Salish Sea Shoreline Forum Report

Improving Permitting Efficiency and Effectiveness - Coordination, Communication and Mitigation that Works

February 3, 2014
Edmonds Conference Center

Contents

Key Take-Aways from the Forum

The second Salish Sea Shoreline Forum was held on February 3, 2014. These forums are intended to bring together researchers, policy makers, and outreach staff from municipalities, agencies, non-profit organizations, academic institutions, and the business community to discuss shoreline efforts throughout the Salish Sea (see Attachment 1 for detailed purpose statement).

The first Salish Sea Shoreline Forum held September 30, 2013 focused on incentives for soft shore techniques and the prevention of shoreline armoring.

The second Salish Sea Shoreline Forum turned the discussion to the permitting process associated with single-family shoreline armoring or mitigation. The key take-aways from the second forum are:

- Any efforts to promote soft shore alternatives to bulkheads must keep the residential homeowner in mind. The alternatives will only be successful if homeowners support changes.
- There are opportunities to improve the permitting process, and stakeholders at all levels are interested.
- Providing mapping of priority areas to concentrate resources would be beneficial
- Improvements have already been made, and examples of improved service can be applied to other jurisdictions. Some examples of improvements include:
    - Use of e-permitting provides a way to be more efficient
    - Create resource centers focused on assisting applicants
- Better coordination among all stakeholders and regulatory agencies involved with permitting is needed.
- Working with residential property owners, there are a number of ways to address their concerns about the permitting process including pre-application meetings, clarification of definitions of what is restoration and opportunities for mitigation. There are opportunities to include homeowners in the monitoring process.
- There are opportunities to improve approaches to mitigation. Use of the Habitat Equivalency Analysis may be a useful tool. Another tool is use of an in-lieu fee program.
- Participants had many specific ideas for improving the permitting and mitigation process including centralized permitting, universal permit application, education, more use of general funds in order to create stable funding for staff, coordination between agencies for reporting, requirements and desired outcomes, electronic monitoring, greater use of pre-application meetings, removing the bulkhead exemption for single family residences, independent state geotechnical review committee, expanded use of HEA or other models (and an official mitigation guide), increased financial incentives for landowners, more use of programmatic permits, require monitoring of mitigation in permits, implement “no touch” zones, address sea level rise, more sharing of data, commitment from agencies at all levels, streamlined permit process, adding development community into this discussion, and more emphasis on avoidance and minimization in mitigation.

Summary of the Forum

The day was structured into 4 parts, followed by a facilitated discussion (see *Attachment 2* for detailed program):

- Part 1: Evaluating the Shoreline Permitting Process
- Part 2: Efforts to Improve Permitting Process: Coordination and Communication
- Part 3: Cross Communication about efforts to improve shoreline conditions
- Part 4: Efforts to Improve Shoreline Permitting: Solutions for Multi-Jurisdictional Permitting and Mitigation
- Facilitated Discussion on Permitting and Mitigation

Introduction

Introduction and Background on Salish Sea Shoreline Forums – Dave Somers, Chair, Snohomish County Council; Chair, Puget Sound Partnership Ecosystem Coordination Board

Dave Somers shared that the Puget Sound Partnership and the Ecosystem Coordination Board are supportive of improving the permitting process. Stakeholders interested in improving the permitting process each have a different story as to why they want it to improve. Whether the end goal is restoration of critical habitat or streamlining business practices, there remains a disconnect between the behind the scenes efforts and the individual homeowners who will be affected. Homeowners have their own story and their own attachment to their land and home. Any effort made to improve the permitting process needs to keep homeowners in mind.

Part 1: Evaluating the Shoreline Permitting Process

2009 Lake Washington Process - Joe Burcar, Senior Shoreline Planner, Washington Department of Ecology

Two separate keystone projects have been completed by University of Washington Environmental Management graduate students related to shoreline permitting. The first project involved the Fish Friendly Shorelines Group, a team of students in 2006- 2007 surveyed Lake Washington homeowners about shoreline use and barriers to eco-friendly shorelines. The team found that 80% of respondents viewed permitting as a barrier to eco-friendly shorelines. Permitting was the number one barrier, followed by cost, and a perception of ineffective erosion control. A second team conducted interviews with permit issuers at the local, state, and federal level as well as with permit applicants. The team found that the permitting process is confusing and complicated. As a result, private homeowners often relied on consultants and contractors to navigate the permitting process. The Lake Washington Shoreline Team had three recommendations:

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

The Green Shorelines for Lake Washington and Lake Sammamish Committee composed of representatives from the Governor's Office of Regulatory Assistance, King County Water Resource Inventory Area 8 (WRIA 8), Seattle Department of Planning and Development, Seattle Public Utilities, Washington Department of Ecology, and the NOAA Restoration Center, the group held a series of workshops in 2009 that aimed to:

- Define Green Shorelines
- Increase awareness about the permit process
- Present examples and discuss incentives for shoreline restoration
- Educate shoreline homeowners on green shoreline techniques

From the workshops, the committee recommended the following:

- Consider a pilot program to streamline green shoreline projects
- Evaluate other incentives for green shorelines
- Examine the applicability of Army Corp of Engineers shoreline project thresholds
- Look at other permitting exemptions

San Juan Initiative Process - Amy Windrope, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife

The San Juan initiative was a collaborative effort between local, state, federal, and tribal representatives to protect natural resources in San Juan County from the negative effects of population growth. The project was a partnership between the San Juan County Council, the Puget Sound Partnership, and the Surfrider Foundation. Amy served as project manager for the Initiative. The initiative asked a basic question: What is working and what is not for shoreline projection in San Juan County? In 2009, a number of recommendations were made after extensive study of science, policy and community elements. The project had 5 key findings:

- Management programs and the community have made positive improvements over the last 30 years of environmental management.
- Some of the most sensitive parts of the marine shoreline are being altered and there is a high risk of further alteration, resulting in diminished ecosystem function.
- There is a lack of accountability to ensure that people and governments successfully carry out their responsibilities in a way that results in ecosystem protection.
- Current regulatory protection programs are turning people off, and education and incentive programs are not addressing the needs of the ecosystem or shoreline property owners.
- Through scientific advancements and the ethic of stewardship within the San Juan community, there is tremendous opportunity to improve protection of the ecosystem.

