Exhibit "14"

STATE OF WASHINGTON
DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY
PO Box 47775 • Olympia, Washington 98504-7775 • (360) 407-6300
711 for Washington Relay Service • Persons with a speech disability can call 877-833-6341

January 26, 2016

City of Camas, SEPA Official
Community Development Department
PO Box 1055
Camas, WA 98607

Dear SEPA Official:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the determination of nonsignificance for the Parklands at Camas Meadows Project (SEPA15-14) located east of Camas Meadows Golf Course Club House and north of Camas Meadows Drive as proposed by James Kessi, Parklands and Camas Meadows LLC. The Department of Ecology (Ecology) reviewed the environmental checklist and has the following comment(s):

SHORELANDS & ENVIRONMENTAL ASSISTANCE:
Rebecca Rothwell (360) 407-7273

Proposed Stormwater Discharge:
I understand from the SEPA checklist that the applicant is proposing to release treated stormwater into the on-site wetland. The wetland is rated as a Category 3 with a habitat score of 5 under the 2014 wetland rating system (20 under the 2004 rating system). According to both the 2004 rating and the 2014 ratings, the wetland's habitat score exceeds the maximum score for the wetland to be used for treated stormwater discharge. I understand that Camas has asked the applicant for an ecological rationale in order to consider the possibility of allowing stormwater discharge even though the wetland does not meet this criterion, because the habitat score is only slightly higher than the cutoff score.

Per Guide Sheet 2 (Appendix I-D Guidelines for Wetlands when Managing Stormwater) of the 2012 Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington, as Amended in December 2014 (Ecology publication #14-10-055), a wetland may not be used for stormwater discharge if it scores more than 4 points on the habitat score for the wetland rating or contains a breeding population of native amphibian species (highlighting mine):

Guide Sheet 2:

A wetland can be physically or hydrologically altered to meet the requirements of a treatment or flow control BMP/facility if ALL of the following criteria are met:

Modifications that alter the structure of a wetland or its soils will require permits. Existing functions and values that are lost would have to be compensated/replaced.

1. It is classified in Category IV in the "Washington State Wetland Rating System of Western Washington," or a Category III wetland with a habitat score of 19 points or less. (19 points corresponds to 4 points in the 2014 rating system)

2. You can demonstrate that there will be "no net loss" of functions and values of the wetland as a result of the structural or hydrologic modifications done to provide control of runoff and water quality. This includes the impacts from the machinery used for the construction. Heavy equipment can often damage the soil structure of a wetland. However, the functions and values of degraded wetlands may sometimes be increased by such alterations and thus would be self-mitigating. Functions and values that are not replaced on site will have to be mitigated elsewhere.

a. Modifications that alter the structure of a wetland or its soils will require permits. Check with the agency(ies) issuing the permits for the modification(s) to determine which method to use to establish "no net loss."

b. A wetland will usually sustain fewer impacts if the required storage capacity can be met through a modification of the outlet rather than through raising the existing overflow.

3. The wetland does not contain a breeding population of any native amphibian species.

4. The hydrologic functions of the wetland can be improved as outlined in questions 3, 4, 5 of Chart 4 and questions 2, 3, 4 of Chart 5 in the "Guide for Selecting Mitigation Sites Using a Watershed Approach," (available here: http://www.ecy.wa.gov/biblio/0906032.html); or the wetland is part of a priority restoration plan that achieves restoration goals identified in a Shoreline Master Program or other local or regional watershed plan.

5. The wetland lies in the natural routing of the runoff, and the discharge follows the natural routing.

In order to make an assessment of whether it would be advisable to use the wetland for stormwater storage despite the habitat score, we need to look at the specifics of the habitat features. Two important ones are:

(1) There is a large area of seasonally ponded emergent wetland, and
(2) There is more than ¼ acre of thin-stemmed persistent vegetation.

These are conditions that provide prime amphibian breeding habitat. In addition, the upland habitat that is available adjacent to the wetland would be non-breeding-season amphibian habitat.

I don't know whether amphibians are using the site, but having the habitat available for amphibians is also important. The recent federal listing of the Oregon spotted frog as threatened under the Endangered Species Act highlights the importance of emergent wetland areas that can provide amphibian breeding habitat. The burden of proof is on the applicant to demonstrate that the wetland does not contain a breeding population of any native amphibian species.

Based on the habitat score, the type of habitat present in the wetland, and the possibility that the wetland contains a breeding population of native amphibians, using this wetland for stormwater discharge is inadvisable unless the applicant to demonstrate that using the wetland for stormwater discharge would cause no ecological harm.

