

## Draft Shoreline Master Program Comments

<b>Date</b>	<b>Commenter/Affiliation</b>	<b>Section</b>	<b>Ch/Pg</b>	<b>Comment</b>
2/28/11	Tim Matthes – Planning Commission	Regulations	Ch. 6, page 1	Add this: All provisions of this Shoreline Master Program Regulation are enforceable provided no reasonable alternative exists, or when the alternative would result in unreasonable and disproportionate cost to the landowner.
2/28/11	Tim Matthes – Planning Commission	6.2 Archeological and Historical Resources	Ch. 6, page 1	Action needed removal of last sentence in the first paragraph. However, the cities..... Compliance with the RCW and WAC says all that is necessary.
2/28/11	Tim Matthes – Planning Commission	6.2 Development Regulations	Ch. 6.2, pg 2	Remove all of G-DR 2. Reason, we would be giving city regulatory authority to a sovereign nation.
2/28/11	Tim Matthes – Planning Commission	6.3 Critical Areas, Development regulations, b	Ch 6.2, pg 2	Geologically Hazardous Areas, Management Policies: Make change to SMP-G-DR-4 change would cause foreseeable risk to read the city can demonstrate would cause risk...
2/28/11	Tim Matthes – Planning Commission	SMP-GP-5	Ch 6.2, pg 3	Remove how could anyone prove that stabilization might be necessary over the life of the development? Remove!
2/28/11	Tim Matthes – Planning Commission	C. Critical Saltwater Habitats	Ch 6, pg 3	Remove this Paragraph. This statement makes all of Kitsap Counties saltwater shoreline a Critical Saltwater Habitats and there by evoke regulations that in fact will infringe on private property rights.
2/28/11	Tim Matthes – Planning Commission	Development Regulations G-DR-5	Ch 6.3, pg 3	d. Remove, The city should be an example not seek to exclude its self from development regulations that it requires of citizens.
2/28/11	Tim Matthes – Planning Commission	G-DR-6	Ch 6.3, pg 3-4	Remove all including a. and b. Cost is too prohibitive and the burden of proof of damage should be up to the city not the applicant.
2/28/11	Tim Matthes – Planning Commission	G-DR-12	Ch 6.5, pg 6-7	This is regulatory exaction is not allowed by the courts and will cost the city of port orchard a lawsuit if we include it in our regulations. An extraction is a requirement that a property owner provide a benefit to the government in return for receiving permission to use land. Exaction can take any form including dedications of land and

## Draft Shoreline Master Program Comments

				cash payment. See United States Supreme Court Opinions in Nollan vs Dolan (“the takings clause... protects against this majoritarian tyranny...[it] does it by insisting that the costs imposed by government use or regulation of private property are borne by all to whom the benefits inure”)
2/28/11	Tim Matthes – Planning Commission	G-DR-24	Ch 6.5, pg 8	Remove all provision that is an extraction see above explanation.
3/2/11	Stephanie Bailey – Planning Commission	6.3 a SMP-GP-2	Ch 6.2, pg 2	Would the City entertain including the Ross Creek estuary at the end of the sentence? “...with the shoreline and with Blackjack Creek and the Ross Creek estuary.” I would assume there must be some wetlands associated with RC but perhaps not.
3/2/11	Stephanie Bailey – Planning Commission	SMP-GP-3	Ch 6.2, pg 2	Same comment: could Ross Creek estuary be included? “...those associated with Blackjack Creek and the Ross Creek estuary, should be prohibited.”
3/2/11	Stephanie Bailey – Planning Commission	6.3 c G-DR 7	Ch 6.3, pg 4	The use of herbicide treatments in aquatic environments can be detrimental to all plant life and should not be used, especially considering there are alternatives. Would the City consider limiting treatment to mechanical removal of vegetation? As for aquatic pesticide use, I understand if an aquatic environment is unfortunate enough to be overtaken by an invasive animal species, mechanical removal may not be sufficient. That being said, I understand the need to leave aquatic pesticide treatments within G-DR 7 as there may be no alternative.
3/2/11	Stephanie Bailey – Planning Commission	d SMP-GP-10	Ch. 6.3, pg 4	Should Ross Creek estuary be incorporated into this management policy? There’s no harm in including RC as one of the areas where special care will be taken during review of stormwater discharge points.
3/2/11	Stephanie Bailey – Planning Commission	SMP-GP-13	Ch. 6.3, pg 4	It is my understanding the recreational uses of our Shorelines are being limited to marine environments. I see no recreational use for Blackjack Creek, especially considering Bay Street lies between the mouth and the bay. To allow the shoreline of BC to be used for recreational purposes would negate any other restrictions being placed on the stream system. Ecological disturbances such as bank erosion, damage to spawning substrate and interference with fish

