

Lake Washington/Sammamish SMP Guidance:

Fall
2008

To: Lake Washington/Sammamish Local Government; staff, planning commissions, citizen advisory committee and elected officials working on updating Shoreline Master Programs

From: Washington State Department of Ecology – Shorelands & Environmental Assistance Program

Subject: On-going guidance on Shoreline Master Program updates

Ecology is aware of recent letters and emails raising questions related to updates of local Shoreline Master Programs (SMP) within Lake Washington and Lake Sammamish. In an effort to offset any miscommunication and ensure broad understanding of the SMP Guidelines (WAC 173-26), Ecology has attempted to synthesize many of the comments voiced and provide some guidance to these questions for your consideration.

SMP QUESTIONS SENT TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS:

What is the definition of “No Net Loss of Ecological Functions”? Is “no net loss” applied state-wide, by jurisdiction or on a project-by-project basis?

What is No Net Loss of Ecological Functions? Simply stated, the no net loss standard is designed to halt the introduction of new impacts to shoreline ecological functions resulting from planned for and permitted new development. This means that through implementation of the updated SMP, the existing condition of shoreline ecological functions should remain the same or be improved over time. The Shoreline Master Program Guidelines (Guidelines) set forth the obligation to assure that no net loss of ecological functions will be achieved within the SMP’s planning horizon by implementing updated SMP policies and regulations. No net loss of ecological function is a jurisdiction specific determination that is based on anticipated future uses and associated ecological risks from allowed uses within shoreline areas. SMA policy and the Guidelines recognize the need to balance both *use* and *protection* of shoreline resources. Thus, SMPs must provide for preferred shoreline uses set forth in the SMA (RCW 90.58.020). These include water-dependent uses like port development, public access facilities, and owner occupied single-family residences. Impacts resulting from these preferred shoreline uses, when they cannot be avoided, must be reduced by other SMP environment designations and regulations which follow the required mitigation sequence. Achieving no net loss of ecological function relies on consistent application of mitigation sequencing. Mitigation sequencing sets a priority to first avoid, then minimize, rectify, reduce or compensate for impacts

The no net loss analysis is intended to inform the SMP planning process by describing both the presence and potential risks to existing shoreline ecological functions. The analysis should evaluate the intensity of future uses that are appropriate for segments of shorelines to ensure no overall or net loss of ecological functions. A no net loss of ecological functions determination will need to be justified by local governments through a Cumulative Impact Analysis, which essentially anticipates build-out of shoreline areas pursuant to the intensity of development allowed through the updated SMP. This determination must conclude that build-out of the local shoreline will not further threaten existing shoreline ecological functions. In sum, the no net loss

Lake Washington/Sammamish SMP Guidance:

Fall
2008

standard applies to each local jurisdiction as it updates its SMP. Consistent with the no net loss standard, the required mitigation sequence is also applied as the SMP is implemented over time and individual shoreline projects are reviewed and approved by local government. Mitigation sequencing and/or alternative project specific monitoring for no net loss, should provide clear linkage to jurisdiction-wide not net loss goals.

The Department of Ecology (DOE) is overstepping its authority. DOE has an agenda. DOE is over regulating Piers/Docks and Bulkheads without conclusive evidence of their affect on shoreline resources (i.e. overlapping regulations unwarranted changes)

By way of example, recent studies focusing on the affects of shoreline alterations to salmon migration in the littoral environment of lakes (Tabor et al, 2002)¹ (Kahler et al, 2000)² have raised concern pertaining to both the physical barrier of a dock/pier as well as affects to aquatic habitat for both migrating and rearing salmon species. In addition to environmental concerns, increased pier/dock density along shorelines can also negatively affect “normal public use” of the shoreline for recreation and navigation uses upon waters of the state. The state legislature, in RCW 90.58.020 policy, lists Environmental Protection and Public Access as fundamental policy goals/preferred uses within the Shoreline Management Act. In order to provide environmental protection to shorelines, local jurisdictions are required to document existing ecological functions within a shoreline Inventory/Characterization (WAC 173-26-201). The Guidelines (WAC 173-26, Part III) require local governments to address cumulative impacts by considering commonly occurring shoreline development and foreseeable impacts caused or avoided by proposed SMP policies and regulations. Ultimately, SMP policy and regulations must ensure no net loss of ecological functions with reference to the baseline shoreline conditions described within the locally prepared Inventory/Characterization.

