-alignment of the stream channel; restoration of streambanks and riparian habitat.
Justification / Benefit:	Improve stream habitat conditions and reduce erosion.
Comments:	None
Location:	Issaquah-Fall City Road, approx. 0.1 miles east of 274th Ave. SE (2000 Thomas Bros. Map pg. 598-G4)
Estimated Cost:	> \$275K

RECOMMENDATION OVERALL SCORE
MODERATE LOW

PLANNING LEVEL CRITERIA

Ecological Significance			SCORE: MODERATE
Ecological Processes/Indicators <small>(Add additional attribute to this list if indices or processes are missing.)</small>	Improve <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be improved.)</small>	Protect <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be protected.)</small>	Scale Reach/Site/Watershed
Hydrology	No change		
Sediment Regime	Moderate, will reduce bank erosion and reduce turbidity.		Site-Reach
LWD Function	If re-alignment occurs then there will be a greater potential for natural rates of LWD recruitment and retention to occur.		Site
Channel Function	Will improve significantly, by functioning more naturally, and will also introduce habitat complexity.		Site-Reach
Floodplain Function	The road encroaches on to the stream's natural floodplain. The extent of the restored floodplain function depends on the ultimate design of the project. Indefinite benefit.		Site-Reach
Groundwater Recharge	No change		
Water Quality	Should reduce turbidity and may reduce other contaminants introduced by the road.		Site-Reach
Riparian Connectivity	Would improve only to the extent that the stream is moved away from the road – and a continuous corridor of native plants can be established.		Site-Reach
Fish Migration	No change		
Anthropogenic Erosion	Should reduce turbidity and erosion caused by the confinement of the stream.		Site
Others			

Hazards To Life, Limb, And Property					SCORE: LOW
Hazard Type <small>(List the hazard type, e.g. flooding, landslide, emergency access)</small>	Safety/Threat <small>(Describe who or what is at risk if no action is taken.)</small>	Urgency <small>(How quickly do we need to respond to this hazard to prevent a problem from growing worse and requiring an increasingly costly solution?)</small>	Responsibility <small>(Does the problem relate to a County facility that King County has a legal commitment to maintain? Hazards associated with County facilities should be a higher priority than sites where no such commitment exists.)</small>	Frequency <small>(Describe the frequency of the hazard.)</small>	Scale Reach/Site/Watershed
None					

Note: Priorities should be set in the following order: 1. Threats to public health and safety. 2. Damage to public infrastructure and developed public property. 3. Damage to private structures. 4. Damage to significant natural resources

Solution Efficacy -- Part A				
List Recommended Action	Identified Problems <small>(What problems the recommendation should be addressing.)</small>	Does the recommendation address the problem?	Does the recommendation address the problem source or treat a symptom?	Time frame for problem resolution <small>(e.g. immediate, 1yr, etc.)</small>
Re-alignment of the stream channel; restoration of streambanks and riparian habitat.	Encroachment of road on stream habitat.	Yes – to the extent we have the room to relocate the stream.	Symptom – because the road is the issue, by encroaching on the stream.	Immediate

Solution Efficacy-- Part B				SCORE: MODERATE
What is the longevity of the recommendation?	Recommendation Readiness <small>(e.g. need further study, ready for feasibility, ready to build. Also, include what else is needed.)</small>	What are the benefits on a Geographic Scale? Site/Reach/Watershed	Cost	
Indefinite	Engineering, Design, Permitting	Site	> \$275K	

PC-12A

GENERAL INFORMATION

Project Name:	Riparian corridor restoration on King County owned Novack property
Problems Addressed:	Riparian corridor restoration on King County owned Novack property. 232506-9017
Project Description:	Restoration: removal of invasive and replanting. 20 acres. 1100 feet of stream both sides (an additional 800 ft right bank only?)
Justification / Benefit:	Improve riparian habitat conditions
Comments:	Potential assistance from SHRP program
Location:	232506-9017
Estimated Cost:	<\$100,000

RECOMMENDATION OVERALL SCORE
HIGH HIGH

PLANNING LEVEL CRITERIA

Ecological Significance			SCORE: HIGH
Ecological Processes/Indicators <small>(Add additional attribute to this list if indices or processes are missing.)</small>	Improve <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be improved.)</small>	Protect <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be protected.)</small>	Scale Reach/Site/Watershed
Hydrology	Moderate – Low; benefit based on reforestation.		Site
Sediment Regime	No change due existence of reed canary grass.	Moderate protection	Site-Reach
LWD Function	Will improve recruitment once plants mature.		Site-Reach
Channel Function	Will improve significantly after planting matures and reed canary grass recedes.		Site-Reach
Floodplain Function	No change to low benefit		Site-Reach
Groundwater Recharge	No change		
Water Quality	No change		
Riparian Connectivity	Will improve significantly, due to planting of native species.		Site-Reach
Fish Migration	Will improve after the planting matures and shades reed canary grass. Channel will become more distinct and navigable for fish. Stranding risk to fish will be eliminated.		Site-Reach
Anthropogenic Erosion	No change		
Others			

Hazards To Life, Limb, And Property

Hazards To Life, Limb, And Property				SCORE: LOW	
Hazard Type <small>(List the hazard type, e.g. flooding, landslide, emergency access)</small>	Safety/Threat <small>(Describe who or what is at risk if no action is taken.)</small>	Urgency <small>(How quickly do we need to respond to this hazard to prevent a problem from growing worse and requiring an increasingly costly solution?)</small>	Responsibility <small>(Does the problem relate to a County facility that King County has a legal commitment to maintain? Hazards associated with County facilities should be a higher priority than sites where no such commitment exists.)</small>	Frequency <small>(Describe the frequency of the hazard.)</small>	Scale Reach/Site/Watershed
None					

Note: Priorities should be set in the following order: 1. Threats to public health and safety. 2. Damage to public infrastructure and developed public property. 3. Damage to private structures. 4. Damage to significant natural resources

Solution Efficacy -- Part A

List Recommended Action	Identified Problems <small>(What problems the recommendation should be addressing.)</small>	Does the recommendation address the problem?	Does the recommendation address the problem source or treat a symptom?	Time frame for problem resolution <small>(e.g. immediate, 1yr, etc.)</small>
Restoration: removal of invasive and successional replanting. 20 acres. 1100 feet of stream both sides (an additional 800 ft right bank only?)	Riparian restoration (This is a key finding and recommendation of the RRR report.)	Yes	Source	10 years of more, due to rate of vegetation growth.

Solution Efficacy-- Part B

Solution Efficacy-- Part B			SCORE: HIGH
What is the longevity of the recommendation?	Recommendation Readiness <small>(e.g. need further study, ready for feasibility, ready to build. Also, include what else is needed.)</small>	What are the benefits on a Geographic Scale? Site/Reach/Watershed	Cost
Permanent (County owned property)	Needs design and permitting	Site-Reach (1100 feet of stream; near upstream extent of reed canary grass dominance.)	<\$100K

PC-12B

GENERAL INFORMATION

Project Name:	Riparian corridor restoration on County Owned Isaacson property
Problems Addressed:	Riparian corridor restoration on King County owned Issacson property.
Project Description:	Restoration: removal of invasive plants and replanting. 100 acres and at least 3000 ft of stream bank.
Justification / Benefit:	Improve riparian habitat conditions 3400 ft. of stream corridor
Comments:	Potential assistance from SHRP program
Location:	252506-9006, 9011, 9015, 9022, 9027, 9096
Estimated Cost:	<\$150,000

RECOMMENDATION OVERALL SCORE
HIGH HIGH

PLANNING LEVEL CRITERIA

Ecological Significance			SCORE: HIGH
Ecological Processes/Indicators <small>(Add additional attribute to this list if indices or processes are missing.)</small>	Improve <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be improved.)</small>	Protect <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be protected.)</small>	Scale Reach/Site/Watershed
Hydrology	Moderate – Low benefit to hydrology.		Site
Sediment Regime	No change due existence of reed canary grass.	Moderate protection	Site-Reach
LWD Function	Will improve recruitment once plants mature.		Site-Reach
Channel Function	Will improve significantly after planting matures and reed canary grass recedes.		Site-Reach
Floodplain Function	No change to low benefit		Site-Reach
Groundwater Recharge	No change		
Water Quality	No change		
Riparian Connectivity	Will improve significantly, due to planting of native species.		Site-Reach
Fish Migration	Will improve after the planting matures and shades reed canary grass. Channel will become more distinct and navigable for fish. Stranding risk to fish will be eliminated.		Site-Reach
Anthropogenic Erosion	No change		
Others			

Hazards To Life, Limb, And Property

Hazards To Life, Limb, And Property				SCORE: LOW	
Hazard Type <small>(List the hazard type, e.g. flooding, landslide, emergency access)</small>	Safety/Threat <small>(Describe who or what is at risk if no action is taken.)</small>	Urgency <small>(How quickly do we need to respond to this hazard to prevent a problem from growing worse and requiring an increasingly costly solution?)</small>	Responsibility <small>(Does the problem relate to a County facility that King County has a legal commitment to maintain? Hazards associated with County facilities should be a higher priority than sites where no such commitment exists.)</small>	Frequency <small>(Describe the frequency of the hazard.)</small>	Scale Reach/Site/Watershed
None					

Note: Priorities should be set in the following order: 1. Threats to public health and safety. 2. Damage to public infrastructure and developed public property. 3. Damage to private structures. 4. Damage to significant natural resources

Solution Efficacy -- Part A

List Recommended Action	Identified Problems <small>(What problems the recommendation should be addressing.)</small>	Does the recommendation address the problem?	Does the recommendation address the problem source or treat a symptom?	Time frame for problem resolution <small>(e.g. immediate, 1yr, etc.)</small>
Restoration: removal of invasive and replanting. 100 acres and 3000 ft of stream bank.	Riparian restoration (This is a key finding and recommendation of the RRR report.)	Yes	Source	10 years of more, due to rate of vegetation growth.