## Draft Shoreline Master Program Comments

				migration would result from allowing recreation on the shoreline of Blackjack Creek. Would the City entertain striking “recreation” from the following portion of the sentence: “...except for purposes of habitat restoration and enhancement, recreation and public access.”?
3/2/11	Stephanie Bailey – Planning Commission	6.6	pg. 8	Minor typo: Mid-paragraph, “...vegetation has been determined to provide shad(e)....”
3/2/11	Stephanie Bailey – Planning Commission	SMP-GP-33	Ch 6.6, pg 9	Would the City entertain rewording this management policy to read “...and vegetation that poses a risk to property, safety or ecological function.” Noxious weeds and vegetation can pose a great risk to ecological function long before posing a risk to property or human safety. I envision Japanese Knotweed or Bamboo choking out the shoreline of Blackjack Creek, narrowing the stream bed, altering flow, limiting the aquatic food supply, and with time, overtaking the stream channel itself.
3/2/11	Stephanie Bailey – Planning Commission	G-DR-26	Ch 6.6, pg 9	This section appears to have been accidentally merged with the section prior into one large paragraph.
3/2/11	Stephanie Bailey – Planning Commission	G-DR-27	Ch 6.6, pg 9	Would the City entertain striking the word “preferred” and replacing it with “utilized” so the sentence would read “...native plants shall be utilized.” The introduction to 6.6 goes into detail the importance of shoreline vegetation. What is best for any ecological environment is plant and animal life native to that environment. Native plants attract the right insects, birds and wildlife and provide the right amount of shading during the appropriate time of year. Native plants have adapted to the local climate and soil conditions. Native plants do not impede migration, rearing and refugia. This being said, I feel strongly revegetation practices should be limited to native vegetation, especially along Blackjack Creek
3/2/11	Stephanie Bailey – Planning Commission	G-DR-28 through G-DR-31	Ch 6.6, pg 9	I’ve one concern with theses sections. All one has to do is look at a piece of land that’s been deforested or notice a recent highway project that involved grading and you will notice a commonality.....scotch broom and blackberry. The focus of these sections is the percentage of area that can be cleared and what the area will be replanted with but there is no mention of weed control.

## Draft Shoreline Master Program Comments

				How can we as a community be sure invasive don't take over a replanted/mitigated area? Who should be held responsible for keeping the invasive vegetation out; the developer or the property owner? G-DR-31 stipulates exposed soils must attain full coverage within one year but that doesn't guarantee these plantings aren't choked out the following year by invasive plants. I'll comment further on this issue in G-DR-32 h.
3/2/11	Stephanie Bailey – Planning Commission	G-DR-32 f	Ch 6.6, p. 10	Would the City entertain rephrasing the first sentence to read “At the time of planting, shrubs must be <i>at least</i> eighteen....”? Trivial but it'd be a shame to miss out on the opportunity to have larger more mature plants used in landscaping because the developer/property owner was able to get a better deal buying larger plants from the local conservation district.
3/2/11	Stephanie Bailey – Planning Commission	G-DR-32 h	Ch 6.6, p. 10	Would the City entertain adding weed control to this requirement? Perhaps the development regulation could read “For a period of two (2) years after initial planting, the applicant shall replace any unhealthy or dead vegetation planted as part of an approved landscape plan. For a minimum of five (5) years after initial planting, the applicant shall mechanically remove any invasive vegetation. The use of herbicides will not be allowed in the control of invasive vegetation.
3/2/11	Stephanie Bailey – Planning Commission	7.1 & 7.2 Agriculture	Ch 7.2, pg 2	In 7.1, agriculture is allowed in urban conservancy, high intensity and shoreline residential. In 7.2 it appears agriculture is not allowed in high intensity. Unsure if the goal is to allow it or not in high intensity. Does the City want to allow feed lots at all? I recall in the January PC meeting discussion of removing agriculture altogether from the standards. I felt it should be allowed for those individuals with horses or a small herd of cattle but I see no benefit to allowing agriculture to such a scale feed lots would be associated. How does the City feel about this? In addition, further on in the document, under section 7.3, development regulation SU-DR-3 talks about buffers placed and maintained between areas used for cultivation/grazing and adjacent water bodies and wetlands. It is mentioned the buffer should not be less than 20 feet