They found that feeder bluffs are a rare shoreform in San Juan County, roughly 10% of total shorelines in their case study areas, but 30% of these have been armored, despite regulations prohibiting armoring in these areas. Forage fish prefer spawning near gravel supplied specifically by feeder bluffs. Twenty five percent of docks were in eelgrass habitat, an important food source for fish and shellfish, and 80% of armored shorelines were low enough to impact forage fish habitat. The project also found that homes set back less than 50 feet from the shoreline lost more shoreline vegetation than homes further setback. (100 feet) (and these closer home parcels had a larger chance of having armor 67% versus 46%).

The Initiative found a lack of accountability and fairness with dock and armoring permitting. Of the 30% armored areas, the project only found nine county permits and 12 state permits. Much of the information was stored on 3 x 5 cards and boxes and was difficult to find. The initiative also found that over 50% of docks were out of compliance with their respective permit, with the average being 50% longer than what the permits allowed.

They found a difference in attitude between regulator efforts and homeowners' preferences. Shoreline property owners want a view, a dock, and access to water. They are less concerned with their effect on eelgrass population. An analysis of the Public Benefit Rating System found that the while the intent of the program was to reward homeowners with tax relief if they voluntary maintained the natural state of their property, there was no follow-up monitoring of the property to ensure compliance. This contrasts with the San Juan County Land Bank and the San Juan Preservation Trust, both of which monitor sites after enrollment.

In 2013 a follow-up study was conducted on efforts identified in the San Juan Initiative. Since that time both the county and the state have instituted a new permitting system, allowing for greater collaboration at the county and state level.

- New incentives are happening. Green Shores for Homes is being developed in San Juan County, providing technical assistance to homeowners. The San Juan Preservation Trust and Friends of the San Juans provide incentives for homeowners.
- However, the follow-up found that only 1% of structures permitted between 2008 and 2013 received post-construction inspections.
- The study also found that new armoring in San Juan County continued to be built without permitting.
- Vegetation (shoreline) had been maintained, but areas of overhanging vegetation had been lost (4 in very large amounts on a few parcels, three of which were forage fish beaches).

WDFW has developed two new tools for shoreline management. One is High Resolution Aerial Photo Change Detection mapping/modeling which provides a more accurate depiction of land cover change and can model future change (can download the GIS layers/maps that show change in vegetation between 2006 and 2009 for each county, at no cost. Can detect change as small as ¼ acre.). The second new tool involves the use of oblique photo boat surveys.

Part 2: Efforts to Improve Permitting Process: Coordination and Communication

Jefferson County and San Juan County efforts: Efforts to Improve Permitting Process: Coordination and Communication – Susan Key, Shoreline Stewardship Coordinator, San Juan County Community Development and Planning. *Susan Key presented on behalf of Sam Gibboney, Director of Community Development for San Juan County, who was ill.*

Prior to coming to San Juan County Sam Gibboney worked on a permitting efficiency called SquareONE project as a consultant for Jefferson County. Jefferson County received a grant

from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to develop and implement the Square One pilot project related to permitting. The goals of the project were:

- Develop a coaching model to change behavior.
- Get property owners to work with planning staff on their property's unique attributes and sustainable practices.

A workgroup was developed comprised of architects, realtors, residential contractors, public works, stormwater management, site design, land conservation, plan review, and land use planning staff. Additionally, project staff held two focus groups with permit consultants and shoreline property owners and builders. They learned that permit consultants are a key audience for this work – they are critically important in the process. If they know what is coming down the pike, they can convey this to the property owners. Another area that needs focus is owner and builders (DIYers).

They found that the permitting process was the biggest roadblock. Knowing that, the focus became "process shifting," or changing the way things have been done. SquareONE thus was developed to help shoreline applicants consider principles of sustainable site design at the *beginning* of their development process and not after they had already invested substantial time and money into the project. To accomplish that, the project focused on the need of permit contracts and owner/builders for a place to go to for accurate information. An emphasis on *coaching relationships* with planning staff as well as *pre-application meetings* would help fill that gap. A challenge is finding the resources to do this. The SquareONE program opened Friday February 21, 2014 in Port Townsend, Washington.

San Juan County has a small tax base and 45% of the shoreline parcels remain undeveloped. The county is working with the City of Seattle on developing Green Shores for Homes program, funded by a grant from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, to create a voluntary credit rating and incentive system for green shoreline techniques and it is using some of the same ideas learned in the SquareONE process. For example, they are including training for realtors, local contractors, and consultants. The idea is to reach property owners before they invest time and money into designs and permits through pre-application meetings and site visits. They are trying to turn the tide and have homeowners view green shoreline features as improving their property values.

