



## **MEMORANDUM**

**To:** David Ramsay, City Manager

**From:** Stacy Clauson, Contract Planner  
Paul Stewart, Deputy Director of Planning  
Teresa Swan, Senior Planner

**Date:** October 30, 2008

**Subject:** Shoreline Master Program, File No. ZON06-00017, Subfile #3

### **I. INTRODUCTION**

The purpose of this memo is to provide the Council with a status report on the update to the City's Shoreline Master Program. The Planning Commission and Houghton Community Council are currently conducting study sessions and are beginning to work on the draft regulations after having completed their initial review of the goals and policies. Staff will brief the Council on this project in early 2009. In this memo we have provided links to various documents if the Council desires to look at more detailed information.

### **II. PROGRESS TO DATE**

#### **A. Goals, Policies, and Regulations**

The [Final Shoreline Analysis Report](#) was completed in December 2006. Staff and the Planning Commission have been using the information from this report to develop the goals, policies and regulations of the SMP. It is important to note that the inventory and analysis work will be used to write master program policies and regulations designed to achieve "no net loss" of ecological functions. The Analysis Report will also form the basis for the shoreline restoration plan. The goals, policies, and regulations are to be based on the data and analysis given in the Shoreline Analysis Report.

The Planning Commission and Houghton Community Council have developed a comprehensive set of [Goals and Policies](#) for the shoreline. Staff is now working with the Planning Commission and Houghton Community Council on the proposed [regulations](#) that are consistent with the goals and policies. After review of the City's existing SMP regulations and the new State Guidelines, the City has determined that the current SMP is not consistent with many key requirements of the new Guidelines.

As part of the recent public meetings that have taken place before the Planning Commission, a number of shoreline property owners have attended and submitted public comments expressing concern about potential new regulations being considered as part of the update to the Shoreline Master Program. These are discussed in more detailed in Section F of this memo under "Shoreline Property Owner Concerns".

## **B. State Requirements**

Kirkland is required to update our Shoreline Master Program by 2009. As part of this process, the City must implement the principles established in the Shoreline Management Act (RCW 90.58). Washington's Shoreline Management Act (SMA) was passed by the Legislature in 1971 and adopted by the public in a 1972 referendum. The goal of the SMA is "to prevent the inherent harm in an uncoordinated and piecemeal development of the state's shorelines." The Act establishes a broad policy giving preference to uses that:

- Protect the quality of water and the natural environment,
- Depend on proximity to the shoreline ("water-dependent uses"), and
- Preserve and enhance public access or increase recreational opportunities for the public along shorelines.

Under this statute, local governments, in amending their SMPs, are required to:

- Designate preferred uses on the shoreline;
- Protect shoreline natural resources;
- Promote public access; and
- Manage Shorelines of Statewide Significance (which includes Lake Washington) for the long-term benefit of all citizens of the state.

To assist in the update effort, the state has adopted [state shoreline management guidelines](#) (WAC 173-26), which are standards that Kirkland must follow in drafting our updated master program. The Guidelines translate the broad policies of RCW 90.58.020 into standards for regulation of shoreline uses. The update must also be consistent with our local planning under the Growth Management Act, including providing a level of protection equal or greater than critical areas regulations. While the program must be based on these state Guidelines, it can be tailored to the specific needs of Kirkland.

Local shoreline master programs combine both plans and regulations. The plans are a comprehensive vision of how shoreline areas will be used and developed over time. Regulations are the standards that shoreline projects and uses must meet. The Shoreline Master Program applies to land within 200 feet of Lake Washington's high water mark and within wetlands connected to Juanita Bay and Yarrow Bay.

The SMA establishes a balance of authority between local and state government. Cities and counties are the primary regulators but the state (*through the Department of Ecology*) has authority to review and approve local programs and many local permit decisions. Ecology provides technical assistance to all local governments undertaking master program amendments. Master program amendments are effective after **Ecology's approval**. In reviewing master programs, Ecology makes a decision on whether or not the proposed changes are consistent with the policy and provisions of the Act and state Shoreline Master Program Guidelines.