In preparing shoreline regulations, local governments are also required to implement a precautionary principle. At WAC 173-26-201(3)(g) the guidelines state “*As a general rule, the less known about existing resources, the more protective shoreline master program provisions should be to avoid unanticipated impacts to shoreline resources*”. If there is a question about the extent or condition of an existing ecological resource, then the master program provisions shall be sufficient to reasonably assure that the resource is protected in a manner consistent with the policies of these guidelines.

Local governments are required to regulate Piers/Docks through the following sections of the SMP Guidelines (WAC 173-27-211):

¹ Tabor, R.A., and R.M Piaskowski, 2002. Nearshore habitat use by juvenile Chinook salmon to lentic systems of the Lake Washington Basin. Annual Report, 2001. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Lacey, WA.

² Kahler, T.,M. Grassley and David Beauchamp. 2000. A summary of the effects of bulkheads, pier and other artificial structures and Shorezone development on ESA-listed salmonids in lakes. City of Bellevue

Lake Washington/Sammamish SMP Guidance:

**Fall
2008**

- WAC 173-26-211(5)(c)(ii)(D) states: *“All developments and uses on navigable waters or their beds should be located and designed to minimize interference with surface navigation ... and to allow for the safe, unobstructed passage of fish and wildlife, particularly those species dependent on migration.”*
- WAC 173-26-231(b) *“Piers and docks, including those accessory to single-family residences, shall be designed and constructed to avoid or, if that is not possible, to minimize and mitigate the impacts to ecological functions...”*
- WAC 173-26-221 (2)(c)(iii) and (iv). *“Master programs should require that structures be made of materials that have been approved by applicable state agencies.”*

Flexibility versus specific standards for Piers/Docks? Redevelopment standards versus new Piers/Docks standards?

In order to meet the no net loss requirement, jurisdictions updating their SMP's must consider the cumulative impacts of future allowed shoreline uses. Specific to Piers/Docks, jurisdictions will need to refer to specific development standards as a basis for evaluating the build-out potential allowed through future implementation of the updated SMP. This analysis of cumulative impacts must consider the potential risks to shoreline ecological functions if the shoreline were to be fully developed to the maximum intensity allowed through the updated SMP. Therefore, specific to new Piers/Docks, dimensional standards must be proposed as part of the updated SMP. Without specific standards, there would be no certainty in local projections of future (planned) shoreline uses and their impacts and hence no justification that the no net loss standard will be achieved.

The Army Corps of Engineers Regional General Permit (RGP) #3 consist of regionally specific, science based Pier/Dock development standards. These standards reflect completed consultation for Endangered Species Act (ESA) Section 7 and essential fish habitat (EFH) review from federal resource agencies. Pursuant to the SMP Guidelines, updated SMP's are required to be based on objective use of relevant scientific information, for which the RGP standards provide an opportunity for local jurisdictions to incorporate existing minimizing Pier/Dock standards. Local jurisdictions have the option to come up with different standards, but they will need to supply sufficient science based analysis illustrating potential risks to shoreline ecologic functions. Regardless, if jurisdictions decide to utilize the RGP standards or create their own Pier/Dock standards consideration of cumulative impacts as well as a determination of no net loss (risk) of shoreline ecological functions must be concluded.

Existing Pier/Dock redevelopment strategies will need to be jurisdiction specific. These standards should be based on the jurisdictions SMP Inventory/Characterization, with appropriate sideboards identified to ensure that expanded or reconstructed Piers/Docks will not result in net loss of ecological functions. For example, a shoreline with a high density of existing Piers/Docks, may be able to define redevelopment standards that allow some flexibility in the size or orientation of the redeveloped overwater footprint or structures, while also incorporating some degree of restoration. This management strategy must acknowledge existing shoreline resources and maintain or restore shoreline ecological functions through

redevelopment. Restoration of impaired ecological functions should be included in the evaluation of no net loss to help offset impacts introduced from new planned shoreline development allowed in the updated SMP. Alternatively, with less developed shorelines, Ecology suggests that local governments clearly distinguish between new and re-development standards to ensure adequate protection of existing ecological functions.