Pierce County's Road to Becoming the Best Permitting Agency in the State – Dennis Hanberg, Director of Planning and Land Services, Pierce County

In 2011, Pierce County realized they needed to do something about their permitting system. The approval process was too complicated and average turnaround was twelve to sixteen weeks with much process (15-17 "inboxes" to get a permit). Between 10,000 and 15,000 people visit the Department of Planning and Land Services per year. About 2/3 are asking for general information about what they can do with their property.

A team of planning and public works officials was created to write a document called "Creating the Best Permitting Agency in the State." The goals of the effort were to improve the permitting process, maximize the decision-making authority, retain a competent work force (in the midst of an economic downturn) and find a predictable funding base by focusing on:

- Customer service
- Technology integration
- Timely and reliable decisions
- Process improvements
- A strong management team (all rowing the same direction)
- A vision

Technical tools changed from being those focused on the agency to being more of an integration between the agency and the customer. In the new system online applications for garages, building permits, and other additions are available. A system called eNotifications helps customers track where their permit is in the approval process (6000 people have signed up for enotify). Every time action is taken on a permit, an e-mail is sent to the customer keeping them informed. The customer also receives a link to view comments made to permits. Payments can also be made online, and a permit technician is available to answer questions online. The website also has a comprehensive "Dashboard" that has information on an applicant's permit status, links to relevant agencies, aerial maps, and GIS overlays. The effort is to get people to use the online tools as much as possible and thus spend less time traveling to their office. The tools have reduced average transaction time from 40 minutes to 20 minutes per customer.

The agency is going to reduce the number of required paper copies, increase "over the counter" permits and by the end of 2014, they will allow emailed permit applications. They are also starting to use video inspections (example: video Skype inspection of a plumbing construction project rather than driving 2 hours to the site location). They have 25% fewer people coming into the development center and have reduced trip miles. This overhaul cost about $350,000 in the first year. Dennis feels that the overall sense of tension between staff and customers (50-60 people waiting in the lobby) has dropped way off. The number of complaints to council has dropped from to 2-3 per week to almost zero. They are not reducing standards, but are able to say "no" quicker, where warranted. Everything that they post on the web has ability for comments (thus more transparent).

Permitting Effectiveness Review, Kitsap and San Juan Counties with WDFW – Kathlene Barnhart, Watershed Projects Coordinator, Kitsap County Department of Community Development

Through a Puget Sound Marine and Nearshore Grant from the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Kitsap County and San Juan County are implementing a troubleshooting, action planning, course correction, and tracking and monitoring approach to shoreline bulkhead permitting system review. They are looking specifically at the effectiveness of their current bulkhead *permitting process* and see if they are making a difference on the nearshore ecosystem health.

They found in a review of 5 years of permits (2007-2012) that for 65 permits, 56 were for repair and replacement. They developed a troubleshooting report of issues they found and are creating a report card of potential solutions. They have looked closely at implementation of permit conditions. The findings, so far, are:

- There is no verification link between Hydraulic Project Approval (HPA) and county permits.

- Permits have insufficient information about existing site conditions using fixed landmarks so can't identify where the old structure was located.
- The documentation is done in a bit of a "hodgepodge" way. This needs to be standardized.
- Staff lacks technical training and do not have the time and resources to follow up.
- Bulkhead exemption permits do not reflect the amount of resources required depending on the permit.
- Information on permits that required mitigation was difficult to access. Mitigation needs to be recorded better and in standardized ways. The county is considering using mitigation bonding and mitigation banking.

Kitsap County has low to moderate permit fees. They are entirely reliant on fees.

Audience Discussion: Coordination and Communication

Two questions were asked of the forum participants for open discussion:
- Who is trying new ways to communicate and to improve the permitting process?
- Which aspect of the process are you trying to address: The applicant; Internal processes; Permit tracking; Other?
Responses are grouped by topic:

Technology upgrades

- One city has moved to a completely electronic permitting system. "You can't fix all of the problems with electronic approaches but you can speed up the processing."
- Some of the electronic tracking systems are lacking the ability to have some level of personal contact.

Fees, funding, and overall costs

- There is a challenge with tying all costs to permit fees. A "permit fund" or "development reserve" needs to be provided. Those services that are providing information should be tied to general funds. If you don't do something like that, then you lose all your staff in economic downturns.
- We need to do some accounting of how much our state is paying to defend laws and regulations. It would be good to include this accounting (dollar amount) when we are doing these studies. Is the enforcement cost coming anywhere close to these costs? There is a big gap here.
- One jurisdiction has been able to use 30% of general funds to help support their department's work. They have also raised permit fees.
- To help low income families, one jurisdiction developed a programmatic permit for their own permitting structure (for certain scenarios of development).
- Many permits have regulations structured in a way so that if you depart from the requirements, they have to spend money on consultants – and this works against some property owners who want to do the right thing. The state should subsidize these greener project permitting. This is a major barrier right now.
- Another person commented that in another jurisdiction there were no fees and still people avoided getting permits, so she doesn't think there is such a direct link with the fees, but does think there is a strong link to monitoring.

- In Oregon, they have waived fees for some permits (they work at the state level there – it is a one-stop shop). It is easier to see what is required for the feds in the same system. Things move along much more quickly than in Washington.

Monitoring

- People see their neighbors not being monitored. There is distrust because of this lack of monitoring and it would help if there was an annual requirement that is computerized (to document, for example, if the plants survived with photos). This could help reduce the staff costs (and thus the fees).
- Another city has had success with self-monitoring. For projects such as vegetation, owners can self-report to the relevant agency. It has helped to get the word out and show that they are equitably applying the code. In addition, code enforcers have broadened the scope of their work. When not performing monitoring, code enforcers do outreach to natural resource reviewers. That cuts the costs and gets them more hands-on on the project – they are more engaged in the discussion now.

