

**DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND BUILDING
STAFF REPORT
TO CITY OF LAKE FOREST PARK HEARING EXAMINER**

The following review by the City of Lake Forest Park Planning Department is based on information contained in the application and supplemental correspondence, information in the file, comments and letters received on-site investigation, applicable scientific reports, applicable codes, development standards, adopted plans, and other information on file with the City.

SUMMARY INFORMATION

- City File Numbers:** 2015-SSD-0001; 2015-SSD-0010
- Hearing Date:** Thursday, March 10, 2016; 9:30 AM
- Requested Action:** Approval of Shoreline Substantial Development and Shoreline Variance to construct a new 955 square foot pier which extends 233 feet waterward of the ordinary high water mark.
- Applicant:** T.J. and Jessie Fudge
17350 Beach Drive
Lake Forest Park, WA 98155
- Site Location:** 17350 Beach Drive
Lake Forest Park, WA 98155
Parcel Number: 403010-0055
- Comprehensive Plan Designation:** Conservation Residential, High (Exhibit 3)
- Zoning Classification:** RS-7,200 Single-Family Residential, High. (Exhibit 4)

APPLICABLE CODES AND REGULATIONS FOR THE CONDITIONAL USE

(This list may not be completely exhaustive)

Lake Forest Park Municipal Code Sections Directly Applicable to the Proposal:

1. LFPMC Chapter 16.18 – Establishes the SMP (Shoreline Master Program) as the regulatory document for all shoreline uses, development and shoreline modification activities.
2. LFP SMP 3.4 (C) – Establishes notice requirements for an SSD and Shoreline Variance
3. LFP SMP 3.8 (A) – Establishes posting and publishing policy specific to SSD applications
4. LFP SMP 8.5 (A) (1-19) – Establishes general regulations for private and public structures
5. LFP SMP 8.5 (B) (1-3) – Establishes general regulations for new piers
6. LFPMC 16.26.030 – Establishes the authority of the Hearing Examiner to issue quasi-judicial decisions for conditional use applications (Type I application).
7. LFPMC 16.26.110(D) – Establishes the decision of the Hearing Examiner on a Type I application as the final decision of the city.
8. LFPMC 16.26.040(D), .050, .090, and .110(C) – Establishes the public notification requirements associated with Type I applications.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:**Description of the proposal:**

T.J. and Jessie Fudge have requested approval for their Substantial Shoreline Development and Shoreline Variance applications to construct a new 955 square foot pier which extends 233 feet waterward of the ordinary high water mark, or OHWM (Exhibit 2). The proposed pier includes a boatlift and two jet-ski lifts. The new straight walkway is proposed to be constructed with grated decking and alternate double and single pilings (Exhibit 2).

A Shoreline Variance is necessary because the maximum waterward intrusion allowable through LFP Shoreline Master Program is 120 feet. The additional length of pier is requested in order to reach a minimum water depth of five feet. Methods of construction have been proposed to minimize habitat impacts. These include working within the allowable fish window, using a vibratory driver to reduce noise impacts, incorporating decking materials that are fully grated, and providing mitigation plantings along 75 percent of the length of the shoreline (Exhibit 8-9).

This review process requires two applications, both a Shoreline Substantial Development and a Shoreline Variance. Applicants T.J. and Jessie Fudge authorized representation by Mr. Alan Foltz from the Watershed Company with the initial application, and for applications to other agencies. The Fudges have chosen to represent themselves for the subsequent public hearing.

Site Characteristics:

The project site is a 50-foot-wide residential single-family lot, approximately 161 feet deep. The subject site has one single-family home and is zoned RS 7,200. The terrain is flat and the lot is situated northeast to southwest from Beach Drive to Lake Washington (Exhibit 2). The shoreline for this lot is impacted by a bulkhead that belongs to the neighbor to the southwest, which extends perpendicular from the Fudge shore approximately 100 feet waterward. See Discussion near the end of this report for information regarding King County citation of property address.

Adjacent Land Use Characteristics:

The two properties immediately adjacent to the subject site are also zoned RS 7,200. The Shneidman property, to the northeast (17356 Beach Drive NE), includes one single-family house and one pier which extend approximately 57 feet waterward of the OHWM. The Turner properties include two lots to the southwest of the subject property. The Turner property closest to the project site has three separate structures built in 1937, and one pier that extends approximately 168 feet waterward of the OHWM (17347 Beach Drive NE). The pier is located at or near the property line shared with the neighboring Turner property to the west (17345 Beach Drive NE), which includes four structures built between the years 1930-1953. The Kenmore Interceptor sewer line is in the vicinity of the proposed pier (Exhibit 13).

The City-owned Waterfront Park is found further south, beyond the two Turner properties. This is the location where Lyon Creek empties into Lake Washington. The park property shares a border to the southwest with the Lake Forest Park Civic Club. The existing pier at the Civic Club reaches approximately 290 feet waterward, with some portion of the pier beyond the inner harbor line (Exhibit 8.02).

Project Review Timeline:

Two SSD applications are required for review of this proposal. The first application was submitted on January 12, 2015 and the second on November 13, 2015. These applications were considered complete as of December 11, 2015. Due to a clerical oversight, this differs from what was stated in the notice. A combined Notice of Application, SEPA Determination, and Notice of public hearing was published on January 26, 2016 and February 2, 2016. Properties within 300 feet of the subject site were sent the published announcement on or prior to January 26, 2016, and the notice was posted in the three required locations on that same date (Exhibit 9).

The public hearing was rescheduled due to a noticing error, and the new hearing was announced in the Seattle Times with a notice published on February 25, 2016. The subject property was noticed on this date. Properties within 300 feet of the subject site were sent the same announcement, and the notice was posted in the three required locations (Exhibit 9). The review time from complete application to public hearing has equaled 90 days.

CRITERIA ANALYSIS

The following criteria have been excerpted from the Lake Forest Park Shoreline Master Program. For those criteria not applicable to this proposal, the code language may only be listed on the following criteria list, along with a statement in bold: **Not Applicable**.

Some criteria with a **Not Applicable** response are included with the annotated criteria list, when additional information is considered potentially useful for Examiner review. Alphabetized sub-headings for LFP SMP 8.5 (B) are underlined within the excerpt below for ease of reference.