Streamlined permitting process at what cost to property rights?

It is anticipated that any identified streamlined process would not be the only option available to shoreline property owners. For certain uses, local governments do have an opportunity through updating of their SMP to pre-analyze impacts of certain minimal impact activities and provide a streamlined review process for those limited uses. In general, the scope of projects fitting within a streamlined permitting process must be more specific and potentially restrictive to ensure certainty and broad consistency with SMP goals and policies. For example, Pier/Dock proposals consistent with federally established guidelines could be streamlined through a local shoreline permit process for some shoreline areas where shoreline ecological functions can be shown to not be negatively impacted.

Restrictive Pier/Dock standards are thwarting of shoreline property owner's property rights.

Under Washington State law a private dock is not a shoreline property right associated with ownership of shorelines of the state. Construction of a dock or pier is a privilege that may be allowed under certain circumstances when consistent with Shoreline Management Act policy (RCW 90.58.020), the local government Shoreline Master Program and the Public Trust Doctrine.

The Public Trust Doctrine is a legal principle derived from English Common Law. The essence of the doctrine is that the waters of the state are a public resource owned by and available to all citizens equally for the purposes of navigation, conducting commerce, fishing, recreation and similar uses and that this trust is not invalidated by private ownership of the underlying land. The doctrine limits public and private use of tidelands and other shorelands to protect the public's right to use the waters of the state. (See State Supreme Court case *Caminiti v. Boyle*, 107 Wn. 2d 662, 732 P.2d 1989). The Public Trust Doctrine does not allow the public to trespass over privately owned uplands to access the tidelands. It does, however, protect public use of navigable water bodies below the ordinary high water mark. Protection of the trust is a duty of the State, and the Shoreline Management Act is one of the primary means by which that duty is carried out. The doctrine requires a careful evaluation of the public interest served by any action proposed. This requirement is fulfilled, in major part, by the planning and permitting requirements of the Shoreline Management Act and locally approved SMPs.

In any case, local governments do have the authority to regulate the size and require mitigation for potential impacts associated with docks to protect the public interest.

QUESTIONS DIRECTED TO ECOLOGY:**What baseline is used for each individual property based on the SMP Guideline no net loss of ecological function requirement?**

The baseline for SMP updates is derived from the individual shoreline Inventory and Characterization prepared for each jurisdiction during the initial stages of their shoreline program update. This analysis is intended to inform the SMP planning process through description of both the presence and potential risks to existing shoreline ecological functions as described within WAC 173-26-201(3)(c) and (d). The Inventory/Characterization is not necessarily intended to evaluate individual properties. Rather, the analysis should describe what intensity of future shoreline uses and activities should be planned and anticipated for each segment of shoreline to ensure that the end result is no overall or net loss of ecological functions. In other words, it is understood (and should be evaluated) that some projects will have minimal negative impacts and some projects will improve ecologic conditions, as long as a jurisdiction can illustrate overall maintenance or improvement to ecological conditions, then they are meeting the no net loss requirement. The no net loss determination will need to be justified through a Cumulative Impacts Analysis, which essentially anticipates build-out of shoreline areas pursuant to the intensity of development allowed through the updated SMP. With this information, the impacts to existing shoreline ecological functions resulting from future development can be anticipated and where appropriate avoided. It is important to understand that this analysis will vary by jurisdiction and is fundamentally based upon the characteristics of each individual jurisdiction's shoreline.

Specific to implementation of an updated SMP, individual project review should consider no net loss as a governing principal (WAC 173-26-186), So, in summary, the baseline for each individual property is the ecological conditions that existed at the time a local SMP is comprehensively updated per SMP Guidelines requirements.