Regulations, political will and technical assistance

- If your customers come in and absolutely oppose your authority to regulate, then all of these innovations will make no difference. This is seen in a number of jurisdictions (up to 75% of the property owners). And so some other element needs to be injected to help people understand.
- There should be "no go" zones for places where there are forage fish or eel grass. This would make it much clearer and easier political. In San Juan County, that would just be 10 of 400 miles of shorelines.
- The political will to say "no" is difficult to say in the face of geotech reports that say "you are going to lose a house." Most jurisdictions don't have engineering departments that are able to take on that liability.
- We need codes or guidelines that show that it will be cheaper to move your house back rather than build a bulkhead.
- It would be great to have a state geo or other technical person that the local jurisdictions could call on. Technical assistance and tools are needed for local jurisdictions.
- The state and local jurisdictions should combine efforts.
- For projects that are greener (taking out a bulkhead or dock), the contractors come up against barriers with the permits (because it isn't standard) and their client then just says "why don't I just keep what I have?" Would like to see the agencies become more willing to accept incremental improvements if it doesn't 100% fit their expectations (they say "it is not giving us what we want.")
- Seattle put together a watershed-based map (describing species and the impacts to the species) and they use that document for Corp of engineer permits. They update it regularly. And so instead of each department having to do this individually, they can just use this document. It is published online so that others can use the information: http://www.seattle.gov/util/EnvironmentConservation/Projects/SeattleBiologicalEvaluation/index.htm
- Programmatic approaches need a pre-assessment stage. There is no short-cutting this, but then you have efficiencies later.
- Participants also noted that mapping priority areas to concentrate resources would be beneficial.

Lunch Presentation: Tribal Treaty Right at Risk Initiative

Tribal Treaty Right at Risk Initiative – Daryl Williams, Tulalip Tribes

The Treaty Rights at Risk Initiative is an effort started by the Treaty Indians Tribes of Western Washington to address decreasing salmon habitat and stock. There has been a long history, leading to this initiative, including a large number of court cases (key fishing rights cases from 1905 to the present) based on the treaties. The most recent case is about culverts and fish passage, and WSDOT was given 17 years by the judge to fix their culverts (WSDOT is appealing this decision.).

There are five treaty areas in western Washington and these treaties reserved the rights for the tribes to hunt fish and gather traditional foods. The state and the tribes split evenly the harvestable portion of the fish, both wild and hatchery. The tribal harvest has been declining for decades. The harvest on wild fish is very low now (steelhead and chinook). Fish habitat is now in poor condition with regards to both water quality and habitat degradation. Stormwater is not being very well addressed in rural areas and habitat is being modified with new development. Tributaries are blocked, especially along the railroads. Overall, much habitat has been lost and we continue to destroy it faster than we restore it. According to Darrell, we need to do a better job of protecting what we have as well as restore the damage.

The Tribal Treaty Right at Risk Initiative was started by the Northwest Tribes due to the inaction by federal and state agencies to protect the tribes' treaty protected rights. By allowing the continued decline of fish and their habitats, the tribes' culture and way of life is also at risk. The Treaty Indian Tribes in western Washington published a report in 2011 titled, "Treaty Rights at Risk: Ongoing Habitat Loss, the Decline of the Salmon Resource, and Recommendations for Change" (http://treatyrightsatrisk.org). Daryl said that the public needs to support these protections. Under federal Endangered Species Act, you have to recover the species whereas the treaties are focused on harvestable fish - this has been an area of misunderstanding. There are concerns about hatchery fish intermingling with wild fish with regard to genetics.

Part 3: Cross Communication: Updates Related to Improving Processes for Managing and Restoring Shorelines Around the Salish Sea

This session consisted of short (up to 3 minutes each) presentations including:

Nicole Faghin (WA SeaGrant) gave an update on Green Shores for Homes, which is a voluntary certification project. They are in the phase of piloting projects in Kirkland and in the San Juans to test the credits. They are also looking at models for technical assistance for homeowners. In addition, she is working on a project on Public Benefit Rating System (PBRS) to see if improvements can be made to that program to provide homeowner incentives.

Tim Quinn (WA Department of Fish and Wildlife) is looking for partners that they can work with to help develop monitoring plans for Critical Area Ordinance updates or SMPs. WDFW will bring

technical help to document small changes over three years that will help local jurisdictions document changes related to their regulations. He also discussed newly developed programmatic compliance and monitoring program for Hydraulic Project Approvals, specifically for marine nearshore armoring and water crossing structures on fish-bearing streams.

Randy Carman (WA Department of Fish and Wildlife) announced that they are about to release the Marine Shorelines Design Guidance for softer alternatives shorelines, including how to evaluate sites. It includes 24 case studies. The project entailed much fieldwork and analysis. Two training workshops are coming up.

Mike Levine (Marine Surveys and Assessments) put in a plug for programmatic assessments as He believes this will save time for everyone. He would like to see the programmatic assessments accepted at the county level. The Corps has a programmatic permit for piers, ramps, and floats, and the counties essentially ask for the same information.

Jim Weber (NW Indian Fisheries Commission) discussed the regulatory gap subcommittee of the Salmon Recovery Council. They are looking at shoreline armoring first, a complicated issue. They are trying to figure out how agencies could most effectively address armoring in a way that protects land, fish and no net loss. They would like people to give them comments.