Lake Forest Park Shoreline Master Program, Chapter 8

8.5 Overwater Structures: Piers, Docks, Floats and Buoys**8.5.A. General Regulations for Private and Public Structures**

1. *All new, reconstructed, repaired, or modified overwater structures must comply with all other regulations as stipulated by State and Federal agencies, local Tribes, or others that have jurisdiction.*
2. *New floating docks shall not be permitted. Piers that terminate in a floating section are allowed provided that the landward edge of the float is over water with a depth of ten (10) feet or more and are at least 30 feet from the OHWM. All float tubs shall be fully encapsulated. **Not Applicable.***
3. *Proposed overwater structures which are not an accessory use to residential development and are not joint-use structures must obtain a conditional use permit. A conditional use permit may be granted if... **Not Applicable.***
4. *Except for recreation floats, proposed overwater structures which are not accessory to a residential use and are granted a conditional use permit must comply with the regulations of this section for overwater structures which are accessory to single-family residential development. **Not Applicable.***
5. *Proposed overwater structures which do not comply with the dimensional standards contained in this chapter may only be approved if they obtain a variance.*
6. *No portion of the deck of a pier shall, during the course of the normal fluctuations of the elevation of the water body, protrude more than five (5) feet above the OHWM.*

7. *No residential dwelling unit may be constructed on a pier. **Not Applicable.***
8. *Grated decking is required on all new or replaced moorage facility surfaces.*
9. *All pier and dock dimensions shall be minimized to the maximum extent feasible. The proposed length must be the minimum necessary to support the intended use.*
10. *No skirting is permitted on any structure. **Not Applicable.***
11. *All piers, docks, floats, and similar structures shall float at all times on the surface of the water or shall be of fixed-pile construction. Floating structures shall at no time rest on the lake substrate.*
12. *All over-water structures and other water-use developments shall be constructed and maintained in a safe and sound condition. Abandoned or unsafe structures shall be removed or repaired promptly by the owner.*
13. *Lighting associated with overwater structures shall be beamed, hooded, or directed to avoid causing glare on adjacent properties or waterbodies. Illumination levels shall be the minimum necessary for safety.*
14. *Piles, floats and other water-use structures that are in direct contact with water or over water shall not be treated or coated with herbicides, fungicides, paint, or pentachlorophenol. Use of wood members treated with arsenate compounds or creosote is prohibited.*
15. *Temporary moorages shall be permitted for vessels used in the construction of shoreline facilities. The design and construction of temporary moorages shall be such that upon termination of the project, the aquatic habitat in the affected area can be returned to its original (pre-construction) condition within one (1) year at no cost to the environment or the public.*
16. *Boathouses or other walled covered moorage are not permitted. **Not Applicable.***
17. *If a pier, ramp, or dock is provided with a safety railing, such railing shall not exceed 36 inches in height and shall be an open framework that does not unreasonably interfere with shoreline views of adjoining properties. **Not Applicable.***
18. *Moorage facilities shall be marked with reflectors, or otherwise identified to prevent unnecessarily hazardous conditions for water surface users during the day or night. Exterior finish shall be generally non-reflective.*
19. *No more than one moorage type is allowed per single-family residential lot, except that in cases when an existing moorage structure must be extended to a length consistent with this SMP to achieve adequate moorage depth, one (1) mooring buoy may be allowed as an alternative to structure extension.*

8.5.B. New Piers

1. *New piers may be permitted as an accessory to residential development provided:
 - a. The applicant has demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Shoreline Administrator that a shared or joint-use pier is not feasible.
 - b. No more than one (1) pier for each single-family residence is permitted.*

*c. On lots with less than fifty (50) feet of waterfront, joint-use piers shall be required, except when both lots abutting the subject lot have legal pre-existing piers or docks and the applicant demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Shoreline Administrator that a shared use agreement is not feasible. Only in this case may the lot with less than fifty (50) feet of waterfront be permitted an individual pier. **Not Applicable.***

2. A new, joint-use pier may be permitted on a community recreation lot shared by a number of waterfront and/or upland lots provided the applicant has demonstrated a need for moorage. **Not Applicable.**

3. Development Standards

a. Only piers and ramps are permitted in the first 30 feet of the OHWM. All floats, fingers and ells must be at least 30 feet waterward of the OHWM.

b. All new decking must be fully grated.

c. Length.

i. The maximum waterward intrusion of any portion of any pier shall be one hundred twenty (120) feet. In cases where more than 80 feet are desired, the applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Shoreline Administrator that there are unique circumstances that require additional length, such as situations where the excess pier length is necessary to achieve a minimum depth of 10 feet. The proposed length must be the minimum necessary to support the intended use.

*ii. The maximum length of ells and fingers is 26 feet. The maximum length of a float is 20 feet. **Not Applicable.***

d. Width.

i. The maximum width of a pier walkway is four (4) feet with ells and floats up to six (6) feet wide. Any additional fingers must be two (2) feet wide.

*ii. The maximum width of a ramp connecting a pier to a float is 3 feet. **Not Applicable.***

e. Size. Surface coverage, including all floats, ramps and ells, shall be limited to the following:

i. Four hundred eighty (480) square feet for a single property owner;

*ii. Seven hundred (700) square feet for a joint-use structure utilized by two residential property owners; **Not Applicable.***

*iii. One thousand (1,000) square feet for a joint-use structure utilized by three or more residential property owners. **Not Applicable.***

f. Spacing. Except for joint-use structures, piers shall be spaced a minimum of 20 feet apart from adjacent piers or 10 feet from the side yard, whichever is greater.

g. Piles. Piles shall be the minimum size allowed by site-specific engineering or design considerations, and shall not be treated with pentachlorophenol, creosote, chromated copper arsenate (CCA) or comparably toxic compounds. Piles shall be spaced a minimum of 18 feet apart except when shown not to be feasible for site-specific engineering or design considerations.

h. Mitigation. All proposals involving new piers or docks are subject to the following mitigation requirements:

i. Any existing in-water and overwater structures shall be removed if they are associated with either a moorage structure or other recreational use that is located within 30 feet of the OHWM.

ii. Emergent vegetation shall be planted waterward of the OHWM, unless the City determines that it is not appropriate or feasible.

iii. Native riparian vegetation shall be planted in at least 75 percent of the nearshore riparian area located along the water's edge. The vegetated portion of the nearshore riparian area shall average ten (10) feet in depth from the OHWM, but may be a minimum of five (5) feet wide to allow for variation in landscape bed shape and plant placement. Joint-use piers required under the provisions of this Chapter shall require a vegetative riparian zone along all properties sharing the pier. Other joint-use piers shall be required to provide the same mitigation as required for one property, which can be split evenly between the subject properties.

iv. Mitigation plantings shall be subject to the following requirements:

a) Restoration of native vegetation shall consist of a mixture of trees, shrubs and groundcover and be designed to improve habitat functions. At least three (3) trees per 100 linear feet of shoreline and 60% shrubs must be included in the plan. Plant materials must be native. Plant density and spacing shall be appropriate for the site and commensurate with spacing recommended for each individual species proposed. An alternative planting plan or mitigation measure in lieu of meeting these requirements shall be allowed if approved by other state and federal agencies.