In order to meet the new state requirements established in the 2003 Guidelines, there are a number of key areas that need to be evaluated and potentially updated in our SMP:

- The City's current regulations on **shoreline stabilization** are not consistent with the new state Guidelines. The new Guidelines place a greater emphasis on ensuring that new development is properly sited so as not to need new shoreline stabilization structures, on

restricting the use of hard structural shoreline stabilization measures such as bulkheads, and of prioritizing the use (only when needed) of soft structural shoreline stabilization measures in lieu of more traditional bulkheads. Examples of soft structural shoreline stabilization can be found in Attachment 7.

As a result, the Guidelines require that new, enlarged, and replacement structural shoreline stabilization measures may only be permitted if it is supported by a geotechnical report that addresses the necessity of the shoreline stabilization measure. Further, if the proposed development is new, there must also be a demonstration that non-structural measures are not feasible or not sufficient. Replacement structures are treated the same as new shoreline stabilization structures, which is causing concern by shoreline property owners. City staff is working with the Commission to provide clear direction on the threshold of what constitutes repair and what is replacement. .

- The City's current regulations on **shoreline vegetation** need adjustment in order to protect existing shoreline vegetation.
- The City's current regulations on **piers and docks** need adjustment in order to address potential impacts to aquatic habitat. The Department of Ecology has advised local jurisdictions that they will be looking for specific dimensional standards to address issues such as pier size and pier grating.
- The **setbacks along the shoreline** need review in order to determine whether these provisions provide adequate protection of ecological functions and minimize the need for shoreline stabilization.
- The City's SMP now needs to meet a **no net loss** standard. The Guidelines require that the impacts of establishing uses or conducting development are identified and mitigated with a final result that is no worse than maintaining the current level of environmental resource productivity or "no net loss". 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 current level is established based upon the 2006 Final Shoreline Analysis.

The no net loss standard is designed to halt the introduction of new impacts to shoreline ecological functions resulting from new development. Impacts resulting from shoreline uses, when they cannot be avoided, must be reduced by other SMP environment designations and regulations which follow the required mitigation sequence. Mitigation sequencing sets a priority to first avoid, then minimize, rectify, reduce or compensate for impacts. Since most types of new shoreline developments produce at least some degree of impact to ecological functions, the no net loss standard means that the SMP must contain provisions for mitigating these unavoidable impacts. As a result, if new shoreline development is to occur (new or expanded bulkheads, docks, or shoreline buildings) while meeting the no net loss standard, some lessening of existing impacts must occur through private and/or public restoration. In order to meet the no net loss standard, the City may also need to adjust some of its current provisions to further avoid and reduce new impacts.

A no net loss of ecological functions determination will need to be justified by the City through a Cumulative Impact Analysis, which essentially anticipates build-out of shoreline areas based on 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.

The 2006 Final Shoreline Analysis Report identified a number of recommended opportunities to lessen existing impacts, such as reducing or modifying the amount of shoreline armoring, reducing overwater coverage and in-water structures (grated pier decking, pier size reduction, pile size and quantity reduction, moorage cover removal), improvements to nearshore native vegetation cover, and reductions in impervious surfaces. The City has a number of options that it could explore to initiate these type of improvements, including new regulations, regulatory incentives, permitting incentives and financial incentives, such as grants, as well as City-initiated restoration on city-owned properties, but we need to be able to demonstrate that the impacts generated by new development and redevelopment are mitigated to the greatest extent feasible, and for any remaining impacts, are offset by these improvements. Therefore, in selecting among these options, we need to ensure that the option has a viable chance of being implemented. City staff is working with the Planning Commission to review these options and determine which are more appropriate. One concept that has drawn particular concern from property owners was an option that would trigger the need to implement shoreline restoration activities, such as bulkhead replacement or, if that is not feasible, shoreline vegetation installation or placement of gravel in front of existing bulkheads, with new development and significant redevelopment on the site. The Planning Commission is still discussing this issue.