Kelsey Gianou (WA Department of Ecology) gave a quick update about her soft shoreline stabilization guidance document (including permitting). She will have her document out in March.

Michael Murphy (King County Department of Natural Resources and Planning) encouraged more use of the Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program as an incentive for conservation that incentivizes protection of land including wetlands and steep slopes. In the TDR program, development rights can be purchased from one area (rural) and applied elsewhere (urban). For example, development rights could potentially be purchased for the shoreline area of one property, and transferred to a development in downtown Seattle for increased density. In addition, he discussed a pilot program for lakes Washington and Sammamish which is an in-lieu-fee program for offsetting impacts related to docks and piers. King County will use this fund for habitat projects according to the WRIA 8 plan.

Mike Grady (The National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)) discussed a project at the shoreline at their Western Regional Center near Warren G. Magnuson Park that has the potential to be a learning lab for good BMPs for the public. They own about 100 acres at Sand Point. They are soliciting partners to make the area a demonstration for green shoreline techniques. He needs technical and financial assistance.

Part 4: Efforts to Improve Shoreline Permitting: Solutions for Multi-Jurisdictional Permitting and Mitigation

Single Family Residential Ideas that Work – Jenny Rotsten, Sealevel Bulkhead Builder, Inc. and Heather Page, Anchor Page QEA

Jenny and Heather gave a dual talk from the perspective of large and small single-family projects which included examples and recommendations for permitting from the private sector with the following key points:

Educating the property owners

- Residential property owners do not like to deal with permitting.
- Large project applicants also have concerns. One of their main concerns is "how long will it take?"

Early coordination

- When beginning a project, a meeting with stakeholders before significant time and money has been invested is helpful. Project denial early in the permitting process gives more time to develop other solutions. They like to get everyone out at the site. Pre-application meetings with relevant city and county jurisdictions help everyone get on the same page. Sometimes the definitions of the "project" need clarity – different agencies view the same thing through different lenses (does it or does it not need a corps permit, for example)

Which studies do you need?

- The code is sometimes not easy to understand, even for consultants. The City of Seattle has done a good job of providing help and giving tips.
- They often hear late in the process about requirements (like a specific habitat assessment. For example, an eelgrass survey). They would like to know this earlier in the process.
- They suggest that these specialized surveys be made public so that other applicants, perhaps those with less funding, can learn from them.
- It would also be helpful if flood plain development plans can be better defined. Many jurisdictions are not uniformly saying what should be in the reports and how they will be reviewed.
- Also, more clarity and education is needed for archeological reports, including what kind of monitoring is needed. There is not clear to the property owner (single family) about why these are needed.

Coordination with Tribes

- It would be great to be able to have more direct communication with tribes, rather than hearing afterwards from the local jurisdiction.

Mitigation Ideas

- "Mitigation" is the first question that many applicants ask. Small sites, especially single family resident sites, are often unable to provide enough space for 1 to 1 mitigation. Need to get creative. Often looking at stormwater.
- Programs such as the King County In-Lieu Fee program have been helpful.

Monitoring and Compliance

- It would be good if there could be a way to remind single family property owners that they need to do their follow-up work or monitoring, such as beach

nourishment. An automated notice would be great. Not only do homeowners not remember, there is turnover at the local jurisdiction staff level.

- Technology can be incorporated into monitoring and compliance. Private consultants keep track of client's compliance needs, but not all homeowners have this service.
- A notice on the deed of the property could help trigger subsequent owners.
- There is a need for a common definition of restoration.

Mitigation in ESA Section 7 Consultations using Habitat Equivalency Analysis– Jeff Fisher, NOAA

Habitat Equivalency Analysis (HEA) is a method of assessing damage and mitigation requirements for resource impact, to determine the loss or gain from the impact. They started using HEA because NOAA has a long history of using this methodology for natural resources damages cases related to an injury to a resource. They are using HEA for calculation of conservation credits for conservation banks. It is a service-to-service approach in which they determine how much restoration is needed to get to function equivalency over time. There is an assumption that the public will accept a tradeoff of functions lost versus functions gained. The unit value of service (at landscape scale) is independent of change in service level at injured and restored site. For example, if the site involves the last old growth tree needed for marbled murrelet habitat, HEA could not be used. It applies where there is an adverse effect and yet they believe they can offset that adverse effect. It applies to the area impacted, knowing the extent of the impact, and rate at which recovery will occur. You are minimizing impact but there can still be a deficit in the function and that is what HEA addresses.

The goal is to use HEA to quantify project related habitat impacts. Then you find mitigation on-site, off-site, or conservation credits off-site (Conservation Banks) to offset habitat impacts. The currency is Discounted Service Acre Years (DSAYs). They assume, for example, that a bulkhead will have impacts for 300 years. The formula uses a 3% discount rate. Habitat values are the key factor. They wanted a transparent, consistent definition that could be easily explained to the public to justify a "yes" or "no" answer for a project. The have two different ways to determine habitat values:

- Habitat Catalogue used by NMFS Habitat for Upper Columbia River and by NOAA Restoration Center for Natural Resources Damage Assessment cases; and
- Evaluation Matrix used by NMFS for Puget Sound.

As an example, for chinook, they look at forage fish spawning habitat, the lower photic zone, the deeper zone, water quality, cover, riparian zone, etc. NOAA is working with other agencies and is looking to expand and formalize use of HEA for mitigation to freshwater areas.