In addition, the City shall accept existing native trees, shrubs and groundcover as meeting the requirements of this section, including vegetation previously installed as part of a prior development activity, provided that the existing vegetation provides a landscape strip at least as effective in protecting shoreline ecological functions as the required vegetation.

v) In addition to a native planting plan, a 5-year vegetation maintenance and monitoring plan shall be submitted to the City for approval. The monitoring plan shall include the following performance standards:

a) Preparation of as-built drawings after installation of the mitigation plantings;

b) Annual monitoring reports for 5 years that include written and photographic documentation on tree and shrub mortality, subject to the following success criteria:

i. One-hundred (100) percent survival of all planted native trees and shrubs during the first two (2) years after planting; and

ii. One hundred (100) percent survival of trees and eighty (80) percent survival of remaining native plants in years three (3) through five (5).

Copies of reports that are submitted to state or federal agencies in compliance with permit approvals may be submitted in lieu of a separate report to the City, provided that the reports address a 5-year maintenance and monitoring plan.

i. The City shall approve the following modifications to a new pier proposal that deviates from the dimensional standards above, subject to both U.S Army Corps of Engineers and Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife approval to an alternate project design. The applicant shall provide documentation at the time of building permit submittal that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife have approved the alternative proposal design. In addition, the following requirements and all other applicable provisions in this Chapter shall be met.

Administrative Approval for Alternative Design of New Private Pier or Dock State and Federal Agency Approval	Requirements
Maximum Area	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife have approved proposal No larger than authorized through state and federal approval
Maximum Width	4 ft. for portion of pier or dock located within 30 ft. of the OHWM; otherwise, 6 ft. for walkways Otherwise, the pier and all components shall meet the dimensional criteria listed above.
Minimum Water Depth	No shallower than authorized

8.5.F. Boatlifts, Canopies, and Covered Moorage

1. Boatlifts and boatlift canopies may be permitted as an accessory to residential development, or as a conditional use in the Shoreline Residential and Urban Conservancy Environments when not accessory to residential structures, provided that:

- a. All lifts are placed as far waterward as feasible and safe,*
- b. Boatlift canopies are elevated above the boatlift to the maximum extent practicable and are made of light-permeable fabric, and **Not Applicable.***
- c. Any platform lifts are fully grated.*

*2. A moorage cover over a boat slip or boat lift may be permitted in the Shoreline Residential Environment when accessory to a residential structure or as a conditional use when not accessory to a residential structure , provided that: **Not Applicable.***

- a. The cover must be constructed of light-permeable materials,*
- b. The cover must be elevated above the water’s surface to the maximum extent practicable, and*
- c. The applicant demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Shoreline Administrator that the moorage cover is the minimum size necessary to serve the intended use of protecting the watercraft from the elements.*

3. All lifts, canopies, and covers must comply with all other regulations as stipulated by State and Federal agencies, local Tribes, or others that have jurisdiction.

4. Boat houses are not permitted. Not Applicable.

Lake Forest Park Shoreline Master Program Chapter 3.8

A. Variances:

The purpose of a variance permit is strictly limited to granting relief to specific bulk dimensional, or performance standards set forth in the Master Program, and where there are extraordinary or unique circumstances relating to the property such that the strict implementation of the Master Program would impose unnecessary hardships on the applicant or thwart the SMA policies as stated in RCW 90.58.020.

Construction pursuant to this permit shall not begin nor can construction be authorized except as provided in RCW 90.58.020. In all instances, extraordinary circumstances shall be shown and the public interest shall suffer no substantial detrimental effect.

1. Application: An application for a Shoreline variance shall be submitted on a form provided by the City accompanied by maps, completed environmental checklist, applicable fees, and any other information specified in this Master Program or requested by the Administrator. An applicant for a substantial development permit who wishes to request a variance shall submit the variance application and the substantial development permit application simultaneously.

2. Criteria for Granting Variances: Variance permits for development that will be **located landward** of the ordinary high water mark and landward of any wetland may be authorized provided the applicant can demonstrate consistency with the following variance criteria as listed in WAC 173-27-170 (see 3.b below):

a. That the strict application of the bulk, dimensional, or performance standards set forth in the Master Program precludes, or significantly interferes with, reasonable use of the property.

b. That the hardship described above is specifically related to the property, and is the result of unique conditions such as irregular lot shape, size, or natural features and the application of the Master Program and not, for example, from deed restrictions or the applicant's own actions.

c. That the design of the project is compatible with other permitted activities within the area and with uses planned for the area under the Comprehensive Plan and Master Program and will not cause adverse impacts to the shoreline environment.

d. That the variance will not constitute a grant of special privilege not enjoyed by the other properties in the area.

e. That the variance requested is the minimum necessary to afford relief.

f. That the public interest will suffer no substantial detrimental effect.

3. Variance permits for development and/or uses that will be *located waterward* of the ordinary high water mark or within any wetland may be authorized provided the applicant can demonstrate all of the following:

a. That the strict application of the bulk, dimensional, or performance standards set forth in the Master Program precludes all reasonable use of the property.

b. That the proposal is consistent with the criteria established under subsection (2)(a) through (f) of this section.

c. That the public rights of navigation and use of the shorelines will not be adversely affected.

4. In the granting of all variance permits, consideration shall be given to the cumulative impact of additional requests for like actions in the area. For example, if variances were granted to other developments and/or uses in the area where similar circumstances exist, the total of the variances shall also remain consistent with the policies of RCW 90.58.020 and shall not cause substantial adverse effects to the shoreline environment.