- Apart from preventing net loss of shoreline ecological functions, the new SMP is also required to include a **Restoration Plan**. No one, including DOE, expects the Kirkland shoreline to be restored to pre-settlement conditions. So, in this case, the State guidelines use the term “restoration” generally to describe actions ranging from complete rehabilitation, e.g. replacing a bulkhead with a softened, natural edge (some gently-sloping beach and some native vegetation), to any ecologically helpful action, e. g. removing some invasive non-native plants, planting some native plants, or making the portion of the dock closest to land narrower to reduce shade in the near-shore (where juvenile Chinook salmon are attacked by predator fish in shady areas). Unlike the ‘no net loss’ requirement that will be addressed through regulations, the restoration plan will rely on some combination of incentives, public projects, volunteers, and non-profit programs for implementation.

In response to concerns directed at the Department of Ecology regarding the SMP update process being undertaken throughout the region, DOE recently issued a response letter that addresses some of these State requirements and DOE’s position on some of these key issues (see Attachment 6).

### **C. State and Federal Permitting Issues**

When dealing with structures either in or along the edge of Lake Washington, there are other state and federal jurisdictions, such as the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), which have permitting authority.

For instance, the Corps and WDFW both have jurisdiction over bulkhead construction and some repair projects, and are strongly encouraging property owners to implement fish- and wildlife-friendly shoreline protection measures when feasible. The Corps has recently issued a Regional General Permit which provides a streamlined permitting process for projects which,

depending upon the existing site conditions, either result in replacement of hard structural shoreline stabilization structures with soft structural shoreline stabilization measures, or, if this is not feasible, soften the shoreline edge by placing spawning gravels in front of existing bulkheads or installing plantings on the shoreline edge. The City is trying to ensure that our own policies are consistent with these provisions in order to provide a more coordinated permitting process across the local, state and federal jurisdictions. As an example, the draft regulations propose a simpler and reduced level of review for soft structural shoreline stabilization measures than hard structural stabilization measures. In some cases, the soft structural shoreline stabilization may qualify as a restoration project and only require a Shoreline Exemption from the City, saving time and money.

Further, in order to better enable shoreline property owners to implement soft structural shoreline stabilization approaches in Kirkland, the proposed regulations would allow placement of fill material for purposes of habitat enhancement waterward of the ordinary high water mark (OHWM). This will allow property owners who are not able to remove their hard structural stabilization to improve shoreline function, and increases design flexibility for those who can remove their hard structural stabilization. In addition, for those restoration projects that result in shifts of the OHWM landward of its existing location, the waterfront setbacks and lot coverage would be measured from the pre-restoration OHWM location. This could be a significant flexible technique that would be an incentive to implement a soft shoreline design.

Many of the requirements for shoreline stabilization structures that the City is considering (e.g. for consideration of shoreline protection alternatives when constructing replacement or new bulkheads) are already addressed by the Corps and WDFW that have permitting authority. Therefore the City, in many cases, is not imposing new requirements that would not otherwise need to be met or require significant additional cost and permitting time for property owners to identify appropriate alternatives.

#### **D. Salmon Recovery Efforts**

There are other federal efforts that also impact the City's approach to shoreline management – in particular, the listings of Chinook salmon, bull trout, and steelhead as threatened under the Endangered Species Act. This has required that the City take the following actions:

- Participate in WRIA 8 regional groups that developed and that now coordinate implementation of the WRIA 8 Chinook Salmon Conservation Plan
- Adopt and implement the WRIA 8 Chinook Salmon Conservation Plan,

Implementation of the WRIA 8 Chinook Salmon Conservation Plan involves both the Planning and Public Works Departments. The City does not currently have streams that support significant Chinook salmon populations, and so Kirkland's responsibilities under the plan are to provide cool clean water to Lake Washington, to protect and improve shoreline habitat conditions that are important for juvenile Chinook using Lake Washington, to protect and improve habitat for Coho salmon (Coho salmon eat cutthroat trout which are a major predator of Chinook juveniles in Lake Washington), and to participate in regional coordination and monitoring efforts. Efforts to protect streams and water quality include actions by all City departments, but the main emphasis is on land use regulations, such as critical areas, shoreline management and tree retention, created and managed by the Planning Department, and on surface water management programs implemented by the Public Works Surface Water Utility.