Will new piers or bulkheads replacing existing structures be evaluated against existing site conditions?

Yes, existing site conditions are one consideration, but also the specific planning policies and regulations contained in the SMP that apply to new piers and bulkhead replacements and the particular shoreline site will need to be considered as well. SMP updates are two-dimensional, requiring jurisdiction-wide planning for future uses as well as implementation over time of the SMP on an individual project-by-project basis. From a jurisdiction-wide planning perspective, the shoreline Inventory and Characterization documents shoreline modifications that may or may not impair existing shoreline ecological functions. Regardless of the degree of existing modifications, the bottom line is that updated SMP's need to adequately protect existing shoreline ecological functions. For example, within heavily developed shorelines, redevelopment strategies that account for improvements to existing site conditions might be an appropriate approach. Whereas, within unaltered (natural) shorelines, emphasis should be placed on protection measures for which existing structures should be phased out overtime as existing non-conforming uses.

Example Question: How is DOE suggesting local governments view a scenario where an applicant is pulling a full length bulkhead and replacing with transitional bulkheads at either end and a cove beach in the middle?

Ecology would be in support of partial restoration of shorelines as described within the scenario above, because it represents an improvement in existing conditions when compared to the existing full length bulkhead. For jurisdictions with highly developed shorelines, Ecology would suggest that local governments clearly describe redevelopment perimeters to encourage partial shoreline restoration.

What is DOE doing to encourage local governments to have a process acknowledging individual improvements associated with shoreline redevelopment?

As previously stated, redevelopment strategies should be jurisdiction specific with appropriate sideboards to ensure no net loss. Also, as part of the comprehensive SMP update, jurisdictions are creating individually customized shoreline restoration plans, where non-regulatory shoreline improvements would be prioritized and encouraged for each stretch of shoreline. In implementing a local restoration plan, all jurisdictions should be encouraged to maintain a list of *“individual improvements associated with shoreline redevelopment”*, so that in the future progress can be identified and evaluated.

Does DOE have a responsibility to protect local governments from vulnerability to thwarting private property rights of shoreline property owners?

Both local governments and the department have the responsibility to ensure private property rights in shoreline areas are not thwarted. There are multiple references both in the SMA itself (starting at RCW 90.58.020) and again in the SMP Guidelines (starting at WAC 173-26-176(3)(h)) ensuring private property rights are protected.

Local governments are directed to consider private property rights in the preparation of all local SMPs as is Ecology and the Attorney General’s Office (AGO) when approving the SMPs. Specifically, the AGO is directed by state law to advise state agencies and local governments in an orderly, consistent process to evaluate proposed regulatory or administrative actions to assure that these actions do not result in unconstitutional takings of private property. The AGO does in fact review SMP submittals to ensure private property rights are protected before the SMPs are approved by Ecology. Following is a link to this guidance posted on our shorelines management web site:

[http://www.atg.wa.gov/uploadedFiles/Home/About_the_Office/Takings/2006%20AGO%20Takings%20Guidance\(1\).pdf](http://www.atg.wa.gov/uploadedFiles/Home/About_the_Office/Takings/2006%20AGO%20Takings%20Guidance(1).pdf)

How is DOE addressing the apparent conflict with biological consulting firms assisting local governments in their SMP update in fairly evaluating and applying SMP standards in a reasonable and practical manner?

Biological consulting firms when involved in SMP updates are only one source of available information. Local governments are required to use all available technical and scientific information in the development of their SMP. This includes contacting all *“relevant state agencies, universities, affected Indian tribes, port districts and private parties for available information.... The requirement to use scientific and technical information in these guidelines does not limit a local jurisdiction's authority to solicit and incorporate information, experience, and anecdotal evidence provided by interested parties as part of the master program amendment process. Such information should be solicited through the public participation process...”* (WAC 173-26-201(2)(a).

It is not clear how any conflict exists if there is no limitation on sources of available information. Ultimately, local government elected officials must consider all of the information put before them, including opposing views and opinions, judge their credibility and decide what standards best achieve SMP guidelines requirements, given local circumstances.