5. Variances from the use regulations of the Master Program are prohibited.

HEARING EXAMINER DECISION REGARDING PRIOR APPLICATION FOR PIER

An initial hearing examiner decision was received by the City to “Deny without prejudice” for a Shoreline Variance request (file numbers SSD06-01 and V06-02) dated September 12, 2006. The applicant for this site at that time was James Kressbach and the decision was based on insufficient evidence to support an informed decision. The City at that time was in the process of drafting the current Shoreline Master Program and in the interim had adopted to the the King County Shoreline Master Program Title 25, King County Code.

Lake Forest Park Shoreline Master Program

Chapter 8.5.A Overwater Structures: Piers, Docks, Floats and Buoys

8.5 CRITERION A.1: *All new, reconstructed, repaired, or modified overwater structures must comply with all other regulations as stipulated by State and Federal agencies, local Tribes, or others that have jurisdiction.*

The Applicant has applied for and received a Letter of Permission from the Army Corps of Engineers for this proposed pier (Exhibit 10). Within the letter, Mr. Buck, District Engineer, explained that Native American tribes with an interest in this location were notified about this application. In response, the Snoqualmie Indian Tribe requested that their archeology staff be present to observe construction. The Muckleshoot Indian Tribe requested copies of as-built drawings and all monitoring reports for this project. It has been reported that the Applicant has agreed to both of these requests (Exhibit 10).

Approval from Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) has not yet been granted, though an application has been submitted and the SEPA DNS has been included with those materials (Exhibit 16). Ms. Christa Heller, representative of WDFW contacted City staff following SEPA DNS publishing. Ms. Heller has requested two or three additional tree species to be included with the mitigation planting plan (Exhibit 13).

Integral to the Shoreline Variance review criteria, LFP-SMP 8.5.B.3.h (v) (b) (i) states the following: “The applicant shall provide documentation at the time of building permit submittal that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife have approved the alternative proposal design.”

Terms of this requirement and subsequent requests from agencies of jurisdiction have been incorporated into the list of recommended conditions of approval on the final page of this report.

Criterion met, subject to compliance with recommended conditions.

8.5 CRITERION A.5: Proposed overwater structures which do not comply with the dimensional standards contained in this chapter may only be approved if they obtain a variance.

A Shoreline Variance request has been submitted in tandem with the SSD request. See criteria responses for LFP-SMP Chapter 3.8.A (1-5) below.

8.5 CRITERION A.6: No portion of the deck of a pier shall, during the course of the normal fluctuations of the elevation of the water body, protrude more than five (5) feet above the OHWM.

The submitted drawings indicate a distance of 2’6” between the OHWM and the top of the proposed pier (Exhibit 8.4). Sheet 5 shows that the thickness of the grating is 1.5” (Exhibit 8.5). The applicant states that the water depth at the end of the dock would fluctuate between three feet and five feet (Exhibit 3, 17). Therefore, the combined information provided suggests that the greatest distance that this proposed pier may have with the water body may reach a height as much as 4’4.5”. Staff recommends that the applicant provide the Hearing Examiner with additional information, or oral testimony, to connect these two statements provided with application materials.

This criterion is met, subject to confirmation with oral testimony or additional documentation.

8.5 CRITERION A.8: Grated decking is required on all new or replaced moorage facility surfaces.

Drawings for the proposed project indicate that all decking will be grated. Additionally, the narrative for this application states that the pier includes grated decking, as does the report. (Exhibits 8 and 9).

This criterion is met.

8.5 CRITERION A.9: All pier and dock dimensions shall be minimized to the maximum extent feasible. The proposed length must be the minimum necessary to support the intended use.

The depth of water reachable with the proposed pier is five feet, which is less than the allowable 10 feet of depth which may be sought with a Shoreline Variance. A Shoreline Variance request has been submitted in tandem with the SSD request. See criteria responses for LFP-SMP Chapter 3.8.A (1-5) below.

This criterion is met subject to Variance approval.

8.5 CRITERION A.11: *11. All piers, docks, floats, and similar structures shall float at all times on the surface of the water or shall be of fixed-pile construction. Floating structures shall at no time rest on the lake substrate.*

Drawings of the proposed pier show that the structure will be supported with fixed-piles. (Exhibit 8)

This criterion is met.

8.5 CRITERION A.12: *All over-water structures and other water-use developments shall be constructed and maintained in a safe and sound condition. Abandoned or unsafe structures shall be removed or repaired promptly by the owner.*

This criterion relates to conditions after construction, and this requirement has been incorporated with recommended conditions of approval.

Criterion met, subject to compliance with recommended conditions.

8.5 CRITERION A.13: *Lighting associated with overwater structures shall be beamed, hooded or directed to avoid causing glare on adjacent properties or waterbodies. Illumination levels shall be the minimum necessary for safety.*

Lighting installations have not been included with this proposal; however, these requirements have been incorporated with recommended conditions of approval.

Criterion met, subject to compliance with recommended conditions.

8.5 CRITERION A.14: *Piles, floats and other water-use structures that are in direct contact with water or over water shall not be treated or coated with herbicides, fungicides, paint, or pentachlorophenol. Use of wood members treated with arsenate compounds or creosote is prohibited.*

Drawings for this proposal show that the pilings will be made of steel. There is no indication that the steel will receive treatment of any kind (Exhibit 8). Glu-lam beams are proposed for the over-water portion of the pier structure. There is no indication within this report that the applicant intends to treat or coat the wood members with herbicides, fungicides, paint, or pentachlorophenol. Similarly, the applicant does not indicate an intention to treat those wood members with arsenate compounds or creosote. These restrictions have been incorporated with recommended conditions of approval.

Criterion met, subject to compliance with recommended conditions.

8.5 CRITERION A.15: *Temporary moorages shall be permitted for vessels used in the construction of shoreline facilities. The design and construction of temporary moorages shall be such that upon termination of the project, the aquatic habitat in the affected area can be returned to its original (pre-construction) condition within one (1) year at no cost to the environment or the public.*

The Applicant has proposed to use a barge in the process of constructing this pier. Proposed construction activities include the use of a vibratory driver which would be connected to a barge

based crane (Exhibit 9, page 3). Submitted materials do not include details of the design and construction of the barge.