Solution Efficacy-- Part B

Solution Efficacy-- Part B			SCORE: HIGH
What is the longevity of the recommendation?	Recommendation Readiness <small>(e.g. need further study, ready for feasibility, ready to build. Also, include what else is needed.)</small>	What are the benefits on a Geographic Scale? Site/Reach/Watershed	Cost
Permanent (County owned property)	Needs design and permitting	Reach scale (3000 feet of stream)	<\$150K

PC-12C

GENERAL INFORMATION

Project Name:	Riparian corridor restoration on Condit property
Problems Addressed:	Riparian corridor restoration
Project Description:	Restoration, removal of invasives and replanting of about 2 acres.
Justification / Benefit:	Improve riparian habitat conditions - 1400 feet of stream corridor
Comments:	Potential assistance from SHRP or DHI County programs
Location:	312507-9012
Estimated Cost:	<\$100,000

RECOMMENDATION OVERALL SCORE
HIGH MODERATE

PLANNING LEVEL CRITERIA

Ecological Significance			SCORE: HGIH
Ecological Processes/Indicators <small>(Add additional attribute to this list if indices or processes are missing.)</small>	Improve <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be improved.)</small>	Protect <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be protected.)</small>	Scale <small>Reach/Site/Watershed</small>
Hydrology	Low benefit to hydrology.		Site
Sediment Regime	No change due existence of reed canary grass.	Moderate protection	Site-Reach
LWD Function	Will improve recruitment once plants mature.		Site-Reach
Channel Function	Will improve significantly after plants mature and reed canary grass recedes.		Site-Reach
Floodplain Function	No change to low benefit		Site-Reach
Groundwater Recharge	No change		
Water Quality	Low to moderate; temperature/DO		
Riparian Connectivity	Will improve significantly, due to planting of native species.		Site-Reach
Fish Migration	No change (not an issue here)		
Anthropogenic Erosion	No change		
Others			

Hazards To Life, Limb, And Property					SCORE: LOW
Hazard Type <small>(List the hazard type, e.g. flooding, landslide, emergency access)</small>	Safety/Threat <small>(Describe who or what is at risk if no action is taken.)</small>	Urgency <small>(How quickly do we need to respond to this hazard to prevent a problem from growing worse and requiring an increasingly costly solution?)</small>	Responsibility <small>(Does the problem relate to a County facility that King County has a legal commitment to maintain? Hazards associated with County facilities should be a higher priority than sites where no such commitment exists.)</small>	Frequency <small>(Describe the frequency of the hazard.)</small>	Scale <small>Reach/Site/Watershed</small>
None					

Note: Priorities should be set in the following order: 1. Threats to public health and safety. 2. Damage to public infrastructure and developed public property. 3. Damage to private structures. 4. Damage to significant natural resources

Solution Efficacy -- Part A				
List Recommended Action	Identified Problems <small>(What problems the recommendation should be addressing.)</small>	Does the recommendation address the problem?	Does the recommendation address the problem source or treat a symptom?	Time frame for problem resolution <small>(e.g. immediate, 1yr, etc.)</small>
Restoration, removal of invasives and replanting.	Riparian restoration (This is a key finding and recommendation of the RRR report.)	Yes	Source	10 years of more, due to rate of vegetation growth.

Solution Efficacy-- Part B				SCORE: HIGH
What is the longevity of the recommendation?	Recommendation Readiness <small>(e.g. need further study, ready for feasibility, ready to build. Also, include what else is needed.)</small>	What are the benefits on a Geographic Scale? <small>Site/Reach/Watershed</small>	Cost	
Permanent	Needs design, permitting, and landowner agreement. (Landowner stated willingness to take action.)	Reach-site scale (1400 feet of stream)	<\$100K (Opportunity for cost sharing with landowner.)	

PC-12D

GENERAL INFORMATION

Project Name:	Riparian corridor restoration on Aldarra golf course
Problems Addressed:	Riparian corridor restoration.
Project Description:	Restoration; removal of invasive and replanting along mainstem and Canyon Creek. Close to 2 miles of stream bank.
Justification / Benefit:	Improve riparian habitat conditions – 10,000 feet of stream corridor (approx 20 acres)
Comments:	Potential assistance from SHRP program. Also address fish passage barrier on Canyon Creek.
Location:	072407-9002, 9004, 9006, 9007, 9028 009800-1370, 1260
Estimated Cost:	<\$200,000

RECOMMENDATION OVERALL SCORE
HIGH MODERATE

PLANNING LEVEL CRITERIA

Ecological Significance			SCORE: HIGH
Ecological Processes/Indicators <small>(Add additional attribute to this list if indices or processes are missing.)</small>	Improve <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be improved.)</small>	Protect <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be protected.)</small>	Scale Reach/Site/Watershed
Hydrology	Moderate – Low benefit to hydrology.		Reach
Sediment Regime	No change due existence of reed canary grass.	Moderate protection	Reach
LWD Function	Will improve recruitment once plants mature.		Reach
Channel Function	Will improve significantly after planting matures and reed canary grass recedes.		Reach
Floodplain Function	No change to low benefit		Reach
Groundwater Recharge	No change		
Water Quality	Low to moderate; temperature/DO		
Riparian Connectivity	Will improve significantly, due to planting of native species.		Reach
Fish Migration	Human placed structures on Canyon Creek do not meet criteria for fish passage. They should be addressed as part of this project.		
Anthropogenic Erosion	No change		
Others			

Hazards To Life, Limb, And Property					SCORE: LOW
Hazard Type <small>(List the hazard type, e.g. flooding, landslide, emergency access)</small>	Safety/Threat <small>(Describe who or what is at risk if no action is taken.)</small>	Urgency <small>(How quickly do we need to respond to this hazard to prevent a problem from growing worse and requiring an increasingly costly solution?)</small>	Responsibility <small>(Does the problem relate to a County facility that King County has a legal commitment to maintain? Hazards associated with County facilities should be a higher priority than sites where no such commitment exists.)</small>	Frequency <small>(Describe the frequency of the hazard.)</small>	Scale Reach/Site/Watershed
None					

Note: Priorities should be set in the following order: 1. Threats to public health and safety. 2. Damage to public infrastructure and developed public property. 3. Damage to private structures. 4. Damage to significant natural resources

Solution Efficacy -- Part A				
List Recommended Action	Identified Problems <small>(What problems the recommendation should be addressing.)</small>	Does the recommendation address the problem?	Does the recommendation address the problem source or treat a symptom?	Time frame for problem resolution <small>(e.g. immediate, 1yr, etc.)</small>
Restoration; removal of invasive and replanting along mainstem and Canyon Creek. Close to 2 miles of stream bank.	Riparian restoration (This is a key finding and recommendation of the RRR report.)	Yes	Source	10 years of more, due to rate of vegetation growth.