In 2005, after nearly five years of collaboration among citizens, scientists, community groups, businesses, environmental groups, public agencies and elected officials, 27 local governments, including Kirkland, ratified the Lake Washington/Cedar/Sammamish Watershed (WRIA 8)

Chinook Salmon Conservation Plan. This plan, together with other plans prepared throughout the Puget Sound region, became part of the official Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Plan approved by NOAA Fisheries Service in 2007. In adopting the resolution ratifying this Plan (Resolution 4510) the City committed to using the scientific foundation and the conservation strategy as the basis for local actions recommended in the Plan and as one source of best available science for future projects, ordinances, and other appropriate local government activities. It was also noted that the comprehensive list of actions should be used as a source of potential site-specific projects and land use and public outreach recommendations.

The WRIA 8's efforts at the local jurisdiction level focus on the conservation and restoration of salmon habitat. For Lake Washington nearshore areas, the WRIA 8 key recommendations are to reduce bank hardening, restore overhanging riparian vegetation, replace bulkheads and rip-rap with sandy beaches and gentle slopes, use plastic mesh rather than solid wood dock surfaces, and reduce the number of docks for more shared docks. City staff is looking for opportunities to respond to the recommendations in the updated SMP.

### **E. Scientific Basis**

The region's response to the listing of Chinook salmon, bull trout, and steelhead has resulted in new scientific data and research that has improved our understanding of shoreline ecological functions and their value in terms of fish and wildlife, water quality, and human health. As noted, one of the sources for the scientific foundation is the WRIA 8 Chinook Salmon Conservation Plan, which has been supported by the City. City staff has provided links to many of the scientific studies that have been completed or are underway on the Shoreline Master Program Update page of the City's website.

### **F. Shoreline Property Owners' Concerns**

As part of the update process, staff has been working with the Planning Commission to review a number of different options that could potentially be incorporated into the update to the SMP to address issues of shoreline stabilization, shoreline vegetation, and shoreline restoration. More detailed information on property owner concerns can be found in individual communications contained within the [September 11](#) and [October 9, 2008](#) Planning Commission memos available on the City's web site, but in general the issues being addressed, as posed by the property owners, can be summarized as follows:

1. Concern over regulations that would require removal of existing bulkheads. Many shoreline property owners have emphasized the value they place upon the protection that their bulkheads provide from impacts caused by strong wave currents and boat wakes along the shoreline. Property owners have also raised questions about softer structural shoreline protection alternatives, due to narrow lot depth, exposure to extremely rough water conditions, and existing development located close to the water.
2. Comments that new regulations are not necessary and are unfair.
3. Questions about the scientific information that is being used as a basis to support the new requirements.
4. Concerns about requirements for shoreline vegetation, which might limit individual choice and block views. There has also been concern expressed that vegetation along Kirkland's shorelines would not provide desired benefits, because of our orientation on the east side of the Lake.

5. Emphasis on water quality within the watershed as a significant concern that should be addressed. Several shoreline property owners have expressed that water quality is a higher priority than the shoreline restoration measures being sought.
6. Encouragement for the City to adopt a softer approach to improving lake shore quality, by encouraging residents to do the right thing, rather than relying on regulation.

In addition, shoreline property owners have also emphasized that the City should carefully consider how these measures would be implemented on City-owned properties along the shoreline, including costs and impacts to the usability of parks.

These comments highlight the importance of drafting regulations in a reasonable manner with respect for existing improvements and property rights. This memo provides some background information on these issues, including information responding to some of the concerns noted above, a summary of how recent laws and actions at the State and Federal level have impacted key issues related to shoreline management, an overview of regulations being considered, and an estimated timeline for next steps.

In response to the frustration and concerns posed by shoreline property owners, City staff is undertaking several different actions:

- Staff is distributing a mailer to those that have participated in the SMP planning process to respond to some of the key concerns (see Attachment 1).
- Staff is organizing a meeting to sit down with several shoreline property owners and have an open dialogue about concerns, information, and ideas.
- Staff is responding to Planning Commission requests for more information with a preliminary analysis that would evaluate the feasibility of shoreline restoration activities along the City's shoreline, given existing wave patterns, lake depth at the bulkhead edge, and site characteristics. This analysis is not site specific, but is intended to give a general sense about the feasibility of these actions along the City's shoreline.
- Staff continues to coordinate with state agencies and other cities to evaluate other options. For instance, one of the options presented and being reviewed by the Planning Commission has been used in Lake Forest Park and incorporates regulatory flexibility as a catalyst for shoreline restoration. Under this system, Lake Forest Park is allowing the use of encroachments into the required setback from the shoreline to trigger different shoreline restoration alternatives.