The requirement associated with this criterion has been incorporated with recommended conditions of approval. Criterion met, subject to compliance with recommended conditions.

8.5 CRITERION A.18: Moorage facilities shall be marked with reflectors, or otherwise identified to prevent unnecessarily hazardous conditions for water surface users during the day or night. Exterior finish shall be generally non-reflective.

Reflectors have not been specifically called out with the proposed plans. These requirements have been incorporated with recommended conditions of approval.

Criterion met, subject to compliance with recommended conditions.

8.5 CRITERION A.19: No more than one moorage type is allowed per single-family residential lot, except that in cases when an existing moorage structure must be extended to a length consistent with this SMP to achieve adequate moorage depth, one (1) mooring buoy may be allowed as an alternative to structure extension.

This proposal only includes one moorage type for one single-family residential lot. The applicant has described why a mooring buoy is not part of this proposal (Exhibit 3). See Discussion section for additional information.

This criterion is met.

Lake Forest Park Shoreline Master Program

Chapter 8. 5. B. New Piers

8.5 CRITERION B.1: New piers may be permitted as an accessory to residential development provided:

a. The applicant has demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Shoreline Administrator that a shared or joint-use pier is not feasible.

The applicant has provided signed letters from neighboring properties stating that a joint-use pier is not an acceptable alternative to this proposed single-use pier. Mr. Shneidman and Mr. Turner, neighbors on each side of the subject property, have declared that they have no interest in constructing a joint-use pier with the Fudges (Exhibit 2.10 – 2.11).

This criterion is met.

b. No more than one (1) pier for each single-family residence is permitted.

The applicant has not requested to build more than one pier for this single-family zoned lot. There are no existing piers.

This criterion is met.

c. On lots with less than fifty (50) feet of waterfront, joint-use piers shall be required, except when both lots abutting the subject lot have legal pre-existing piers or docks and the applicant demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Shoreline Administrator that a shared use agreement is not feasible. Only in this case may the lot with less than fifty (50) feet of waterfront be permitted an individual pier.

The subject property is exactly 50 feet wide, therefore, this criterion is not applicable. Demonstration for meeting this threshold width includes several statements within the application, proposed drawings, and the legal description found with King County (Exhibit 2, 8.03, and 12).

This criterion is met.

8.5 CRITERION B.3.a.: *Only piers and ramps are permitted in the first 30 feet of the OHWM. All floats, fingers, and ells must be at least 30 feet waterward of the OHWM.*

Drawings for this proposal show only a pier is requested in the first 30 feet of the OHWM (Exhibit 8).

This criterion is met.

8.5 CRITERION B.3.b.: *All new decking must be fully grated.*

The applicant has proposed all new decking with a fully grated material. Description of the decking can also be found in the Biological Evaluation (Exhibits 8 - 9).

This criterion is met.

8.5 CRITERION B.3.c: *Length.*

i. The maximum waterward intrusion of any portion of any pier shall be one hundred twenty (120) feet. In cases where more than 80 feet are desired, the applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Shoreline Administrator that there are unique circumstances that require additional length, such as situations where the excess pier length is necessary to achieve a minimum depth of 10 feet. The proposed length must be the minimum necessary to support the intended use.

The applicant has requested approval for a pier that extends 233 feet waterward from the OHWM in order to achieve a minimum depth of five feet. The applicant reports that this is the minimum length required in order to support moorage of a personal vessel. This proposed waterward intrusion exceeds the maximum allowable without a variance.

This criterion is not relevant if associated Shoreline Variance is approved. See responses to criteria LFP-SMP 3.8.A.2 – 3.8.A.5 for Shoreline Variance within this report.

ii. The maximum length of ells and fingers is 26 feet. The maximum length of a float is 20 feet.

Not applicable. The applicant has not included ells or fingers with this proposal.

8.5 CRITERION B.3.d: Width.

i. The maximum width of a pier walkway is four (4) feet with ells and floats up to six (6) feet wide. Any additional fingers must be two (2) feet wide.

Drawings for the proposed pier illustrate a pier width 3' 10.75" which is less than the maximum width of four feet. The applicant has not included ells or fingers with this proposal.

This criterion is met.

ii. The maximum width of a ramp connecting a pier to a float is 3 feet.

Not applicable. The applicant has not included a ramp with this proposal.

8.5 CRITERION B.3.e: Size. Surface coverage, including all floats, ramps and ells, shall be limited to the following:

i. Four hundred eighty (480) square feet for a single property owner;

The applicant has requested approval for a pier with a total area of 955 square feet. The applicant reports that the proposed 233-foot length is necessary in order to reach five feet in depth to support moorage of a personal vessel. The additional length adds to the overall surface coverage.

This criterion is not relevant if associated Shoreline Variance is approved. See responses to criteria LFP-SMP 3.8.A.2 – 3.8.A.5 for Shoreline Variance within this report.

8.5 CRITERION B.3.f: Spacing. Except for joint-use structures, piers shall be spaced a minimum of 20 feet apart from adjacent piers or 10 feet from the side yard, whichever is greater.

Drawings for the proposed pier illustrate that this minimum side yard distance requirement has been met. Exhibit 8.4 shows the proposed pier placed 15 feet from the Turner site, southwest of the subject site. Measurements taken within the scaled drawings indicate that the pier placement is approximately 31 feet from the Shneidman site, to the northeast (Exhibit 8).

This criterion is met.

8.5 CRITERION B.3.g: Piles. Piles shall be the minimum size allowed by site-specific engineering or design considerations, and shall not be treated with pentachlorophenol, creosote, chromated copper arsenate (CCA) or comparably toxic compounds. Piles shall be spaced a minimum of 18 feet apart except when shown not to be feasible for site-specific engineering or design considerations.

Drawings for the proposed pier illustrate piles six inches round, composed of steel (Exhibit 8.07). There are no indications within the application that any toxic compounds proposed to treat these piles.

Pilings are spaced 18 feet apart and are alternatively double and single-loaded. There are two exceptions for this distance between piles. Distance between the two most landward sets of pilings is 20 feet, and distance between the two most waterward set of piles is 16 feet (Exhibit 8.04).

This criterion is met.