Solution Efficacy-- Part B				SCORE: HIGH
What is the longevity of the recommendation?	Recommendation Readiness <small>(e.g. need further study, ready for feasibility, ready to build. Also, include what else is needed.)</small>	What are the benefits on a Geographic Scale? Site/Reach/Watershed	Cost	
Permanent	Needs design, permitting, and landowner agreement.	Reach scale (10,000 feet of stream)	<\$200K	

PC-12E

GENERAL INFORMATION

Project Name:	Riparian corridor restoration near the mouth of Patterson creek near the Agricultural production district.
Problems Addressed:	Riparian corridor restoration.
Project Description:	Riparian corridor restoration (invasive removal and planting) near the mouth of Patterson creek (in the Agricultural production district).
Justification / Benefit:	Improve riparian habitat conditions - 3400 feet of stream corridor
Comments:	Potential assistance from SHRP program
Location:	042407-9013, 092407-9048
Estimated Cost:	

RECOMMENDATION OVERALL SCORE
HIGH MODERATE

PLANNING LEVEL CRITERIA

Ecological Significance			SCORE: HIGH
Ecological Processes/Indicators <small>(Add additional attribute to this list if indices or processes are missing.)</small>	Improve <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be improved.)</small>	Protect <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be protected.)</small>	Scale Reach/Site/Watershed
Hydrology	No change		Site
Sediment Regime	Slight improvement as plants mature.		Site-Reach
LWD Function	Will improve recruitment once plants mature.		Site-Reach
Channel Function	Will improve significantly after plants mature and reed canary grass recedes.		Site-Reach
Floodplain Function	No change to low benefit		Site-Reach
Groundwater Recharge	No change		
Water Quality	Low to moderate; temperature/DO, turbidity		
Riparian Connectivity	Will improve significantly, due to planting of native species.		Site-Reach
Fish Migration	No change (not an issue here)		
Anthropogenic Erosion	No change		
Others			

Hazards To Life, Limb, And Property					SCORE: LOW
Hazard Type <small>(List the hazard type, e.g. flooding, landslide, emergency access)</small>	Safety/Threat <small>(Describe who or what is at risk if no action is taken.)</small>	Urgency <small>(How quickly do we need to respond to this hazard to prevent a problem from growing worse and requiring an increasingly costly solution?)</small>	Responsibility <small>(Does the problem relate to a County facility that King County has a legal commitment to maintain? Hazards associated with County facilities should be a higher priority than sites where no such commitment exists.)</small>	Frequency <small>(Describe the frequency of the hazard.)</small>	Scale Reach/Site/Watershed
None					

Note: Priorities should be set in the following order: 1. Threats to public health and safety. 2. Damage to public infrastructure and developed public property. 3. Damage to private structures. 4. Damage to significant natural resources

Solution Efficacy -- Part A				
List Recommended Action	Identified Problems <small>(What problems the recommendation should be addressing.)</small>	Does the recommendation address the problem?	Does the recommendation address the problem source or treat a symptom?	Time frame for problem resolution <small>(e.g. immediate, 1yr, etc.)</small>
Riparian corridor near the mouth of Patterson creek near the Agricultural production district. Improve riparian habitat conditions - 3400 feet of stream corridor	Riparian restoration (This is a key find and recommendation of the RRR report.)	Yes	Source	10 years of more, due to rate of vegetation growth.

Solution Efficacy-- Part B				SCORE: HIGH
What is the longevity of the recommendation?	Recommendation Readiness <small>(e.g. need further study, ready for feasibility, ready to build. Also, include what else is needed.)</small>	What are the benefits on a Geographic Scale? Site/Reach/Watershed	Cost	
Permanent	Needs design, permitting, and landowner willingness	Reach scale (3400 feet of stream)	<\$100K (will not be an extensive planting event. Will only plant a narrow buffer area near stream.)	

PC-13

GENERAL INFORMATION

Project Name:	4' x 2' Culvert Under SR 202
Problems Addressed:	Flooding—Flooding of highway caused by undersized 4' x 2' culvert under SR 202. (Source: Citizen questionnaire responses)
Project Description:	Replace box culvert with larger culvert
Justification / Benefit:	Eliminate localized flooding
Comments:	Does not appear to be a fish barrier and flooding does not limit site access. Additionally WSDOT will have jurisdiction Encourage State to take action.
Location:	Hwy 202, culvert of Tributary, 31175 SE Redmond Fall City Rd. enter at gate 31175 SE (308th cross Street) (2000 Thomas Bros. Map pg. 599-B3 & C4)
Estimated Cost:	> \$275K

RECOMMENDATION OVERALL SCORE
HIGH LOW

PLANNING LEVEL CRITERIA

Ecological Significance			SCORE: MODERATE
Ecological Processes/Indicators <small>(Add additional attribute to this list if indices or processes are missing.)</small>	Improve <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be improved.)</small>	Protect <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be protected.)</small>	Scale Reach/Site/Watershed
Hydrology	No change		
Sediment Regime	Significant restoration of sediment transport.		Reach
LWD Function	Significant to moderate potential for recruitment and transport of LWD.		Reach
Channel Function	Significant, restoration of natural channel functions. Geomorphic integrity will be restored.		Site
Floodplain Function	Minor improvement to floodplain function and floodplain connectivity.		Site
Groundwater Recharge	No change		
Water Quality	No change		Reach
Riparian Connectivity	No change		Site
Fish Migration	No change-minor at high velocities.		Reach
Anthropogenic Erosion			
Others:			

Hazards To Life, Limb, And Property				SCORE: MODERATE	
Hazard Type <small>(List the hazard type, e.g. flooding, landslide, emergency access)</small>	Safety/Threat <small>(Describe who or what is at risk if no action is taken.)</small>	Urgency <small>(How quickly do we need to respond to this hazard to prevent a problem from growing worse and requiring an increasingly costly solution?)</small>	Responsibility <small>(Does the problem relate to a County facility that King County has a legal commitment to maintain? Hazards associated with County facilities should be a higher priority than sites where no such commitment exists.)</small>	Frequency <small>(Describe the frequency of the hazard.)</small>	Scale Reach/Site/Watershed
Road flooding	High speed, high volume State HWY	Moderate to high severity of risk and low frequency.	WA State (potential collaboration with County for habitat issues/benefit.)	Unknown	Site

Note: Priorities should be set in the following order: 1. Threats to public health and safety. 2. Damage to public infrastructure and developed public property. 3. Damage to private structures. 4. Damage to significant natural resources

Solution Efficacy -- Part A				
List Recommended Action	Identified Problems <small>(What problems the recommendation should be addressing.)</small>	Does the recommendation address the problem?	Does the recommendation address the problem source or treat a symptom?	Time frame for problem resolution <small>(e.g. immediate, 1yr, etc.)</small>
Replace box culvert with larger box culvert	Road flooding and discontinuity of stream processes and features.	Yes	Source	Immediate

Solution Efficacy-- Part B				SCORE: HIGH
What is the longevity of the recommendation?	Recommendation Readiness <small>(e.g. need further study, ready for feasibility, ready to build. Also, include what else is needed.)</small>	What are the benefits on a Geographic Scale? Site/Reach/Watershed	Cost	
Indefinite	Needs further investigation of extent of problem, engineering, and permitting.	Site	> \$275K	

PC-14

GENERAL INFORMATION

Project Name:	Ponding on Union Hill Road
Problems Addressed:	Flooding—Area of flooding is located within a slight depression along this stretch of Union Hill Road where standing water was found in ditches. 2 CB's are located at the intersection of 256th NE where standing water was observed up to the rim elev. No outlet from the CB's was found. (Source: Citizen questionnaire responses)
Project Description:	Clean catch basins and outlets. Investigate elevating road above water table.
Justification / Benefit:	Eliminate localized flooding
Comments:	Road maintenance issue / NDA
Location:	Intersection of NE Union Hill Rd. and 256th NE (2000 Thomas Bros. Map pg. 538-E6)
Estimated Cost:	< \$75K

RECOMMENDATION OVERALL SCORE
MODERATE LOW

PLANNING LEVEL CRITERIA

Ecological Significance			SCORE: LOW
Ecological Processes/Indicators <small>(Add additional attribute to this list if indices or processes are missing.)</small>	Improve <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be improved.)</small>	Protect <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be protected.)</small>	Scale <small>Reach/Site/Watershed</small>
Hydrology	No change		
Sediment Regime	No change		
LWD Function	No change		
Channel Function	No change		
Floodplain Function	No change		
Groundwater Recharge	No change		
Water Quality	No change		
Riparian Connectivity	No change		
Fish Migration	No change		
Anthropogenic Erosion	No change		
Others	No change		

Hazards To Life, Limb, And Property				SCORE: MODERATE
Hazard Type <small>(List the hazard type, e.g. flooding, landslide, emergency access)</small>	Safety/Threat <small>(Describe who or what is at risk if no action is taken.)</small>	Urgency <small>(How quickly do we need to respond to this hazard to prevent a problem from growing worse and requiring an increasingly costly solution?)</small>	Responsibility <small>(Does the problem relate to a County facility that King County has a legal commitment to maintain? Hazards associated with County facilities should be a higher priority than sites where no such commitment exists.)</small>	Scale <small>Reach/Site/Watershed</small>
Roadway Flooding	Potential traffic hazard.	Low-Medium, the ponding of water cause traffic hazard.	King County, Roads or joint with RDP	Unknown – Source of this issue was a citizen complaint. Site

Note: Priorities should be set in the following order: 1. Threats to public health and safety. 2. Damage to public infrastructure and developed public property. 3. Damage to private structures. 4. Damage to significant natural resources

Solution Efficacy -- Part A				
List Recommended Action	Identified Problems <small>(What problems the recommendation should be addressing.)</small>	Does the recommendation address the problem?	Does the recommendation address the problem source or treat a symptom?	Time frame for problem resolution <small>(e.g. immediate, 1yr, etc.)</small>
Clean catch basins and outlets. Investigate elevating road above water table.	Traffic Hazard	Yes. Further investigation is needed.	Symptom	Immediate

Solution Efficacy-- Part B				SCORE: MODERATE
What is the longevity of the recommendation?	Recommendation Readiness <small>(e.g. need further study, ready for feasibility, ready to build. Also, include what else is needed.)</small>	What are the benefits on a Geographic Scale? Site/Reach/Watershed	Cost	
Indefinite	Needs permitting, engineering, and further investigation.	Site.	< \$75K to clean. <\$500K to elevate the road.	