Mitigation Requirements and Alternatives for Single Family Residential Armoring: Is No Net Loss achievable with SFR bulkheads? – Chris Waldbillig, WDFW Marine Area Habitat Biologist

Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife reviews projects for their potential resource impact and plans for mitigation. Mitigation can take the form of beach nourishment or moving armoring above the ordinary high water level, among others. It will depend on the site. A drawback to beach nourishment is that it is difficult to track (it is over many years

and you have a certain level of staff turnover). Also, it requires recurrent maintenance outlays for applicant.

One example of mitigation was on a site along the Hood Canal. The bank had a low grade that allowed logs to be placed at the base and move the bulkhead landward. However, tracking and follow-up beach nourishment will continue for around twenty five years. For some projects, they have to go back in and require some additions because the design didn't work out quite as expected. It is challenging to plan for sea level rise. Current law allows for "up to 6 feet, if needed, for safety conditions" for but they can't force someone to account for sea level rise. They are monitoring some projects, but not all, to see if the mitigation was the right mitigation. There are some sites where they do a bit more study to assess post-construction conditions.

Innovative Mitigation Strategies – Jose Carrasquero, Fisheries and Restoration Principal, Herrera Environmental Consultants

In the context of single-family homes, small projects can have large impacts on resources. Key questions to ask include:

- Does the area really need to be protected?
- What type of substrate material should be used? Should it be marble-size gravel or other?
- Is the focus on function or aesthetics? This may be true to wood, in some cases.
- Is the habitat for species, for humans, or for both?
- Who is the project for?
- Can mitigation occur off-site?

All of these are societal questions. There are a lot of residual impacts that don't get mitigated. Can the dollars for these impacts be used in ways that create higher value? It is important to test the mitigation treatment. His company monitors many, but often the client doesn't have funds to do the monitoring. We need to learn from mitigation projects universally. We have conceptual models for shoreline processes. Jose believes that using natural substrates below the riprap and fill the crevices to make it better for the benthic organisms (and it is more aesthetically pleasing). For wood, you can design it to stay in place in ways that will be permanent – but it is expensive for a single family property owner. Creative approaches are needed. Nature can be messy; letting the wood be naturally recruited may not be acceptable to a private homeowner. In cases where the poorly constructed projects are undermined by subsequent storms, not enough wood was used. It requires a large amount of wood, and thus expense, to do it right.

King County's Mitigation Reserves Program Michael – Michael Murphy, In-Lieu Fee Program Manager, King County

Through an in-lieu fee program, mitigation requirements can be satisfied through the payment of a fee. King County has the first in-lieu fee mitigation program in Washington State to be certified under 2008 federal rules. The program provides flexibility but it is not a "pay to pollute" program. After exhausting "avoid" and "minimize" impacts, King County will identify onsite mitigation options, and then review offsite mitigation options such as

(in order) mitigation bank, permittee-responsible mitigation or an in-lieu fee program (KC or other). Often they hear that the "corps told us to call you." Often it is a combination of some onsite mitigation and participation in the program.

The first step is quantifying the impacts and mitigation requirements. Then they determine the credits and cost. It takes several months to set the price because of the complexities. Often the applicant hears a price that is much higher than they wanted to pay. King County gives the applicant a receipt that they have paid for the credits and they can take that to the Corps of Engineers and they are essentially done with this aspect. Credits are used towards projects in seven mitigation reserve areas within King County. They do the mitigation project in consultation with an interagency review team that includes the tribes with the principle of doing the most important ecological projects first. These service areas correspond with the seven major watersheds in King County. Credits can only be applied to services areas in the same impacted area. Benefits of an in-lieu fee program include:

- Predictability of cost and schedule for the regulated community;
- Monitoring/enforcement of single entity for mitigation of multiple impacts;
- Mitigation/restoration activities implemented and managed through time by entities with an interest in successful restoration;
- Projects address greatest needs first; and
- Fewer larger projects benefit from economy and ecology of scale.

Facilitated Discussion on Permitting and Mitigation

Participants were asked to write down their answers to the following three questions:

1. What ideas do you have about how to move the dialogue forward about permit effectiveness and mitigation?

2. What ideas do you have about how to collaborate to improve permit effectiveness and mitigation?

3. What do you envision as the next steps?

Examples of responses reported out to the entire group:

What ideas do you have about how to move the dialogue forward about permit effectiveness and mitigation?

- Other counties should consider the development of a mitigation program similar to King County. Offsite mitigation opportunities are needed. Would like to have a web page that describes how to do it.
- Multi-agency coordination with all stakeholders together would be beneficial to all stakeholders. Having everyone in the same room (pre-application and site visits) are key.
- Most of the legislation related to these issues applies to mega-projects rather than single family homes (and similarly the Office of Regulatory Assistance).
- Construction firms would appreciate advance notice of further permitting hearings.
- Regional approach to permitting efficiency could address systematic challenges. A replacement project essentially looks like "no impact" on the regulatory forms.

- Local staff needs more education about what the requirements are for HPA and Corps permits. They often don't know the details for those other processes. Also, there needs to be some base.

What ideas do you have about how to collaborate to improve permit effectiveness and mitigation?

- We should explore the idea of a physical one-stop shop for permits, maybe south sound, central sound, and north sound locations, to which an applicant can go (and it would incorporate the local jurisdiction specific requirements).
- Another idea is for a standardized green permit for homeowners. And to standardize the application form and submittal report requirements, so that all single family homeowners would use the same application form for all jurisdictions.
- The JARPA form could be adopted for local jurisdiction applications.
- Move Washington to be more like Oregon, with a more centralized approach. This allows for working more at a watershed level. Maybe some local jurisdictions could get together and pilot this.

What do you envision as the next steps?