8.5 CRITERION B.3.h: Mitigation. All proposals involving new piers or docks are subject to the following mitigation requirements:

i. Any existing in-water and overwater structures shall be removed if they are associated with either a moorage structure or other recreational use that is located within 30 feet of the OHWM.

Not applicable. The subject property has no existing in-water or overwater structure.

This criterion is met.

ii. Emergent vegetation shall be planted waterward of the OHWM, unless the City determines that it is not appropriate or feasible.

Sarah Sandstrom, a representative from the applicant's consultant group, the Watershed Company, and author of the Biological Evaluation, has issued the following statement:

“Emergent plants were not included waterward of the OHWM in the Fudge Planting Plan because the reverse hydroperiod of Lake Washington (high in summer and low in winter) typically results in poor survival of emergent vegetation below the high water mark. Emergent vegetation is included up to the OHWM, with the intent being to allow emergent vegetation to establish and spread waterward as hydrologic conditions of the shoreline allow.” (Exhibit 14)

Staff finds that this explanation sufficiently addresses the question of appropriateness and feasibility.

This criterion is met.

iii. Native riparian vegetation shall be planted in at least 75 percent of the nearshore riparian area located along the water's edge. The vegetated portion of the nearshore riparian area shall average ten (10) feet in depth from the OHWM, but may be a minimum of five (5) feet wide to allow for variation in landscape bed shape and plant placement.

Drawings for this proposal include native riparian vegetation planted at least 75 percent of the nearshore area located at the water's edge. The proposed vegetation appears to have an overall average of 10 feet in depth from the OHWM, with a measurement of approximately 5 feet in depth where this lot meets the Shneidman property, to the northeast.

This criterion is met.

iv. Mitigation plantings shall be subject to the following requirements:

a) Restoration of native vegetation shall consist of a mixture of trees, shrubs and groundcover and be designed to improve habitat functions. At least three (3) trees per 100 linear feet of shoreline and 60% shrubs must be included in the plan. Plant materials must be native. Plant density and spacing shall be appropriate for the site and commensurate with spacing recommended for each individual species proposed. An alternative planting plan or mitigation measure in lieu of meeting these requirements shall be allowed if approved by other state and federal agencies.

Drawings for this proposal and narrative within the Biological Evaluation present the plantings as meeting these requirements. Originally, a total of four trees were proposed as mitigation (Exhibit 9). A comment was received from Christa Heller (Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife) in response to the original planting plan. Ms. Heller stated that WDFW does not recognize Vine Maples as trees, and she recommended adding two or three additional species. The revised planting plan shows a total of six trees proposed along this 50-foot-wide shoreline, none of which are Vine Maple (Exhibit 8).

This criterion is met.

In addition, the City shall accept existing native trees, shrubs and groundcover as meeting the requirements of this section, including vegetation previously installed as part of a prior development activity, provided that the existing vegetation provides a landscape strip at least as effective in protecting shoreline ecological functions as the required vegetation.

The existing landscape includes only a lawn, therefore, the applicant is not asking to have the existing vegetation considered as an integral part of the vegetation requirement.

v. In addition to a native planting plan, a 5-year vegetation maintenance and monitoring plan shall be submitted to the City for approval. The monitoring plan shall include the following performance standards:

A maintenance and monitoring plan has not been included with this proposal; however, these requirements have been incorporated with recommended conditions of approval.

a) Preparation of as-built drawings after installation of the mitigation plantings;

b) Annual monitoring reports for 5 years that include written and photographic documentation on tree and shrub mortality, subject to the following success criteria:

i. One-hundred (100) percent survival of all planted native trees and shrubs during the first two (2) years after planting; and

ii. One hundred (100) percent survival of trees and eighty (80) percent survival of remaining native plants in years three (3) through five (5).

Copies of reports that are submitted to state or federal agencies in compliance with permit approvals may be submitted in lieu of a separate report to the City, provided that the reports address a 5-year maintenance and monitoring plan.

i. The City shall approve the following modifications to a new pier proposal that deviates from the dimensional standards above, subject to both U.S Army Corps of Engineers and Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife approval to an alternate project design. The applicant shall provide documentation at the time of building permit submittal that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife have approved the alternative proposal design. In addition, the following requirements and all other applicable provisions in this Chapter shall be met.

i. The City shall approve the following modifications to a new pier proposal that deviates from the dimensional standards above, subject to both U.S Army Corps of Engineers and Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife approval to an alternate project design. The applicant shall provide documentation at the time of building permit submittal that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife have approved the alternative proposal design. In addition, the following requirements and all other applicable provisions in this Chapter shall be met.

The applicant has received a Letter of Permission from Army Corps of Engineers for the proposed pier and associated mitigation plantings (see Exhibit 10). The applicant has submitted revised plans which appear to differ only in regard to the planting plan from those plans submitted to the Army Corps (Exhibit 8).

With the City-issued SEPA DNS, the applicants' representative, Mr. Foltz, has submitted a JARPA with Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW). A Hydraulic Permit Approval (HPA) from WDFW will be required at the time of building permit submittal. These requirements have been included with the recommended list of conditions.

Administrative Approval for Alternative Design of New Private Pier or Dock

Requirements

State and Federal Agency Approval

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife have approved proposal. This requirement has been incorporated in the recommended list of conditions.

Maximum Area

No larger than authorized through state and federal approval City approval for this variance request to deviate from length and area standards is conditioned on receiving approval from U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife. This requirement has been incorporated in the recommended list of conditions.

Maximum Width

4 ft. for portion of pier or dock located within 30 ft. of the OHWM; otherwise, 6 ft. for walkways Drawings for this proposal illustrate that this pier will be less than four feet wide for the entire length of the walkway. Therefore, the proposal does not deviate from this standard and the applicant has not requested a variance from this standard.

Otherwise, the pier and all components shall meet the dimensional criteria listed above.

Lake Forest Park Shoreline Master Program

Chapter 8.5.F Boatlifts, Canopies, and Covered Moorage

8.5 CRITERION F.1: *Boatlifts and boatlift canopies may be permitted as an accessory to residential development, or as a conditional use in the Shoreline Residential and Urban Conservancy Environments when not accessory to residential structures, provided that:*

a. All lifts are placed as far waterward as feasible and safe,

The proposed boatlift has been located as far waterward as feasible according to the submitted drawings (Exhibit 8). This criterion is met.

b. Boatlift canopies are elevated above the boatlift to the maximum extent practicable and are made of light-permeable fabric, and

This criterion is not applicable. A boatlift canopy is not included with this proposal.

c. Any platform lifts are fully grated.