PC-15

GENERAL INFORMATION

Project Name:	Patterson Tributary #0377
Problems Addressed:	Habitat/Erosion—A 4' diameter 30' long culvert under a private driveway is a partial fish passage barrier due to being perched almost 2 feet above the stream bed and by the gradient being greater than 7%. The channel for approximately 175 feet downstream of this plunge has been incised. (Source: County Drainage Complaint Log, Complaint No. 13S)
Project Description:	Replace culvert with box culvert
Justification / Benefit:	Improve fish passage.
Comments:	The County, has tried to work with owner in the past, the property owner has been uncooperative. No land owner willingness.
Location:	31728 SE Issaquah Fall City Rd. (2000 Thomas Bros. Map pg. 599-D6)
Estimated Cost:	< \$75K

RECOMMENDATION OVERALL SCORE
HIGH LOW

PLANNING LEVEL CRITERIA

Ecological Significance			SCORE: MODERATE
Ecological Processes/Indicators <small>(Add additional attribute to this list if indices or processes are missing.)</small>	Improve <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be improved.)</small>	Protect <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be protected.)</small>	Scale Reach/Site/Watershed
Hydrology	No change		
Sediment Regime	Significant, restores sediment transport.		Reach
LWD Function	Moderate-low potential for recruitment and transport of woody debris in the area.		Reach
Channel Function	Significant, restoration of natural channel functions. Geomorphic integrity will be restored.		Site
Floodplain Function	Minor improvement to floodplain function and floodplain connectivity.		Site
Groundwater Recharge	No change		
Water Quality	Will significantly reduce erosion and scour at base of culvert.		Reach
Riparian Connectivity	No change		Site
Fish Migration	Significantly improves fish access for all species and life stages of salmonids to approximately a 1 mile of fish habitat. (There might be another fish barrier down stream, need to field verify.)		Reach
Anthropogenic Erosion	See water quality		
Others: reintroduces nutrient to upstream areas.	Increases biomass upstream.		Reach

Hazards To Life, Limb, And Property					SCORE: LOW
Hazard Type <small>(List the hazard type, e.g. flooding, landslide, emergency access)</small>	Safety/Threat <small>(Describe who or what is at risk if no action is taken.)</small>	Urgency <small>(How quickly do we need to respond to this hazard to prevent a problem from growing worse and requiring an increasingly costly solution?)</small>	Responsibility <small>(Does the problem relate to a County facility that King County has a legal commitment to maintain? Hazards associated with County facilities should be a higher priority than sites where no such commitment exists.)</small>	Frequency <small>(Describe the frequency of the hazard.)</small>	Scale Reach/Site/Watershed
None					

Note: Priorities should be set in the following order: 1. Threats to public health and safety. 2. Damage to public infrastructure and developed public property. 3. Damage to private structures. 4. Damage to significant natural resources

Solution Efficacy -- Part A				
List Recommended Action	Identified Problems <small>(What problems the recommendation should be addressing.)</small>	Does the recommendation address the problem?	Does the recommendation address the problem source or treat a symptom?	Time frame for problem resolution <small>(e.g. immediate, 1yr, etc.)</small>
Replace culvert with box culvert	Fish passage and steam function	Yes, to the local issue of fish passage—but there may be a downstream barrier. Assess sequencing to achieve greatest fish passage benefit.	Source	Immediate for fish passage.

Solution Efficacy-- Part B				SCORE: HIGH
What is the longevity of the recommendation?	Recommendation Readiness <small>(e.g. need further study, ready for feasibility, ready to build. Also, include what else is needed.)</small>	What are the benefits on a Geographic Scale? Site/Reach/Watershed	Cost	
Indefinite	Need Engineering, Permits, Easements, and landowner agreement. (In the past, this landowner has not been cooperative.)	Site and Reach	\$75,000	

PC-16A

GENERAL INFORMATION

Project Name:	Preservation of Quality Habitat in Patterson Creek Basin - Stevlingson Property
Problems Addressed:	Habitat/Water Quality—Mr. Stevlingson has requested the County purchase his property, which Patterson Creek passes through. Access to the residence is blocked during moderate storm events.
Project Description:	Purchase and restore the property to enhance habitat for fish. Also resolves owner's access issue during times of flooding.
Justification / Benefit:	Riparian restoration and protection of natural function of an important alluvial fan feature.
Comments:	This would be a good location for creating new riparian habitat along Patterson Creek. (This property contains the entire alluvial fan feature.)
Location:	24938 NE Redmond Fall City Road (2000 Thomas Bros. Map pg. 568-D2) parcel #232506-9049
Estimated Cost:	\$419,400

RECOMMENDATION OVERALL SCORE
HIGH MODERATE

PLANNING LEVEL CRITERIA

Ecological Significance			SCORE: HIGH
Ecological Processes/Indicators <small>(Add additional attribute to this list if indices or processes are missing.)</small>	Improve <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be improved.)</small>	Protect <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be protected.)</small>	Scale Reach/Site/Watershed
Hydrology	Minor improvement. Will restore rainwater retention by increasing vegetation on site and by removing impervious surfaces.	Remaining forested portions on property will continue to be preserved.	Site
Sediment Regime	Significant, erosion (fine sediments) will be reduced after revegetation. Also, restores natural sediment functions.		Site/Reach
LWD Function	Significant, LWD function would be restored after the reseeded of LWD.		Site/Reach
Channel Function	Significant restoration to alluvial fan features and function.		Site/Reach
Floodplain Function	Minor improvement by increasing vegetation and retaining nutrients.		Site/Reach
Groundwater Recharge	No change		
Water Quality	Improve WQ by reducing turbidity.		Site/Reach
Riparian Connectivity	Significant, will enlarge area of connectivity. Approximately 500 feet of stream on both sides of the stream.		Site/Reach
Fish Migration	Minor, will increase resting, holding, and cover areas for fish.		Site/Reach
Anthropogenic Erosion	Reduce erosion from non-vegetated areas.		Site/Reach
Others			

Hazards To Life, Limb, And Property

SCORE: MODERATE/LOW

Hazard Type <small>(List the hazard type, e.g. flooding, landslide, emergency access)</small>	Safety/Threat <small>(Describe who or what is at risk if no action is taken.)</small>	Urgency <small>(How quickly do we need to respond to this hazard to prevent a problem from growing worse and requiring an increasingly costly solution?)</small>	Responsibility <small>(Does the problem relate to a County facility that King County has a legal commitment to maintain? Hazards associated with County facilities should be a higher priority than sites where no such commitment exists.)</small>	Frequency <small>(Describe the frequency of the hazard.)</small>	Scale Reach/Site/Watershed
Hazard to one residence in area.	Access to property could be limited during flooding.	Low severity and high frequency. Volume of water flowing over road way is minimal but frequent during rainy season.	Private Drive	High, but low severity	Site

Note: Priorities should be set in the following order: 1. Threats to public health and safety. 2. Damage to public infrastructure and developed public property. 3. Damage to private structures. 4. Damage to significant natural resources

Solution Efficacy -- Part A

List Recommended Action	Identified Problems <small>(What problems the recommendation should be addressing.)</small>	Does the recommendation address the problem?	Does the recommendation address the problem source or treat a symptom?	Time frame for problem resolution <small>(e.g. immediate, 1yr, etc.)</small>
Purchase and restore the property to protect and enhance habitat for fish. Also eliminates owners access issueduring times of flooding.	Reduced alluvial fan function quality.	Yes	Source	Some immediate benefits to flooding issue, and ecological components are long term.