- A quality staff comes at a cost. We would like highly trained and responsive staff, but jurisdictions need the resources.
- Education for staff has been cut in budgets due to the economic downturn. Education for the public has also been cut back. This is a really important needed component.
- A regional permitting center could also include mitigation banks so that several WRIAs could be covered at once. Could have the mitigation funds cross jurisdictional boundaries, but not watershed boundaries.

The entire listing of detailed participant responses to the three questions is included in Attachment xx.

Attachment 1: Forum Purpose Statement

What is the Salish Sea Shoreline Forum?

This proposal is to establish a forum to create an opportunity for a diverse group of interests to come together to discuss issues associated with shoreline efforts throughout the Salish Sea. This includes both marine and fresh water efforts in the nearshore and the 200-foot landward shorezone area.

Information gathered from each of the topical sessions will be summarized and provided to key agencies, the Puget Sound Partnership, or those entities known to have primary responsibility associated with the funding and research of that topic.

Why Is There A Need For A Salish Sea Shoreline Forum?

There are multiple efforts going on throughout the Salish Sea region related to shorelines. However, there is no forum through which professionals can share information about projects, programs, challenges and information sources region-wide. For example, the Puget Sound Partnership identified removal of armoring as a major target effort. Associated with this target is funding from the US Environmental Protection Agency for implementation of priority projects and programs by the Marine and Nearshore Lead Organization administered by Washington Department of Natural Resources and Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, the two Lead Organizations (LO). Other examples include the WRIA 8 Green Shorelines model program for soft shore alternatives to bulkheads along Lake Washington and Puget Sound. For each of these there are numerous ongoing efforts including scientific research, education, outreach, incentives and regulatory reform.

The Salish Sea Shoreline Forum will provide a way to share information across organizations, entities, and geography for all of these efforts. Creating a regular forum for communications would address this communication gap, create more efficiency to minimize duplication of efforts, provide opportunities for collaboration and identify shared needs of all kinds.

Topics for Forum:

Suggested topics for presentations would rotate between information about project implementation and funding or regulation, policy and science updates. Sample topics include:

- **Incentives for alternative green shoreline techniques (September 30, 2013)**
  - Incentives overview, Social Marketing Approach (WDFW/WDNR/PSP); Green Shores for Homes (Seattle/San Juan/Sea Grant) project; Monetary incentives: Public Benefit Ratings System, loans, etc.; Non-monetary incentives: Recent examples.
- **Outreach, Financing and technical assistance on shoreline erosion control**
  - Outreach materials and efforts; Examples from volunteer groups of education and outreach work, providing technical assistance to shoreline landowners, and sources of funding for shoreline projects – softshore design, bulkhead removals and restoration
- **Directions and trends in alternative shoreline treatments**
  - Recent research on the impacts of armoring on PS; Follow up on 2009 Shoreline Armoring Workshop coordinated by Hugh Shipman; Presentations of current work (UW, FOSJ, USGS, WDFW); Presentation on Marine Shoreline Design Guidelines; Feeder Bluff Study
- **Green Shorelines initiatives**
  - Scope "green" shorelines – all aspects of shoreline development (stormwater, vegetation, etc.) or just shoreline erosion control treatments; Updates on Green Shores for Homes, WRIA 8 Green Shorelines Steering Committee, other efforts
- **Updates on physical and geological studies of shorelines**
  - Geology, erosion, and landside mapping; Feeder bluffs project; Littoral drift, wave modeling, etc.
- **Buffers and setbacks on Puget Sound marine shorelines and Lake Shorelines**
  - Recent work that sheds light on these topics; Management challenges in addressing these issues; Examples of how different jurisdictions have handled this; Information and examples on Lake Washington

- **Permitting and mitigation with focus on permits associated with shoreline erosion control structures and alternatives on Salish Sea marine shorelines and lakes (February 3, 2014)**
    - Mitigation; Local, state, federal. Tribal concerns (Treaty Rights at Risk); Challenges in tracking and monitoring armoring and shoreline condition; Discussion of possible efficiencies; Monitoring and enforcement
- **Tracking and assessing patterns and trends in shoreline armoring and alternatives on Salish Sea and lakes**
    - Do we know what we have and how much is occurring?; PSP Targets and Indicators; Monitoring and evaluating No Net Loss requirements; Role of NGOs (Salmon Enhancement Groups, Local Envt'l Groups, etc.)
- **Beach restoration on the Salish Sea**
    - PSNERP, ESRP; Local case studies

When Will the Salish Sea Shoreline Forum Meet?

The forums will meet on a quarterly basis or 3 times a year depending on available resources (e.g. September, January, June). This proposal is to initiate these forums for three (3) years, for a total of 9 – 12 meetings. If at some point it is determined the forum should continue beyond the original number of meetings it can be expanded. However, this proposal would limit the timeframe of the meetings.

Where Will the Salish Sea Shoreline Forum Meet?

The proposed forums will meet in a central place such as Edmonds, Seattle or Tacoma to accommodate people traveling from North, South and West Puget Sound areas. We will also explore opportunities for use of webinars, webcasts or other internet service in order to increase participation for those who cannot travel to meetings.

What is the Structure and Leadership for the Salish Sea Shoreline Forum?

The Salish Sea Shoreline Forum will be convened and facilitated by Washington Sea Grant, Washington Department of Ecology and Futurewise. An advisory committee may be convened to assist with recommendations for topics and structure for the second part of each forum. There will be no formal chair or decision-making process included in the forum structure. Sub-committees may form around specific geographic or topical issues if there is sufficient interest for those (perhaps a working group model).