This criterion is not applicable. A platform lift is not included with this proposal. Drawings reference the proposed boatlift as free-standing.

8.5 CRITERION F.3: *All lifts, canopies, and covers must comply with all other regulations as stipulated by State and Federal agencies, local Tribes, or others that have jurisdiction.*

Terms of this requirement and subsequent requests from agencies of jurisdiction have been incorporated into the list of recommended conditions of approval on the final page of this report.

This criterion is met.

Lake Forest Park Shoreline Master Program

Chapter 3.8.A. Variances

3.8 CRITERION A.2: *Variance permits for development that will be located landward of the ordinary high water mark and landward of any wetland may be authorized provided the applicant can demonstrate consistency with the following variance criteria as listed in WAC 173-27-170:*

a. That the strict application of the bulk, dimensional, or performance standards set forth in the Master Program precludes, or significantly interferes with, reasonable use of the property.

The applicant's representative, Mr. Foltz, states that adherence to dimensional standards would not allow the Fudges to construct a pier capable of vessel moorage due to the special circumstances of the site (Exhibit 2).

This criterion is met.

b. That the hardship described above is specifically related to the property, and is the result of unique conditions such as irregular lot shape, size, or natural features and the application of the Master Program and not, for example, from deed restrictions or the applicant's own actions.

Mr. Foltz and Mr. Fudge describe the unique condition of extreme shallow water as due primarily to the neighboring bulkhead situated perpendicular to the subject property shoreline (Exhibits 2, 3, and 15). This circumstance is related to existing landscape conditions which have not been under the control of the applicant. See Discussion section for additional comments.

This criterion is met.

c. That the design of the project is compatible with other permitted activities within the area and with uses planned for the area under the Comprehensive Plan and Master Program and will not cause adverse impacts to the shoreline environment.

Mr. Foltz states that the proposed pier is compatible with the general purposes and objectives of the Comprehensive Plan (Exhibit 2.08). See exhibit 4 for specific language regarding comprehensive plan designation for this site. Further, a goal within the recently adopted 2015 Comprehensive Plan update, Environmental Quality & Shorelines chapter states the following:

Goal EQ-2 Shoreline Development and Access. Protect the city's shoreline while accommodating reasonable and appropriate uses near shorelines.

The submitted Biological Evaluation states that the construction and use of this proposed pier will not cause adverse impact to the shoreline environment. See the list of suggested conditions of approval for this proposal for measures intended to ensure this outcome.

This criterion is met.

d. That the variance will not constitute a grant of special privilege not enjoyed by the other properties in the area.

Mr. Foltz and Mr. Fudge have described and demonstrated that other piers intended to moor vessels have been constructed on nearby lots and along the Lake Washington shoreline (Exhibits 2 and 3).

This criterion is met.

e. That the variance requested is the minimum necessary to afford relief.

Mr. Fudge has stated that the additional length, and therefore, total pier area proposed with this variance request is the minimum necessary for reasonable use of a pier to harbor a single, average-sized boat (Exhibit 3 and 17).

This criterion is met.

f. That the public interest will suffer no substantial detrimental effect.

Research reported within the Biological Evaluation declares that the environment will suffer no substantial detrimental effect (Exhibit 9). The pier is proposed to be constructed adjacent to private property and to not protrude beyond the inner harbor line (Exhibit 8). The pier will likely be visible from the public dock located at the city-owned Waterfront Park.

This criterion is met.

3.8 CRITERION A.3: *Variance permits for development and/or uses that will be located waterward of the ordinary high water mark or within any wetland may be authorized provided the applicant can demonstrate all of the following:*

a. *That the strict application of the bulk, dimensional, or performance standards set forth in the Master Program precludes all reasonable use of the property.*

The applicants and their representative have inferred that a pier any less large than what has been proposed would not meet the minimum needs for a single-use pier to moor a typical boat (Exhibit 3, 17).

b. *That the proposal is consistent with the criteria established under subsection (2)(a) through (f) of this section.*

See responses above, 3.8 CRITERIA A.2 (A) through (F)

c. *That the public rights of navigation and use of the shorelines will not be adversely affected.*

Drawings for this proposal exhibit that the full length of the pier will remain inside the inner harbor line (Exhibit 8.02). The following definitions have been provided by staff to confirm that this proposal is in keeping with this criterion (source: RCW 79.105.060):

(8) "Inner harbor line" means a line located and established in navigable waters between the line of ordinary high tide or ordinary high water and the outer harbor line, constituting the inner boundary of the harbor area.

(12) "Outer harbor line" means a line located and established in navigable waters as provided in Article XV, section 1 of the state Constitution, beyond which the state shall never sell or lease any rights whatever to private persons.

3.8 CRITERION A.4: *In the granting of all variance permits, consideration shall be given to the cumulative impact of additional requests for like actions in the area. For example, if variances were granted to other developments and/or uses in the area where similar circumstances exist, the total of the variances shall also remain consistent with the policies of RCW 90.58.020 and shall not cause substantial adverse effects to the shoreline environment.*

The applicant has stated that he discovered no more than three lots within the city of Lake Forest Park which have shorelines that neighbor a bulkhead or other shore armoring which projects at least 30 feet waterward perpendicular to a single-family lot (Exhibit 3). The applicant has demonstrated with aerial images that two other such lots have existing piers with an ability to moor boats.

This criterion is met.

3.8 CRITERION A.5: *Variances from the use regulations of the Master Program are prohibited.*

Not Applicable. This proposal does not include a request for a use variance.

This criterion is met.

PUBLIC AND AGENCY COMMENT

The City has not received any public comments for this proposal.

Several agencies of jurisdiction have responded to either the Army Corps of Engineers through their review process which culminated in the Letter of Permission (LOP) (Exhibit 10), or in response to the City notice of SEPA Determination. From the Army Corps LOP, Karen Walters, representative of the Muckleshoot Tribe, requested that the City send copies of all project monitoring reports when they are sent to the regulatory agencies for their records. The Snoqualmie Indian Tribe requested their archeology staff be present to observe construction.