Proposed Buffer Reductions:
The wetland delineation report (Ecological Land Services, August 2015, pp. 6-7) presents a buffer-reduction plan. According to the Camas critical areas ordinance (CAO), standard buffer widths may be reduced under the following conditions, provided that functions of the post-project wetland are equal to or greater after use of these incentives. The first of these conditions is that a "relatively undisturbed, vegetated corridor at least one hundred feet wide is protected between the wetland and any other priority habitats that are present as defined by the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife." The corridor described in the wetland report does not appear to meet these requirements. Looking on Clark County GIS aerial maps at what I believe is the area described as the proposed corridor, I see that there is a golf course trail, an area of mowed and maintained lawn, and a paved, public pedestrian trail. **These are disturbed areas and are breaks in the corridor.**

The CAO also requires that the habitat corridor be protected for the entire distance between the wetland and the priority habitat area by some type of permanent legal protection such as a covenant or easement. Part of the property where the corridor is proposed belongs to the golf course, and part of it belongs to Clark County Parks. Even without the disturbed areas and breaks in the proposed corridor, it is difficult to imagine that either of these property owners would allow a covenant or easement to be placed over portions of their property that would preclude recreational use, especially when recreational use is the purpose of both properties.

The delineation report, on page 7, proposes an additional buffer reduction based on the following CAO language: "Buffer widths may be reduced up to twenty-five percent if the buffer is restored or enhanced from a pre-project condition that is disturbed (e.g., dominated

by invasive species), so that functions of the post-project wetland and buffer are equal or greater."

According to aerial maps (Clark County GIS), it looks like the buffer is mostly forested. Having Himalayan blackberry in the understory is not the same as having the buffer "dominated" by invasive species, as the delineation report states. In fact, having a forested buffer is the goal in most wetland protection and mitigation plans. The existing forested buffer helps to shield the wetland from noise, light, and intrusion; and it can also provide habitat for many species. **Reducing a forested buffer is directly contrary to the objective of restoring the buffer under CAO.**

The applicant further proposes to reduce the buffer to the minimum width allowed by the CAO under combined reductions (50 feet), even though using combined reductions would result in a buffer of 67.5 feet. No rationale is given for this third proposed reduction.

None of the proposed buffer reductions appears to be consistent with the requirements of the Camas CAO. The CAO's mitigation requirements state that the applicant shall avoid all impacts that degrade the functions and values of a critical area or areas (16.51.160).

REVIEWER: Sonia Mendoza
WATER QUALITY CONTACT: Deborah Cornett (360) 407-7269

Erosion control measures must be in place prior to any clearing, grading, or construction. These control measures must be effective to prevent stormwater runoff from carrying soil and other pollutants into surface water or stormdrains that lead to waters of the state. Sand, silt, clay particles, and soil will damage aquatic habitat and are considered to be pollutants.

Any discharge of sediment-laden runoff or other pollutants to waters of the state is in violation of Chapter 90.48 RCW, Water Pollution Control, and WAC 173-201A, Water Quality Standards for Surface Waters of the State of Washington, and is subject to enforcement action.

The following construction activities require coverage under the Construction Stormwater General Permit:

1. Clearing, grading and/or excavation that results in the disturbance of one or more acres **and** discharges stormwater to surface waters of the State; and
2. Clearing, grading and/or excavation on sites smaller than one acre that are part of a larger common plan of development or sale, if the common plan of development or sale will ultimately disturb one acre or more **and** discharge stormwater to surface waters of the State.
    a) This includes forest practices (including, but not limited to, class IV conversions) that are part of a construction activity that will result in the disturbance of one or more acres, **and** discharge to surface waters of the State; and

3. Any size construction activity discharging stormwater to waters of the State that Ecology:
   a) Determines to be a significant contributor of pollutants to waters of the State of Washington.
   b) Reasonably expects to cause a violation of any water quality standard.

If there are known soil/ground water contaminants present on-site, additional information (including, but not limited to: temporary erosion and sediment control plans; stormwater pollution prevention plan; list of known contaminants with concentrations and depths found; a site map depicting the sample location(s); and additional studies/reports regarding contaminant(s)) will be required to be submitted.

You may apply online or obtain an application from Ecology's website at: http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wq/stormwater/construction/ - Application. Construction site operators must apply for a permit at least 60 days prior to discharging stormwater from construction activities and must submit it on or before the date of the first public notice.

Ecology's comments are based upon information provided by the lead agency. As such, they may not constitute an exhaustive list of the various authorizations that must be obtained or legal requirements that must be fulfilled in order to carry out the proposed action.

If you have any questions or would like to respond to these comments, please contact the appropriate reviewing staff listed above.

Department of Ecology
Southwest Regional Office

(SM:16-0119)

cc: Deborah Cornett, WQ
Joyce Smith, HQ/WQ
Rebecca Rothwell, SEA
James Kessi, Parklands and Camas Meadows LLC (Applicant)