## Draft Shoreline Master Program Comments

				<p>wide. In chart 7.2 under the cultivation/grazing section of agriculture, a 100 foot setback is stipulate in both permitted zones. Are these numbers contradicting each other or am I misunderstanding? I strongly support the use of a buffer consisting of native vegetation; I'm just unsure whether or not the buffer is different than the setback and if not, why stipulate 20 feet when in theory a property owner could turn the entire 100 foot setback into a buffer.</p>
3/2/11	Stephanie Bailey – Planning Commission	7.3 SU-DR-4	Ch. 7.3, pg 5	<p>Would the City entertain the following...? Blackjack is considered shoreline so it's protected but Ross Creek feeds Ross Creek estuary and Ross Creek isn't covered by this requirement. Should the regulation read something along the lines of "... (agricultural) pesticides within 100 feet of a shoreline or tributary to Ross Creek estuary are prohibited."? Adding the word "tributary" would protect Ross Creek from <i>agricultural</i> pesticide application within 100 feet of the stream. There's little use in protecting the estuary if the water feeding it is heavily contaminated with agricultural chemicals.</p>
3/2/11	Stephanie Bailey – Planning Commission	7.13 SMP-SU-66	pg. 15	<p>Very nice, loved seeing LID techniques included in this management policy!</p>
3/10/11	Tim Matthes – Planning Commission	Chapter 7- Shoreline Use Policies and Regulations. 7.7 Flood Control Works and In stream Structures page 7 Management Policies	Ch 7.7, pg 7	<p>Remove all of SMP-SU-14 Reason: This statement is based on some future likely happening? And it conflicts with the statements in SMP-SU-15</p>
3/10/11	Tim Matthes – Planning Commission	7.13 Residential Development SMP-SU-66	pg 15	<p>Remove (enhance, and restore shoreline) in the first sentence. Reason they are not required by law.</p>
3/10/11	Tim Matthes – Planning	SMP-SU-67	pg 15	<p>Remove. This is an exaction. see definitions.</p>

## Draft Shoreline Master Program Comments

	Commission			
3/10/11	Tim Matthes – Planning Commission	SMP-SU-68	pg. 15	Remove. This is also an exaction.
3/10/11	Tim Matthes – Planning Commission	Development Regulation SD-DR-45	pg 15	Remove. This requires a few to provide a benefit to all and it is an exaction and a taking.
3/10/11	Tim Matthes – Planning Commission	Chapter 10: Existing Developments Existing Uses	pg 1	Change following standards d. to read , If a nonconforming use is discontinued for reasons above and beyond the owners control, its nonconforming status shall not be lost and reasonable time shall be allowed for the property owner to take corrective action.
3/10/11	Tim Matthes – Planning Commission	10.2 Existing Structures	p 1	maintained as follows: b. Remove, Replacement will not be allowed on nonconforming overwater structures. These types of properties should not be singled out!
3/10/11	Tim Matthes – Planning Commission	Chapter 14- Definitions		Add the definition for Exaction as follows,  Exaction- 1. as an exacting, as of money, time, ect. 2 an excessive demand; extortion 3 An exacted fee, tax, requirement. Any development regulation requirement that requires a property owner to provide a benefit to the government or the public in return for permission to use or develop his land. Exaction can take any form including dedications of land and cash payment for being allowed a development permit.
3/10/11	Tim Matthes – Planning Commission	Chapter 14- Definitions		Add the definition for Taking  Taking- 1 to get by force or skill ,seize ,grasp. catch, capture, win, ect. See The Takings Clause of the U.S Fifth Amendment "[N]or shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation."
3/13/11	Tim Matthes – Planning Commission			I still am having a problem with the term "critical saltwater habitats" . It is used in several more places than the ones that I mentioned. For the record, I am asking that this term be removed from all our SMP chapters. Why was this term not defined in chapter 14? Who came up with