In response to the SEPA DNS, Christa Heller has requested that additional trees are planted, which has been addressed with a revised planting plan (Exhibit 8). Jacob Sheppard from King County Wastewater Treatment Division has requested notification prior to construction out of concern to the proximity of an existing sewer line, as well as an opportunity to enable a King County Inspector to be present on site during construction (Exhibit 13).

DISCUSSION**Address discrepancy with King County i-map**

The address for this site is not reported correctly within the mapping option for King County i-map, though the linked, detailed information for the subject property is correct (Exhibit 12).

Mooring Buoy Option

For LFP SMP Chapter 8.5 CRITERION A.19, “one (1) mooring buoy may be allowed as an alternative to structure extension.” However, given the depth of water at the subject site, a mooring buoy would not be an acceptable alternative because the language for LFP-SMP Chapter 8.5 (J)(1)(c) states that “Mooring buoys shall be placed in water depths of 9 feet or greater based on ordinary high water, but no further than 120 feet waterward of the OHWM” (Exhibit 8) (Exhibit 15). This combination of requirements appears to be impossible to meet at this site.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION

The Planning Department concludes that the applicant has shown that the proposal meets or can meet all of the criteria for a Shoreline Substantial Development and a Shoreline Variance permit. The City of Lake Forest Park Planning Department recommends approval of the proposal of drawings associated with Exhibits 8.3 through 8.11 with the conditions listed below.

After City approval of a conditional use or variance permit, the City shall submit the permit to the Department of Ecology for Ecology’s approval, approval with conditions, or denial. Ecology shall render and transmit to the City and the applicant its final decision approving, approving with conditions, or disapproving the permit within thirty (30) days of the date of submittal by the City pursuant to WAC 173-27-110.

The Department of Ecology shall review the complete file submitted by the City on conditional use and variance permits and any other information submitted or available that is relevant to the application. The Department of Ecology shall base its determination to approve, approve with conditions, or deny a conditional use permit or variance on consistency with the policy and provisions of the Shoreline Management Act and, except as provided in WAC 173-27-210, and the criteria in WAC 173-27-160 and 173-27-170.

The City shall provide timely notification of the Department of Ecology's final decision to those interested persons having requested notification from the City pursuant to WAC 173-27-130.

The Planning Department recommends the conditional approval of the request for Shoreline Substantial Development (2015-SSD-0001) and Shoreline Variance (2015-SSD-0010) for the above described reasons with the following conditions:

1. The site plan is valid for a period of five years from the date of approval. Construction pursuant to a permit will not begin or be authorized until twenty-one days from the date the City decision for this Shoreline Variance is filed with the Department of Ecology (RCW 90.58.140).
2. Permittee must apply for and receive all necessary permits from the Department of Planning and Building prior to commencing any proposed work.
3. All over-water structures and other water-use developments shall be constructed and maintained in a safe and sound condition. Abandoned or unsafe structures shall be removed or repaired promptly by the owner.
4. Lighting associated with overwater structures shall be beamed, hooded or directed to avoid causing glare on adjacent properties or waterbodies. Illumination levels shall be the minimum necessary for safety.
5. The design and construction of temporary moorages shall be such that upon termination of the project, the aquatic habitat in the affected area can be returned to its original (pre-construction) condition within one (1) year at no cost to the environment or the public.
6. Moorage facilities shall be marked with reflectors, or otherwise identified to prevent unnecessarily hazardous conditions for water surface users during the day or night. Exterior finish shall be generally non-reflective.
7. Prior to building approval, the Permittee must receive City approval for a 5-year vegetation maintenance and monitoring plan for the approved mitigation according to criteria stated in LFP SMP 8.5 (B)(3)(h)(v).
8. The Permittee shall provide documentation at the time of building permit submittal that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife have approved the proposed pier design.
9. The Permittee is responsible for complying with any conditions of approval placed on these or other state or federal permits or approvals, and for submitting revised drawings to the City for its review and approval, if necessary, to reflect these state or federal conditions of approval.
10. The Permittee shall not cover grated decking material with any objects which would impact light transmission.

11. Prior to construction, the Permittee shall provide evidence that the wood members proposed to construct this pier have not been treated or coated with herbicides, fungicides, paint, or pentachlorophenol; Additionally, the Permittee shall provide evidence that wood members used to construct this pier have not been treated with arsenate compounds or creosote.
12. The Permittee must attempt to arrange with the Snoqualie Indian Tribe for their archeology staff to be present to observe construction. Contact information is as follows:
Adam Osbekoff, Phone: (425) 753-0388, email: adam@snoqualmietribe.us
13. The Permittee is responsible for supplying as-built drawings and all monitoring reports for this project. Contact information is as follows:
Karen Walter, Muckleshoot Indian Tribe Fisheries Division
39015 172nd Avenue SE
Auburn, WA 98092
14. Construction drawings for building permit review must include the location of the Kenmore Interceptor lake line. Drawings must be submitted to the following address for project impact analysis:
Mark Lampard, Local Public Agency Coordinator
King County WTD, Project Management Unit
201 South Jackson Street, KSC-NR-0508
Seattle, WA 98104-3855
15. Permittee must contact Mr. Lampard at King County WTD a minimum of 72 hours prior to commencing any construction. Permittee is required to arrange for a King County Inspector to be on site during construction. Contact information is as follows:
Mark Lampard, Local Public Agency Coordinator
Phone: 206-477-5414, and e-mail: mark.lampard@kingcounty.gov
16. A structure for which a variance has been issued shall be considered a legal nonconforming structure and the requirements of this section shall apply as they apply to preexisting nonconformities.

Submitted: _____ **Date:** _____
Andrea Flower
Assistant Planner

For information about this proposal or questions about this staff report, please contact Andrea Flower, Assistant Planner at Lake Forest Park City Hall, 17425 Ballinger Way NE, (206) 957-2832 or e-mail aflower@cityoflfp.com

PARTIES OF RECORD

Karen Walters	Muckleshoot Indian Tribe Fisheries Division 39015 172nd Avenue SE Auburn, WA 98092
Christa Heller	Washington State Fish & Wildlife – Issaquah Field Office christa.heller@dfw.wa.gov
Jacob Sheppard	Mark Lampard, Local Public Agency Coordinator King County WTD, Project Management Unit 201 South Jackson Street, KSC-NR-0508 Seattle, WA 98104-3855