Shoreline property owners have addressed many important concerns that need to be more thoroughly discussed. It is important that the City keep open lines of communication with these affected property owners.

There is also the need for more information to be shared with shoreline property owners about how alternative shoreline protection measures may be able to be used. These alternative protection measures are not appropriate for all properties, but if they can be incorporated they do represent an important improvement to our shoreline habitat. The City of Seattle is presently producing a guidebook that may help to address many of the concerns that have been raised about the adequacy of alternative shoreline protection measures and under what circumstances these techniques might be appropriate to implement – in addition to our current efforts, staff plans to make this information available to shoreline property owners.

**G. Next Steps**

The following chart reveals the tasks that have been completed and those that are yet to do. Timing estimates for the remaining tasks may need to be adjusted.

**UPDATING KIRKLAND'S SHORELINE MASTER PROGRAM (SMP)**

PHASE	TASKS	STATUS/TIMING*	BY
<b>1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Secure grant from Dept. of Ecology (DOE)</li> <li>B. Identify and map areas subject to the SMP</li> <li>C. Prepare Public Participation Plan</li> <li>D. Planning Commission, Houghton Community Council, City Council, and Dept. of Ecology (DOE) review and approve Public Participation Plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Done (Mar. 2005 - Jan. 2006)</li> <li>B. Done (Jan. - Mar. 2006)</li> <li>C. Done (Feb. - Mar. 2006)</li> <li>D. Done (Apr. - May 2006)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Staff, DOE</li> <li>B. Consultant</li> <li>C. Staff</li> <li>D. PC, HCC, <b>CC</b>, DOE</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Prepare a draft shoreline inventory, analysis, and characterization</li> <li>B. Notify all parties with potential interest about the project, events, &amp; public comment opportunity via SMP website, email, mail, signs, newspaper, TV, and meetings.</li> <li>C. Distribute the draft inventory, analysis, and characterization for review and comment by DOE and all parties with potential interest</li> <li>D. Introduce project and present data at public forums and shoreline tour</li> <li>E. Submit the final version to DOE for review</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Done (Mar. – Jul. 2006)</li> <li>B. Ongoing (Began Sept. 1, 2006)</li> <li>C. Done (Sept. 1 - Oct. 15, 2006)</li> <li>D. Done (Sept. 18 &amp; 30, 2006)</li> <li>E. Done (Dec. 2006)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Consultant &amp; staff</li> <li>B. Staff</li> <li>C. Staff</li> <li>D. Staff and speakers</li> <li>E. Staff</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Staff brief PC, HCC, and CC on project purpose, process, and status</li> <li>B. Develop goals and policies</li> <li>C. Public Participation Event</li> <li>D. Designate Shoreline Environments</li> <li>E. Develop regulations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Done (July 12, July 23 and Aug. 7, 2007)</li> <li>B. Done (draft)</li> <li>C. Done (June 9<sup>th</sup> Open House)</li> <li>D. Done (draft reviewed by PC)</li> <li>E. Underway (Drafts reviewed by PC on 9/11/08, 10/9/08, with further study on 11/24/08 and in December)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. PC, HCC and <b>CC</b></li> <li>B. PC and HCC</li> <li>C. Staff</li> <li>D. PC and HCC</li> <li>E. PC and HCC</li> </ul>
<b>4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Conduct cumulative impacts analysis (to confirm that policies and regulations would prevent net loss of ecological functions)</li> <li>B. Revisit environment designations, policies and regulations if necessary</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. January 2009</li> <li>B. February 2009</li> <li>C. January 2009</li> <li>D. February 2009</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. PC and HCC</li> <li>B. PC and HCC</li> <li>C. <b>CC</b></li> <li>D. PC and</li> </ul>