Solution Efficacy-- Part B

SCORE: HIGH

What is the longevity of the recommendation?	Recommendation Readiness <small>(e.g. need further study, ready for feasibility, ready to build. Also, include what else is needed.)</small>	What are the benefits on a Geographic Scale? Site/Reach/Watershed	Cost
Permanently Preserved and Restored.	Feasibility, landowner readiness, permitting, and engineering.	Site/Reach.	\$419,400

PC-16B

GENERAL INFORMATION

Project Name:	Preservation of Quality Habitat in Patterson Creek Basin - Tributary 0383
Problems Addressed:	Preservation of high quality habitat and restoration of degraded areas.
Project Description:	Acquisition of parcels 252506-9012, 9032, 9045, 9073, 9091, 9095
Justification / Benefit:	Good intact habitat area.
Comments:	
Location:	(See maps)
Estimated Cost:	\$2.5Mil could be lower if we are able to employ lower cost measures such as conservation easements. (Needs to be assessed.)

RECOMMENDATION OVERALL SCORE
HIGH HIGH

PLANNING LEVEL CRITERIA

Ecological Significance			SCORE: HIGH
Ecological Processes/Indicators <small>(Add additional attribute to this list if indices or processes are missing.)</small>	Improve <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be improved.)</small>	Protect <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be protected.)</small>	Scale Reach/Site/Watershed
Hydrology	Parcels 9032 and 9045 have been substantially altered and acquisition would allow restoration to take place.	Parcels 9012, 9073, 9091, and 9095 have high quality habitat that would be protected through acquisition.	Reach
Sediment Regime	The alluvial fan lies on parcels 9032 and 9045. Acquisition of these parcels would allow restoration of natural sediment transport and deposition patterns in this reach.	Current conditions for the upper portion of the stream are high quality. Acquisition would preserve natural sediment transport and deposition patterns.	Reach
LWD Function	500 feet of riparian corridor could be restored, which is currently cleared, increasing LWD recruitment.	Most of the reach is forested and unconfined, natural bank.	Reach
Channel Function	Significant restoration to alluvial fan features and function.	3100 feet of stream corridor (2600 feet undisturbed)	Reach
Floodplain Function	Improvement by increasing vegetation and retaining nutrients and allowing channel migration.		Reach
Groundwater Recharge	No change	No change	
Water Quality	Improve WQ by reducing turbidity.		
Riparian Connectivity	Significant, will enlarge area of connectivity. Approximately 500 feet of stream on both sides of the stream.	2600 feet of riparian forest will be protected.	Reach
Fish Migration	Minor benefits gained from the removal of the culverts.		
Anthropogenic Erosion			
Others			

Hazards To Life, Limb, And Property

SCORE: MODERATE LOW

Hazard Type <small>(List the hazard type, e.g. flooding, landslide, emergency access)</small>	Safety/Threat <small>(Describe who or what is at risk if no action is taken.)</small>	Urgency <small>(How quickly do we need to respond to this hazard to prevent a problem from growing worse and requiring an increasingly costly solution?)</small>	Responsibility <small>(Does the problem relate to a County facility that King County has a legal commitment to maintain? Hazards associated with County facilities should be a higher priority than sites where no such commitment exists.)</small>	Frequency <small>(Describe the frequency of the hazard.)</small>	Scale Reach/Site/Watershed
Nuisance flooding	Possible risk to home access and a well.	Stream may avulse soon.	No county owned facilities	At least Annually	site

Note: Priorities should be set in the following order: 1. Threats to public health and safety. 2. Damage to public infrastructure and developed public property. 3. Damage to private structures. 4. Damage to significant natural resources

Solution Efficacy -- Part A

List Recommended Action	Identified Problems <small>(What problems the recommendation should be addressing.)</small>	Does the recommendation address the problem?	Does the recommendation address the problem source or treat a symptom?	Time frame for problem resolution <small>(e.g. immediate, 1yr, etc.)</small>
Acquisition of parcels 252506-9012, 9032, 9045, 9073, 9091, 9095	Protect high quality habitat and restore degraded habitat.	Yes	Source	Immediate

Solution Efficacy-- Part B

SCORE: HIGH

What is the longevity of the recommendation?	Recommendation Readiness <small>(e.g. need further study, ready for feasibility, ready to build. Also, include what else is needed.)</small>	What are the benefits on a Geographic Scale? Site/Reach/Watershed	Cost
Permanent	Landowner willingness, grant availability.	Reach	\$2.5Mil could be lower if we are able to employ lower cost measures such as conservation easements. (Needs to be assessed.)

PC-16C

GENERAL INFORMATION

Project Name:	Preservation of Quality Habitat in Patterson Creek Basin - Korn Reach Acquisiton/Reconnection
Problems Addressed:	Reconnecting habitat to Patterson Creek natural area.
Project Description:	Acquisition of both degraded and high quality property, preservation of good habitat and restoring degraded areas. Parcels 252506-9005, 9028, 9033, 9057, 9068, 9069
Justification / Benefit:	preservation of good habitat and restoring degraded areas.
Comments:	
Location:	
Estimated Cost:	\$1.5 Mil

RECOMMENDATION OVERALL SCORE
HIGH HIGH

PLANNING LEVEL CRITERIA

Ecological Significance			SCORE: HIGH
Ecological Processes/Indicators <small>(Add additional attribute to this list if indices or processes are missing.)</small>	Improve <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be improved.)</small>	Protect <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be protected.)</small>	Scale Reach/Site/Watershed
	Parcels 9033, 9057, 9068, 9069 are disturbed and requires restoration. Total 27 acres and about 2000 feet of stream.	Parcels 9005, 9028 are high quality intact habitat. They are 36 acres and 2000 feet of stream.	
Hydrology	There will be a slight hydrology improvement if 27 acres are reforested.	Moderate protection of natural hydrology. Will preserve approx. 36 acres of forested land	Reach
Sediment Regime	Slight improvement to no change.	This reach is not significant recruitment or deposition area.	Reach
LWD Function	2000 feet of riparian corridor could be restored, increasing LWD recruitment.	Will continue to protect natural LWD function on 2000 feet of stream.	Reach
Channel Function	Significant restoration of 2000 feet of channel function.	2000 feet of undisturbed stream corridor.	Reach
Floodplain Function	Minor improvement by increasing native riparian vegetation.	No change, but will continue to protect natural floodplain function.	Reach
Groundwater Recharge	No change	No change	
Water Quality	Improve WQ by reducing turbidity and temperature by increasing shade.	Will continue to protect this function.	
Riparian Connectivity	Significant, will enlarge area of connectivity. Approximately 2000 feet of stream on both sides of the stream. The effect from this addition will connect a total of 1.5 miles of contiguous habitat.	2000 feet of riparian forest will be protected.	Reach
Fish Migration	No change	No change	
Anthropogenic Erosion	Slight benefit by eliminating livestock access to bank areas.	No change	
Others			

Hazards To Life, Limb, And Property					SCORE: MODERATE LOW
Hazard Type <small>(List the hazard type, e.g. flooding, landslide, emergency access)</small>	Safety/Threat <small>(Describe who or what is at risk if no action is taken.)</small>	Urgency <small>(How quickly do we need to respond to this hazard to prevent a problem from growing worse and requiring an increasingly costly solution?)</small>	Responsibility <small>(Does the problem relate to a County facility that King County has a legal commitment to maintain? Hazards associated with County facilities should be a higher priority than sites where no such commitment exists.)</small>	Frequency <small>(Describe the frequency of the hazard.)</small>	Scale Reach/Site/Watershed
Nuisance flooding	Reduced use of property for livestock raising. No residential impact.	Not urgent because no life threat. It's a formal complaint to the County.	No County facilities affected.	Annually	Site

Note: Priorities should be set in the following order: 1. Threats to public health and safety. 2. Damage to public infrastructure and developed public property. 3. Damage to private structures. 4. Damage to significant natural resources

Solution Efficacy -- Part A				
List Recommended Action	Identified Problems <small>(What problems the recommendation should be addressing.)</small>	Does the recommendation address the problem?	Does the recommendation address the problem source or treat a symptom?	Time frame for problem resolution <small>(e.g. immediate, 1yr, etc.)</small>
Acquisition and restoration of both degraded and high quality property. Parcels 252506-9005, 9028, 9033, 9057, 9068, 9069	Degraded habitat and high quality habitat that lacks protection.	Yes	Source	Immediate to 10 years. (To complete acquisitions and restoration.)