## Draft Shoreline Master Program Comments

				it? Don't you think that its use trumps all the other GPs and DRs.?
3/25/11	Alison O'Sullivan – Suquamish Tribe			The City of Port Orchard lies within the Suquamish Tribe's "Usual and Accustomed Fishing Area (U&A). The Tribe seeks protection of all treaty-reserved natural resources through avoidance of impacts to habitat and natural systems. The Tribe urges City of Port Orchard to avoid land use decisions that will impact natural resources within the Tribe's U&A.
3/25/11	Alison O'Sullivan – Suquamish Tribe			The Tribe has reviewed chapters 6,7,9 and 13 of the City of Port Orchard's shoreline master program update. The draft SMP review notification was received on February 24 (via email) and was intended for planning commission review on the 28 <sup>th</sup> not leaving an opportunity for planning commissioners to consider Tribal comments in their review. We have had difficulty coordinating with the City on various issues including but not limited to the CAO revisions, SMP revisions and SEPA notifications. The Tribe generally prefers to have early and continuous participation. This document should have been provided to the agencies (WDFW and DOE) and the Tribe well in advance of the planning commission discussion. This avoids the 11 <sup>th</sup> hour issues that may arise.
3/25/11	Alison O'Sullivan – Suquamish Tribe			1. Review of these chapters as difficult as there they were not accessible electronically in their entirety. The only option is to look at each chapter separately. In addition, it is not clear why these particular chapters were selected for review as they are out of order and usually policies and goals are identified first. Chapter 5 is goals and policies and Chapter 6 is policies and regulations. It is confusing.
3/25/11	Alison O'Sullivan – Suquamish Tribe			2. The City is partnering with the County on various activities and it needs to be clearly stated in the document
3/25/11	Alison O'Sullivan – Suquamish Tribe			3. There is no mention of mitigation sequencing.
3/25/11	Alison O'Sullivan – Suquamish Tribe			4. There is no mention of cumulative impacts analysis.
3/25/11	Alison O'Sullivan – Suquamish Tribe			5. There is little to no mention of restoration planning. Since the urban areas typically have more degradation and impacts they have

## Draft Shoreline Master Program Comments

				a greater responsibility to try and retain what is left and maintain function. Your website indicates that you are using the county document. Please provide some discussion with specific focus on Port Orchard and reference.
3/25/11	Alison O’Sullivan – Suquamish Tribe	Ch. 6.2		Please replace previous language with the following: The following provisions apply to archaeological and historic resources. Shorelines have a high probability for unrecorded archaeological resources. The Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation and the Suquamish Tribe will be notified prior to any shoreline development to determine if an archaeological assessment is necessary. Archaeological sites located both in and outside of the shoreline jurisdiction are subject to RCW 27.44 and RCW 27.56 and development or uses that may impact such sites shall comply with WAC 25-48. The City’s shorelines were historically used by the Suquamish Tribe and unrecorded archaeological resources occur within shoreline areas.
3/25/11	Alison O’Sullivan – Suquamish Tribe	SMP-GP-1		Prevent the destruction or damage of any site having historic, cultural, scientific or cultural value, as identified by the appropriate authorities, including the State Department of Archaeology and Preservation and the Suquamish Tribe.
3/25/11	Alison O’Sullivan – Suquamish Tribe	G-DR-1		Leave as is
3/25/11	Alison O’Sullivan – Suquamish Tribe	G-DR-2		Permits issued in areas with a high probability for unrecorded archaeological resources or recorded cultural resources require an evaluation by a professional archaeologist in consultation with the Suquamish Tribe and the Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation.
3/25/11	Alison O’Sullivan – Suquamish Tribe	6.3		The Tribe is concerned that the City does not have Washington Department of Ecology concurrence on the updated Critical Areas Ordinance. It is our understanding that the Updated CAO may not meet Best Available Science and will therefore be an issue in your Shoreline Master Program Update (SMP) as there are references to the CAO for protection of critical areas.
3/25/11	Alison O’Sullivan –			Should address removal of obsolete, non-functional, and