	C. Staff brief CC on draft goals, policies, and regulations D. Prepare restoration plan		HCC
<b>5</b>	A. Ecology informal review of complete draft SMP B. Public workshop C. SEPA D. Staff brief CC on the draft SMP E. Public hearing F. CC study session(s) and local adoption of SMP	A. February – April 2009 B. March 2009 C. February/March 2009 D. June - July 2009 E. April 2009 F. July 2009	A. DOE B. Staff C. Staff D. <b>CC</b> E. HCC, PC F. <b>CC</b>
<b>6</b>	A. State conducts another comment period on the SMP B. State works with Kirkland to finalize the SMP	A. To be determined (TBD) B. TBD	A. DOE B. DOE, <b>CC</b> , HCC
<i>* Estimates of timing for remaining tasks are approximate and are subject to change</i>			

**H. Public Participation**

Since the last City Council reading file on this topic in May, 2008, the following opportunities for public participation and comment have occurred:

- A. Open House. A Public Open House focusing on the SMP Update was held on Monday, June 9th. The primary goals of the Open House were to:
1. Provide broad notice to property owners and other interested citizens of the City’s Shoreline Master Program and opportunities available to engage in the process.
  2. For participants to advise the City on what issues are of greatest interest and concern to them and, therefore, should be included in the update;
  3. Identify the future vision of the waterfront in 25 years; and
  4. For participants to prioritize key tools that the City should use in implementing the updated Shoreline Master Program.

The Open House was broadly advertised through a number of different outlets, including mailing notices to property owners within the shoreline jurisdiction, posting on the City’s main webpage, noticing to members of the Shoreline list-serv, publishing of articles in the newspaper, mailing notices to non-governmental organizations and state and federal departments with interest, and posting on notice boards throughout the City. It was estimated that 31 people attended the Open House. Background materials were made available for public review at the Open House and a copy of the display boards is included for your review in Attachment 2. A record of the items discussed is included in Attachment 3.

- B. Survey. An on-line survey was conducted addressing issues relating to shoreline management. The availability of the survey was noticed via the Open House, on notice boards, to both the City’s list-serv and Shoreline list-serv, on the City’s main website, in news releases and other outlets. The survey was available from

June 9<sup>th</sup> to July 11<sup>th</sup> and 59 citizens participated. The results of the survey are summarized in Attachment 4.

- C. Draft Policies. The draft goals and policies as reviewed by the Planning Commission and Houghton Community Council have been posted on the SMP website, with an opportunity for the public to review and comment.
- D. Planning Commission meetings. The Planning Commission has started their review of the shoreline regulations.

Public notice of the Planning Commission and Houghton Community Council meetings will continue to be provided on the public notice boards that have been installed at key locations along the City's shoreline. The project list service will e-mail all subscribers with meeting information and provide links to the staff meeting packets available for viewing prior to the public meetings. The website developed for the SMP Update will continue to be managed to include information about meeting dates and meeting packets. In addition, a public workshop is tentatively planned for March, 2009.

### **III. UW STUDY EVALUATION LAKE WASHINGTON SHORELINE PERMIT PROCESS**

Staff also wanted to take this opportunity to share the results of a completed study addressing the shoreline permitting process. An interdisciplinary group of graduate students enrolled in the University of Washington's Environmental Management Certificate Program released their results of a study undertaken evaluating the Lake Washington Shoreline Permitting Process (see Attachment 5). Some of the key recommendations from this report are as follows:

- Streamline the permit process for eco-friendly shoreline designs at the state and/or local level.
- Increase outreach and education efforts to Lake Washington property owners and shoreline contractors.
- Promote collaboration and coordination between the local, state and federal permit issuing agencies that regulate shoreline construction on Lake Washington.

In response to these recommendations, a working group of representatives from Lake Washington jurisdictions has convened in order to promote collaboration and coordination. The City is participating in this effort and plans to include these concepts in our shoreline regulations.

### **IV. ATTACHMENTS**

1. Shoreline Stabilization Response to FAQ
2. Background Materials for June 9, 2008 Open House
3. Summary of June 9, 2008 Open House
4. Summary of On-Line Survey
5. Results of UW Study of Lake Washington Shoreline Permitting Process
6. DOE Response to FAQ
7. King County's "Better than Bulkheads" information