Solution Efficacy-- Part B				SCORE: HIGH
What is the longevity of the recommendation?	Recommendation Readiness <small>(e.g. need further study, ready for feasibility, ready to build. Also, include what else is needed.)</small>	What are the benefits on a Geographic Scale? Site/Reach/Watershed	Cost	
Permanent	Land owner willingness,	Reach	\$1.5 Mil	

PC-16D

GENERAL INFORMATION

Project Name:	Preservation of Quality Habitat in Patterson Creek Basin – Korn Reach extension
Problems Addressed:	flooding - and blockage of emergency access.
Project Description:	Acquisition of two parcels and small restoration, Removal of one house and reforestation. Removal of bridge and road.
Justification / Benefit:	Flooding, Riparian and forest cover benefits. 40 acres protected and restored. Property provides connectivity to King County park and natural areas approximately 700 acres. 1200 ft of Patterson Creek frontage
Comments:	
Location:	302507-9012, 9160 located in Subbasin 2B.
Estimated Cost:	>\$1 Mil

RECOMMENDATION OVERALL SCORE
HIGH HIGH

PLANNING LEVEL CRITERIA

Ecological Significance			SCORE: HIGH
Ecological Processes/Indicators <small>(Add additional attribute to this list if indices or processes are missing.)</small>	Improve <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be improved.)</small>	Protect <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be protected.)</small>	Scale Reach/Site/Watershed
Hydrology	Minor, removal of impervious surface and blockage of floodway, and increase forest cover.	No change	Site-Reach
Sediment Regime	Fine sediment delivery from road flooding and ponding can be reduced.	No change	Site-Reach
LWD Function	Minor, opportunity to restore any lost riparian cover	No change	Site
Channel Function	Restore channel morphology and continuity if bridge is removed	No change	Site
Floodplain Function	Restore floodplain area in existing road prism, restore channel migration capability if bridge is removed.	No change	Site
Groundwater Recharge	NC	No change	Site
Water Quality	Minor, lower turbidity through reducing sediment inputs and potential for temperature improvement through shading.	No change	Site
Riparian Connectivity	1100 feet of riparian habitat on site that can be protected or restored and riparian break caused by road crossing that can be corrected.	No change	Reach
Fish Migration	Minor to NC	No change	Site
Anthropogenic Erosion	Minor, Reduce sediment input from road.	No change	Site
Others			

Hazards To Life, Limb, And Property					SCORE: MODERATE/LOW
Hazard Type <small>(List the hazard type, e.g. flooding, landslide, emergency access)</small>	Safety/Threat <small>(Describe who or what is at risk if no action is taken.)</small>	Urgency <small>(How quickly do we need to respond to this hazard to prevent a problem from growing worse and requiring an increasingly costly solution?)</small>	Responsibility <small>(Does the problem relate to a County facility that King County has a legal commitment to maintain? Hazards associated with County facilities should be a higher priority than sites where no such commitment exists.)</small>	Frequency <small>(Describe the frequency of the hazard.)</small>	Scale Reach/Site/Watershed
Improving Emergency Access	1 residence will be stranded if an emergency occurs during a flooding event. Will limit emergency response.	Low, the danger is occasional. Danger more likely to occur infrequently.	Private Road that serve King County owned property	Several times annually.	Site

Note: Priorities should be set in the following order: 1. Threats to public health and safety. 2. Damage to public infrastructure and developed public property. 3. Damage to private structures. 4. Damage to significant natural resources

Solution Efficacy -- Part A				
List Recommended Action	Identified Problems <small>(What problems the recommendation should be addressing.)</small>	Does the recommendation address the problem?	Does the recommendation address the problem source or treat a symptom?	Time frame for problem resolution <small>(e.g. immediate, 1yr, etc.)</small>
Acquisition of two parcels. Removal of one house, bridge, and road. Reforestation.	We will be removing the need for emergency access by removing the resident.	Yes, by removing the residences from the floodplain.	Source, by eliminating the problem.	Immediate

Solution Efficacy-- Part B				SCORE: HIGH
What is the longevity of the recommendation?	Recommendation Readiness <small>(e.g. need further study, ready for feasibility, ready to build. Also, include what else is needed.)</small>	What are the benefits on a Geographic Scale? Site/Reach/Watershed	Cost	
Permanent	Minor permitting and landowner willingness.	Site	>\$1M	

PC-16E

GENERAL INFORMATION

Project Name:	Preservation of Quality Habitat in Patterson Creek Basin - Canyon Creek Acquisitions
Problems Addressed:	Preservation of high quality habitat. Parcel # 072407-9009 (Also 182407-9010, 9011, 9106)
Project Description:	100 acres owned by Seattle School District. 2700 feet of stream. Possibility of receiving a donation of a conservation easement. There are addition forestred parcels totaling 80 acres and 2900 ft of stream, upstream from Issaquah Fall City Road.
Justification / Benefit:	preservation of good habitat.
Comments:	The opportunity to protect the school property should be addressed within the next 5 years.
Location:	
Estimated Cost:	>\$3 Mil

RECOMMENDATION OVERALL SCORE
HIGH MODERATE

PLANNING LEVEL CRITERIA

Ecological Significance			SCORE: HIGH
Ecological Processes/Indicators <small>(Add additional attribute to this list if indices or processes are missing.)</small>	Improve <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be improved.)</small>	Protect <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be protected.)</small>	Scale Reach/Site/Watershed
Hydrology		Will protect hydrology significantly. Will preserve approx. 180 acres of land	Reach
Sediment Regime		Current conditions for the upper portion of the stream are high quality. Acquisition would preserve natural sediment transport and deposition patterns.	Reach
LWD Function		Most of the reach is forested and unconfined, natural bank.	Reach
Channel Function		5600 feet of semi-undisturbed stream corridor	Reach
Floodplain Function		Will be preserved	Reach
Groundwater Recharge		No change	
Water Quality		Will be preserved	Reach
Riparian Connectivity		5600 feet of riparian forest will be protected.	Reach
Fish Migration		No change	
Anthropogenic Erosion		No change	
Others			

Hazards To Life, Limb, And Property					SCORE: LOW
Hazard Type <small>(List the hazard type, e.g. flooding, landslide, emergency access)</small>	Safety/Threat <small>(Describe who or what is at risk if no action is taken.)</small>	Urgency <small>(How quickly do we need to respond to this hazard to prevent a problem from growing worse and requiring an increasingly costly solution?)</small>	Responsibility <small>(Does the problem relate to a County facility that King County has a legal commitment to maintain? Hazards associated with County facilities should be a higher priority than sites where no such commitment exists.)</small>	Frequency <small>(Describe the frequency of the hazard.)</small>	Scale Reach/Site/Watershed
None					

Note: Priorities should be set in the following order: 1. Threats to public health and safety. 2. Damage to public infrastructure and developed public property. 3. Damage to private structures. 4. Damage to significant natural resources

Solution Efficacy -- Part A				
List Recommended Action	Identified Problems <small>(What problems the recommendation should be addressing.)</small>	Does the recommendation address the problem?	Does the recommendation address the problem source or treat a symptom?	Time frame for problem resolution <small>(e.g. immediate, 1yr, etc.)</small>
100 acres owned by Seattle School District. 2700 feet of stream. Possibility of receiving a donation of a CE. (Forestry parcels 80 acres, 2900 ft of stream)	Protection of high quality habitat	Yes	Source	Immediate

Solution Efficacy-- Part B				SCORE: HIGH
What is the longevity of the recommendation?	Recommendation Readiness <small>(e.g. need further study, ready for feasibility, ready to build. Also, include what else is needed.)</small>	What are the benefits on a Geographic Scale? Site/Reach/Watershed	Cost	
Permanent	Landowner willingness (3 landowners), seek grants.	Reach	>\$3 Mil could be lower if we are able to employ lower cost measures such as conservation easements. (Needs to be assessed.)	

PC-17

GENERAL INFORMATION

Project Name:	NE 40th & 45th Street Culvert
Problems Addressed:	Habitat—NE 40th St. and NE 45 St culverts on Dry Creek are fish passage barriers.
Project Description:	Replace culverts.
Justification / Benefit:	Improve fish access to habitat.
Comments:	Verify the extent of upstream habitat available.
Location:	NE 40th St. and NE 45th St. on Dry Creek (2000 Thomas Bros. Map pg. 568-F1)
Estimated Cost:	\$150K

RECOMMENDATION OVERALL SCORE
HIGH LOW

PLANNING LEVEL CRITERIA

Ecological Significance			SCORE: HIGH/MODERATE
Ecological Processes/Indicators <small>(Add additional attribute to this list if indices or processes are missing.)</small>	Improve <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be improved.)</small>	Protect <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be protected.)</small>	Scale Reach/Site/Watershed
Hydrology	No change		
Sediment Regime	Significant improvement, restores sediment transport.		Reach
LWD Function	Significant to moderate potential for recruitment and transport of woody debris in the area.		Reach
Channel Function	Significant, restoration of natural channel functions. Geomorphic integrity will be restored.		Site
Floodplain Function	Minor improvement to floodplain function and floodplain connectivity.		Site
Groundwater Recharge	No change		
Water Quality	Reduce erosion and scour at base of culvert.		Reach
Riparian Connectivity	No change		Site
Fish Migration	Significant restores approximately 1/2 mile of fish habitat.		Reach
Anthropogenic Erosion	See water quality		
Others: reintroduces nutrient to upstream areas.	Increases biomass upstream.		Reach