## Draft Shoreline Master Program Comments

	Suquamish Tribe			unnecessary structures.
				There is no mention of clam habitat.
3/25/11	Alison O'Sullivan – Suquamish Tribe	6.4		Document does not address climate change and the increase of the 100 year storm (we have them yearly). Bulkheads and structural revetments should be located further landward than where they are today (notice that many bulkheads have been over topped and a new OHW is being established).
3/25/11	Alison O'Sullivan – Suquamish Tribe	6.5 Public Access		There is not enough detail regarding the shoreline path. It appears that the path will preclude the maintenance of a vegetated shoreline buffer (too many exceptions).
3/25/11	Alison O'Sullivan – Suquamish Tribe	G-DR-16		G-DR-16 states the “where deemed necessary to protect ecological functions and ensure no net loss, the easement MAY encourage a buffer of native vegetation.....does this mean that in areas where it is deemed necessary there will be a buffer and everywhere else won't?
3/25/11	Alison O'Sullivan – Suquamish Tribe	7.4 Aquaculture SU-DR-7		This regulation precludes the use of culturing native oysters for the goals of repopulation as well as water quality improvement. We recommend removal of this language.
3/25/11	Alison O'Sullivan – Suquamish Tribe	7.8 Industrial and Port Development SU-DR-24		Overwater construction of non-water dependent uses should be prohibited.
3/25/11	Alison O'Sullivan – Suquamish Tribe	SU-DR-27(c)		Storage and parking should not be over water uses
3/25/11	Alison O'Sullivan – Suquamish Tribe	7.11 Mooring Buoys SMP-SU-41		(Should actually read Moorage as it discusses more than buoys) Moorage should not be a development requirement.
3/25/11	Alison O'Sullivan – Suquamish Tribe	SMP-SU-45		Typo – fills should be floats
3/25/11	Alison O'Sullivan – Suquamish Tribe	7.13 Residential Development SMP-SU-64		New development should be planned and built to eliminate the need for shoreline stabilization and flood hazard reduction measures.
3/28/11	Lalena Amiotte – Washington DNR			General Comment: Management policies and Development Regulations should use

## Draft Shoreline Master Program Comments

---

				<p>words which emphasize that it is policy or regulation and not an option or choice. Avoid the words “should” or “preferred.” Use words such as “will,” “shall,” or “must,” consistently through the plan.</p>
				<p>General Comment:  WA DNR recommends addressing within regulation a prohibition of toxics and pollutants entering the water.  No creosote, chromate copper arsenate, or pentachlorophenol treated wood, or other comparably toxic compounds may be used as part of the decking, pilings, or other components of any in-water structures such as docks, wharves, piers, marinas, rafts, floats, shipyards and terminals. Treated wood may only be used for above water structural framing and may not be used as decking, pilings or for any other uses. During maintenance, existing treated wood must be replaced with alternative materials such as untreated wood, steel, concrete, or recycled plastic, or encased in a manner that prevents metals, hydrocarbons and other toxins from leaching out.</p> <p>Tires are prohibited as part of above and below water structures or where tires could potentially come in contact with the water (e.g., floatation, fenders, hinges). Existing tires used for floatation must be replaced with inert or encapsulated materials such as plastic or encased foam, during maintenance or repair of the structure.</p> <p>All foam material whether used for floatation or for any other purpose must be encapsulated within a shell that prevents breakup or loss of the foam material into the water and is not readily subject to damage by ultraviolet radiation or abrasion. During maintenance, existing un-encapsulated foam material must be removed or replaced.</p>
				<p>General Comment:  WA DNR recommends addressing within regulation covered moorage activities.</p>

## Draft Shoreline Master Program Comments

---

			<p>New covered moorage and boat houses will not be allowed on state-owned aquatic land. Where Washington DNR determines that existing covered moorage, covered watercraft lifts and boathouses are impacting or occur within important habitats for endangered and threatened species and their prey, the structures must either be removed by the end of the life of the structure or moved out of the nearshore and littoral areas. In areas not identified as predicted habitat for covered species or their prey, the structures must be replaced or renovated with structures that maximize light transmission within a period defined in the authorizing agreement. Where covered moorage and covered watercraft lifts are allowed to continue, the replacement structures must be 100 percent translucent or transparent roofing materials that are rated by the manufacturer as having 90 percent or better light transmittance. No side walls or barrier curtains are allowed.</p>
		Chapter 6; G-DR 9	<p>City of Port Orchard is consistent with WA DNR standards. WA DNR is encouraged that the City of Poulsbo has accounted, within policy, for this activity.</p> <p>New and reconfigured outfalls must be located to avoid impacts to existing native aquatic vegetation attached to or rooted in substrate. The diffuser or discharge point(s) for new or expanded outfalls must be located offshore and at a buffer distance beyond the nearshore/littoral area, to avoid impacts to those areas. This buffer distance shall be calculated as the extent of the mixing zone (including both the acute and chronic mixing zones) as defined in the current National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit for the leasehold. Leaseholds without a current NPDES permit must requisition a mixing zone analysis for the outfall from a qualified party and the analysis must follow protocols approved by Washington DNR science staff. The outfall pipe must be subsurface within the nearshore.</p>
		Chapter 6; Shoreline Vegetation	<p>For activities which will occur on state-owned aquatic lands, WA DNR standards for native aquatic vegetation protections will apply. All new activities and structures must avoid existing, native aquatic</p>