Hazards To Life, Limb, And Property					SCORE: MODERATE/LOW
Hazard Type <small>(List the hazard type, e.g. flooding, landslide, emergency access)</small>	Safety/Threat <small>(Describe who or what is at risk if no action is taken.)</small>	Urgency <small>(How quickly do we need to respond to this hazard to prevent a problem from growing worse and requiring an increasingly costly solution?)</small>	Responsibility <small>(Does the problem relate to a County facility that King County has a legal commitment to maintain? Hazards associated with County facilities should be a higher priority than sites where no such commitment exists.)</small>	Frequency <small>(Describe the frequency of the hazard.)</small>	Scale Reach/Site/Watershed
Unknown			County Road		Site

Note: Priorities should be set in the following order: 1. Threats to public health and safety. 2. Damage to public infrastructure and developed public property. 3. Damage to private structures. 4. Damage to significant natural resources

Solution Efficacy -- Part A				
List Recommended Action	Identified Problems <small>(What problems the recommendation should be addressing.)</small>	Does the recommendation address the problem?	Does the recommendation address the problem source or treat a symptom?	Time frame for problem resolution <small>(e.g. immediate, 1yr, etc.)</small>
Replace culverts and improve fish passage.	Fish passage, and stream function	Yes	Source	Immediate for fish passage and stream function.

Solution Efficacy-- Part B			SCORE: High
What is the longevity of the recommendation?	Recommendation Readiness <small>(e.g. need further study, ready for feasibility, ready to build. Also, include what else is needed.)</small>	What are the benefits on a Geographic Scale? Site/Reach/Watershed	Cost
Indefinite	Needs Engineering, Permits, More investigation regarding threat to road.	Site and Reach	\$150K

PC-19A

GENERAL INFORMATION

Project Name:	Protection and restoration of Forest Cover – Subbasin 2A
Problems Addressed:	Protect Forest Cover on existing DNR land. Parcels 242506-9002, 9003
Project Description:	Acquisition and restoration of forest. 80 acres
Justification / Benefit:	Protect forest cover.
Comments:	
Location:	
Estimated Cost:	>\$3.2 Mil

RECOMMENDATION OVERALL SCORE
HIGH LOW

PLANNING LEVEL CRITERIA

Ecological Significance			SCORE: HIGH
Ecological Processes/Indicators <small>(Add additional attribute to this list if indices or processes are missing.)</small>	Improve <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be improved.)</small>	Protect <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be protected.)</small>	Scale <small>Reach/Site/Watershed</small>
Hydrology		Primary benefit is to hydrology through protecting forest cover.	Reach
Sediment Regime		Area not adjacent to stream. No change	
LWD Function		Area not adjacent to stream. No change	
Channel Function		Area not adjacent to stream. No change	
Floodplain Function		Area not adjacent to stream. No change	
Groundwater Recharge		No change unknown if it is an issue.	
Water Quality		Area not adjacent to stream. No change	
Riparian Connectivity		Area not adjacent to stream. No change	
Fish Migration		Area not adjacent to stream. No change	
Anthropogenic Erosion		Area not adjacent to stream. No change	
Others			

Hazards To Life, Limb, And Property					SCORE: LOW
Hazard Type <small>(List the hazard type, e.g. flooding, landslide, emergency access)</small>	Safety/Threat <small>(Describe who or what is at risk if no action is taken.)</small>	Urgency <small>(How quickly do we need to respond to this hazard to prevent a problem from growing worse and requiring an increasingly costly solution?)</small>	Responsibility <small>(Does the problem relate to a County facility that King County has a legal commitment to maintain? Hazards associated with County facilities should be a higher priority than sites where no such commitment exists.)</small>	Frequency <small>(Describe the frequency of the hazard.)</small>	Scale <small>Reach/Site/Watershed</small>
None					

Note: Priorities should be set in the following order: 1. Threats to public health and safety. 2. Damage to public infrastructure and developed public property. 3. Damage to private structures. 4. Damage to significant natural resources

Solution Efficacy -- Part A				
List Recommended Action	Identified Problems <small>(What problems the recommendation should be addressing.)</small>	Does the recommendation address the problem?	Does the recommendation address the problem source or treat a symptom?	Time frame for problem resolution <small>(e.g. immediate, 1yr, etc.)</small>
Acquisition and restoration of forest. 80 acres	Loss of forest cover in basin	Yes	Source	Immediate

Solution Efficacy-- Part B				SCORE: HIGH
What is the longevity of the recommendation?	Recommendation Readiness <small>(e.g. need further study, ready for feasibility, ready to build. Also, include what else is needed.)</small>	What are the benefits on a Geographic Scale? Site/Reach/Watershed	Cost	
Permanent	Landowner willingness, grant candidate.	Reach	>\$3.2 Mil	

PC-19B

GENERAL INFORMATION

Project Name:	Protection and restoration of Forest Cover – Subbasin 2B
Problems Addressed:	Protect Forest Cover on STDNR lands. Parcels 262506-9002, 9003*, 9015, 9016* *these are at least half in Evans Creek basin
Project Description:	Acquisition and restoration of forest. 160 acres, about 110 in Patterson.
Justification / Benefit:	Protect forest cover.
Comments:	
Location:	
Estimated Cost:	>\$6.4 Mil

RECOMMENDATION OVERALL SCORE
HIGH LOW

PLANNING LEVEL CRITERIA

Ecological Significance			SCORE: HIGH
Ecological Processes/Indicators <small>(Add additional attribute to this list if indices or processes are missing.)</small>	Improve <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be improved.)</small>	Protect <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be protected.)</small>	Scale Reach/Site/Watershed
Hydrology		Primary benefit is to hydrology through protecting forest cover.	Reach
Sediment Regime		Area not adjacent to stream. No change	
LWD Function		Area not adjacent to stream. No change	
Channel Function		Area not adjacent to stream. No change	
Floodplain Function		Area not adjacent to stream. No change	
Groundwater Recharge		No change unknown if it is an issue.	
Water Quality		Area not adjacent to stream. No change	
Riparian Connectivity		Area not adjacent to stream. No change	
Fish Migration		Area not adjacent to stream. No change	
Anthropogenic Erosion		Area not adjacent to stream. No change	
Others			

Hazards To Life, Limb, And Property					SCORE: LOW
Hazard Type <small>(List the hazard type, e.g. flooding, landslide, emergency access)</small>	Safety/Threat <small>(Describe who or what is at risk if no action is taken.)</small>	Urgency <small>(How quickly do we need to respond to this hazard to prevent a problem from growing worse and requiring an increasingly costly solution?)</small>	Responsibility <small>(Does the problem relate to a County facility that King County has a legal commitment to maintain? Hazards associated with County facilities should be a higher priority than sites where no such commitment exists.)</small>	Frequency <small>(Describe the frequency of the hazard.)</small>	Scale Reach/Site/Watershed
None					

Note: Priorities should be set in the following order: 1. Threats to public health and safety. 2. Damage to public infrastructure and developed public property. 3. Damage to private structures. 4. Damage to significant natural resources

Solution Efficacy -- Part A				
List Recommended Action	Identified Problems <small>(What problems the recommendation should be addressing.)</small>	Does the recommendation address the problem?	Does the recommendation address the problem source or treat a symptom?	Time frame for problem resolution <small>(e.g. immediate, 1yr, etc.)</small>
Acquisition and restoration of forest. 160 acres, about 110 in Patterson.	Loss of forest cover in basin	Yes	Source	Immediate

Solution Efficacy-- Part B				SCORE: HIGH
What is the longevity of the recommendation?	Recommendation Readiness <small>(e.g. need further study, ready for feasibility, ready to build. Also, include what else is needed.)</small>	What are the benefits on a Geographic Scale? Site/Reach/Watershed	Cost	
Permanent	Landowner willingness, grant candidate.	Reach	>\$6.4 Mil	

PC-19C

GENERAL INFORMATION

Project Name:	Protection and restoration of forest cover – Laird Norton Trust Property in subbasin 2B
Problems Addressed:	Protect Forest Cover on trust land. Parcels 252506-9013, 9017, 9018, 9090, 9091, 9092, 9093, 9094
Project Description:	Acquisition and restoration of forest. 160 acres
Justification / Benefit:	Provides connection to two large King County owned properties
Comments:	
Location:	
Estimated Cost:	>\$6.4 Mil

RECOMMENDATION OVERALL SCORE
HIGH LOW

PLANNING LEVEL CRITERIA

Ecological Significance			SCORE: HIGH
Ecological Processes/Indicators <small>(Add additional attribute to this list if indices or processes are missing.)</small>	Improve <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be improved.)</small>	Protect <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be protected.)</small>	Scale Reach/Site/Watershed
Hydrology	Replanting component to improve hydrology.	Primary benefit is to hydrology through protecting forest cover.	Reach
Sediment Regime		Area not adjacent to stream. No change	
LWD Function		Area not adjacent to stream. No change	
Channel Function		Area not adjacent to stream. No change	
Floodplain Function		Area not adjacent to stream. No change	
Groundwater Recharge		No change unknown if it is an issue.	
Water Quality		Area not adjacent to stream. No change	
Riparian Connectivity		Area not adjacent to stream. No change	
Fish Migration		Area not adjacent to stream. No change	
Anthropogenic Erosion		Area not adjacent to stream. No change	
Others			

Hazards To Life, Limb, And Property					SCORE: LOW
Hazard Type <small>(List the hazard type, e.g. flooding, landslide, emergency access)</small>	Safety/Threat <small>(Describe who or what is at risk if no action is taken.)</small>	Urgency <small>(How quickly do we need to respond to this hazard to prevent a problem from growing worse and requiring an increasingly costly solution?)</small>	Responsibility <small>(Does the problem relate to a County facility that King County has a legal commitment to maintain? Hazards associated with County facilities should be a higher priority than sites where no such commitment exists.)</small>	Frequency <small>(Describe the frequency of the hazard.)</small>	Scale Reach/Site/Watershed
None					

Note: Priorities should be set in the following order: 1. Threats to public health and safety. 2. Damage to public infrastructure and developed public property. 3. Damage to private structures. 4. Damage to significant natural resources

Solution Efficacy -- Part A				
List Recommended Action	Identified Problems <small>(What problems the recommendation should be addressing.)</small>	Does the recommendation address the problem?	Does the recommendation address the problem source or treat a symptom?	Time frame for problem resolution <small>(e.g. immediate, 1yr, etc.)</small>
Acquisition and restoration of forest. 160 acres,	Lost of forest cover in basin	Yes	Source	Immediate

Solution Efficacy-- Part B				SCORE: HIGH
What is the longevity of the recommendation?	Recommendation Readiness <small>(e.g. need further study, ready for feasibility, ready to build. Also, include what else is needed.)</small>	What are the benefits on a Geographic Scale? Site/Reach/Watershed	Cost	
Permanent	Landowner willingness, grant candidate	Reach	>\$6.4 Mil	

PC-19D

GENERAL INFORMATION

Project Name:	Protection and restoration of forest cover – Mitchell Hill Acquisitions
Problems Addressed:	Mitchell Hill area. Parcels 172407-9011,9032, 9033 and 182407-9016 and 212407-9038, 9005
Project Description:	Acquisition and restoration of forest. (acquire 120 acres)
Justification / Benefit:	
Comments:	Mitchell Hill has 560 acres in WA DNR ownership and 120 acres in KC ownership. Investigate opportunitie to influence State and County forest management practices.
Location:	
Estimated Cost:	>\$4.8 Mil

RECOMMENDATION OVERALL SCORE
HIGH MODERATE

PLANNING LEVEL CRITERIA

Ecological Significance			SCORE: HIGH
Ecological Processes/Indicators <small>(Add additional attribute to this list if indices or processes are missing.)</small>	Improve <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be improved.)</small>	Protect <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be protected.)</small>	Scale Reach/Site/Watershed
Hydrology		Primary benefit is to hydrology through protecting forest cover.	Reach
Sediment Regime		Area not adjacent to stream. No change	
LWD Function		Area not adjacent to stream. No change	
Channel Function		Area not adjacent to stream. No change	
Floodplain Function		Area not adjacent to stream. No change	
Groundwater Recharge		No change unknown if it is an issue.	
Water Quality		Area not adjacent to stream. No change	
Riparian Connectivity		Area not adjacent to stream. No change	
Fish Migration		Area not adjacent to stream. No change	
Anthropogenic Erosion		Area not adjacent to stream. No change	
Others			

Hazards To Life, Limb, And Property				SCORE: LOW	
Hazard Type <small>(List the hazard type, e.g. flooding, landslide, emergency access)</small>	Safety/Threat <small>(Describe who or what is at risk if no action is taken.)</small>	Urgency <small>(How quickly do we need to respond to this hazard to prevent a problem from growing worse and requiring an increasingly costly solution?)</small>	Responsibility <small>(Does the problem relate to a County facility that King County has a legal commitment to maintain? Hazards associated with County facilities should be a higher priority than sites where no such commitment exists.)</small>	Frequency <small>(Describe the frequency of the hazard.)</small>	Scale Reach/Site/Watershed
None					

Note: Priorities should be set in the following order: 1. Threats to public health and safety. 2. Damage to public infrastructure and developed public property. 3. Damage to private structures. 4. Damage to significant natural resources

Solution Efficacy -- Part A				
List Recommended Action	Identified Problems <small>(What problems the recommendation should be addressing.)</small>	Does the recommendation address the problem?	Does the recommendation address the problem source or treat a symptom?	Time frame for problem resolution <small>(e.g. immediate, 1yr, etc.)</small>
Acquisition and restoration of forest. 120 acres	Loss of forest cover in basin	Yes	Source	Immediate

Solution Efficacy-- Part B				SCORE: HIGH
What is the longevity of the recommendation?	Recommendation Readiness <small>(e.g. need further study, ready for feasibility, ready to build. Also, include what else is needed.)</small>	What are the benefits on a Geographic Scale? Site/Reach/Watershed	Cost	
Permanent	Landowner willingness, grant candidate.	Reach	>\$4.8 Mil	

PC-18

GENERAL INFORMATION

Project Name:	Monte Lindsey Dam (King County has thoroughly investigated options and has elected to protect the road and leave dam maintenance/management issues to dam owner)
Problems Addressed:	Habitat/Flooding/Erosion—6' high X 10' wide X 280' long earthen berm s deteriorating , blocking fish passage and is in potential danger of failing due to the weakening of the structure via sheet flow over the top and erosion along the toe during high flows. Seepage at the toe of the dam has been observed. (Source: County Drainage Complaint Log, Complaint No. 05S)
Project Description:	1. Stabilize embankment. 2. Stabilize Spillway Channel. 3. Drain Pond
Justification / Benefit:	Reduce risk of ecological damage to downstream wetland areas and damage to Duthie Hill Road if dam were to fail.
Comments:	DOE is currently monitoring this dam and County DHI program may also be looking at this project. Additionally, a feasibility study has been completed for this project.
Location:	North of Duthie Hill Rd. on the NW side between 270th Ave. SE and 268th Pl. SE (2000 Thomas Bros. Map pg. 598-F2 & G2)
Estimated Cost:	\$75k - \$250K

RECOMMENDATION OVERALL SCORE

PLANNING LEVEL CRITERIA

Ecological Significance			SCORE:
Ecological Processes/Indicators <small>(Add additional attribute to this list if indices or processes are missing.)</small>	Improve <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be improved.)</small>	Protect <small>(Describe how or what ecological processes will be protected.)</small>	Scale <small>Reach/Site/Watershed</small>
Hydrology			
Sediment Regime			
LWD Function			
Channel Function			
Floodplain Function			
Groundwater Recharge			
Water Quality			
Riparian Connectivity			
Fish Migration			
Anthropogenic Erosion			
Others			

Hazards To Life, Limb, And Property				SCORE:	
Hazard Type <small>(List the hazard type, e.g. flooding, landslide, emergency access)</small>	Safety/Threat <small>(Describe who or what is at risk if no action is taken.)</small>	Urgency <small>(How quickly do we need to respond to this hazard to prevent a problem from growing worse and requiring an increasingly costly solution?)</small>	Responsibility <small>(Does the problem relate to a County facility that King County has a legal commitment to maintain? Hazards associated with County facilities should be a higher priority than sites where no such commitment exists.)</small>	Frequency <small>(Describe the frequency of the hazard.)</small>	Scale <small>Reach/Site/Watershed</small>

Note: Priorities should be set in the following order: 1. Threats to public health and safety. 2. Damage to public infrastructure and developed public property. 3. Damage to private structures. 4. Damage to significant natural resources

Solution Efficacy -- Part A				
List Recommended Action	Identified Problems <small>(What problems the recommendation should be addressing.)</small>	Does the recommendation address the problem?	Does the recommendation address the problem source or treat a symptom?	Time frame for problem resolution <small>(e.g. immediate, 1yr, etc.)</small>
1. Stabilize embankment. 2. Stabilize Spillway Channel. 3. Drain Pond				

Solution Efficacy-- Part B			SCORE:	
What is the longevity of the recommendation?	Recommendation Readiness <small>(e.g. need further study, ready for feasibility, ready to build. Also, include what else is needed.)</small>	What are the benefits on a Geographic Scale? <small>Site/Reach/Watershed</small>	Cost	
			\$75k - \$250K	