## Draft Shoreline Master Program Comments

		Conservation		<p>vegetation attached to or rooted in the substrate.</p> <p>New and expanded docks, wharves, piers, marinas, rafts, floats, shipyards and terminals must be at least a specified buffer distance from existing native aquatic vegetation attached to or rooted in substrate. The buffer distance for structures docks, piers, wharves, rafts and floats not associated with motorized watercraft is either 8 meters (25 feet) from the edge of the structure or the maximum distance shade will be cast by the structure, whichever is larger. To avoid prop dredging and prop scour associated with motorized watercraft. For docks, piers, wharves, rafts and floats associated with motorized watercraft, the horizontal buffer distance for structures associated with watercraft is 8 meters (25 feet) from the outside of the vessel whenever there is a vertical buffer of 2 meters (7 feet) of water above the vegetative canopy at the lowest low water within the diameter of the turning circle. When the vertical buffer is less than 2 meters (7 feet) within the diameter of the turning circle, the horizontal buffer distance will be either 8 meters (25 feet) from the outside of the vessel, the maximum distance shade will be cast by the structure, or the diameter of the turning circle, whichever is greater. For this measure the turning circle is defined as 3.5 times the length of the longest vessel to use the structure.</p> <p>New and expanded nearshore buildings must be at least a specified buffer distance from existing native aquatic vegetation attached to or rooted in the substrate. The buffer distance for nearshore buildings is the maximum distance shade will be cast by the structure.</p> <p>Existing docks, piers, rafts and floats that are not located at the appropriate buffer distance from existing native aquatic vegetation attached to or rooted in substrate must be moved, or renovated so that they allow at least 30 percent of ambient light to reach the</p>
--	--	--------------	--	---

## Draft Shoreline Master Program Comments

---

				<p>vegetative canopy. The value of 30 percent was chosen because it is the minimum light value required by protected vegetation. Timeframes for relocation and renovation will be based on the expected lifespan of the materials used in the structure. Ambient light is measured as the amount of light between the wavelengths of 400 to 700 nanometers, the photosynthetically active range.</p> <p>To prevent prop scour, boat mooring areas for new docks, marinas, shipyards and terminals, mooring buoys, rafts and floats must be located where the water will be deeper than 2 meters (7 feet) at the lowest low water, or where it can be shown that prop scour will not adversely impact aquatic vegetation or increase suspended sediment loads</p> <p>The portions of piers, elevated docks, and gangways that are over the nearshore/littoral area must have unobstructed grating over at least 50 percent of the surface area. Floating docks 1.5 meters (5 feet) or greater in width, must have unobstructed grating over at least 50 percent of the surface. Floating docks less than 1.5 meters (5 feet) in width must have unobstructed grating over at least 30 percent of the surface. All grating material must have at least 60 percent functional open space. Grating requirements can also be met if the combination of grated surface area and grating open space are equal to or better than the above standards.</p> <p>Gangways must incorporate 100 percent grating with 60 percent functional open space.</p> <p>Skirting is prohibited. When existing structures undergo maintenance or repair the replaced portions must meet these standards.</p> <p>Private recreational docks must meet or exceed the minimum standards established by the appropriate regulatory authorities for</p>
--	--	--	--	--

## Draft Shoreline Master Program Comments

---

				residential overwater structures.
		Chapter 7; 7.5 Boat Ramps & Launches		For activities which will occur on state-owned aquatic lands, WA DNR standards will apply. New or renovated ramps and launches must be an elevated design of sufficient height off the substrate within the nearshore area to minimize the obstruction of currents, alteration of sediment transport, and eliminate the accumulation of drift logs and debris under the ramps or be level with the beach slope within the nearshore area. In instances where the substrate is suitable for forage fish spawning, the structure must also span the spawning area.
		Chapter 7.11 Mooring Buoys SU-DR-37		Please include the following language. WA DNR requires registration for mooring buoys placed onto state-owned aquatic lands. Prior to installation please contact the WA DNR for further details at (360) 902-1100 or see: <a href="#">How Do I Authorize My Mooring Buoy?</a> To prevent prop scour, boat mooring areas for new docks, marinas, shipyards and terminals, mooring buoys, rafts and floats must be located where the water will be deeper than 2 meters (7 feet) at the lowest low water, or where it can be shown that prop scour will not adversely impact aquatic vegetation or increase suspended sediment loads.  Floats, rafts and mooring buoys must use embedded anchors and midline floats to prevent dragging of anchors or lines.  Situating mooring buoys in water deep enough that vessels do not ground at lowest low water.

## Draft Shoreline Master Program Comments

---