Who Would Participate in the Salish Sea Shoreline Forum?

The forums will be open to anyone interested in Salish Sea shoreline issues. Target audiences will be professionals engaged in shoreline restoration, shoreline enhancement, and shoreline protection efforts. These groups typically include (though this list is not necessarily complete):

- Local Governments:
- Local Shoreline Planners and
- Regulators
- WRIAs on Puget Sound and
- Lake Washington/Lake
- Sammamish,
- State Government:
- Washington Department of
- Natural Resources,
- Washington Department of
- Fish and Wildlife,
- Washington Department of
- Health Washington
- Department of Ecology and
- Washington Recreation and
- Conservation Office
- Federal Government:
- EPA
- NOAA/NMFS
- Corps of Engineers
- USGS
- USFWS
- Ports
- Puget Sound Partnership
- Tribes
- Puget Sound Conservation
- Districts
- Non-Profits with focus on
- shoreline issues
- Marine Resource Committees
- and Northwest Straits
- Commission
- Universities: University
- scientists engaged in
- research regarding the
- nearshore environment
- (this includes UW, WWU,
- WSU and any private
- universities engaged in
- science research)
- PSNERP/ESRP
- Private Property Owners
- Consultants in related fields
- Businesses

Attachment 2: Forum Program

Agenda

Topic: Improving Permitting Efficiency and Effectiveness - Coordination, Communication and Mitigation that Works

How to improve the single family homeowner permit process, including mitigation.

As a note: The focus of this forum will be primarily on single-family landowners with the idea that improving permitting for those properties will also improve permitting for larger projects.

PURPOSE OF THE FORUMS: The Salish Sea Shoreline Forum brings diverse groups of interests together to discuss issues associated with shoreline efforts throughout Salish Sea.

8:30 AM Check-in, coffee, networking

9:00 AM Welcome, introductions and information about Salish Sea Shoreline Forums – Dave Somers, Chair Snohomish County Council and Chair, Ecosystem Coordination Board, Puget Sound Partnership
Updates on Incentives work - Nicole Faghin, Washington Sea Grant

9:10 AM Evaluating the Shoreline Permitting Process

- 2009 Lake Washington Process – Joe Burcar, Senior Shoreline Planner, WA Department of Ecology
  - Background and Purpose of meeting and Recommendations
- 2009 San Juan Initiative Process – Amy Windrope, WA Department of Fish and Wildlife
  - Background and Purpose of Initiative and Recommendations

10:00 Break (15 minutes)

10:15 Efforts to Improve Permitting Process: Coordination and Communication

- Jefferson County and San Juan County efforts - Sam Gibboney, Director of Community Development, San Juan County
- Pierce County's road to becoming the Best Permitting Agency in the State - Dennis Hanberg, Director Planning and Land Services, Pierce County
- Permitting effectiveness review, Kitsap and San Juan Counties with WDFW - Kathlene Barnhart, Watershed Projects Coordinator, Kitsap County Dept. of Community Development

Discussion facilitated by Annette Frahm: Who is trying new ways to communicate and to improve the permitting process?

11:45 AM Pick up your lunch

12:00 PM Lunch Presentation about Tribal Treaty Rights at Risk Initiative – Daryl Williams, Tulalip Tribes

1:00 PM Cross communication (30 minutes). Open mike. Each person to speak for up to 3 minutes about **updates related to improving processes for managing and restoring shorelines around the Salish Sea.**

1:30 PM Efforts to Improve Shoreline Permitting: Solutions for Multi-Jurisdictional Permitting and Mitigation

- Ideas that work:
  - Large-Scaled Shoreline Project examples that work - Heather Page, Anchor QEA
  - Single Family Residential Ideas that Work – Jenny Rotsten, Sealevel Bulkhead Builders, Inc.
- Mitigation Efforts
  - Habitat Equivalency Analysis – Jeff Fisher, NOAA

2:05 PM BREAK – 15 minutes

2:20 PM Mitigation (continued)

- Mitigation Requirements and Alternatives for SFR Armoring - Chris Waldbillig, WDFW Marine Area Habitat Biologist
- Innovative Mitigation Strategies - José Carrasquero, Fisheries and Restoration Principal,
- Herrera Environmental Consultants
- In-lieu Programs, including Conceptual Approach for Docks and Piers – Michael Murphy, In-Lieu Fee Program Manager, King County

3:00 PM Open Discussion Permitting and Mitigation (facilitated by Annette Frahm):

(Questions that are being asked at each forum):

- Which are ideas to move forward?
- How do we collaborate?
- Where should we go from here as next steps to work on these issues?

3:50 PM Next Steps and Closing: Heather Trim and Hilary Franz, Futurewise

4:00 PM Adjourn

This second Salish Sea Shoreline Forum is supported by the Puget Sound Partnership, WA SeaGrant, and Futurewise and is partially funded by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, through agreements with the Puget Sound Marine and Nearshore Grant Program, a partnership between Washington Departments of Fish and Wildlife and Natural Resources.

Attachment 3: List of participants

Note: this list includes people who registered online and at the event as well as those who watched via live streaming. For reporting, we are including people who did not end up participating:

Elizabeth Anderson
Cathy Angell, *Padilla Bay NERR*
Laura Arber, *WA Dept of Fish and Wildlife*
Rachel Aronson, *WA Dept. of Ecology*
Justine Asohmbom, *WA Dept. of Ecology*
Justine Asohmbom, *WA Dept. of Ecology*
Greg Ballard, *Clallam County DCD*
Bob Barnard, *WA Dept of Fish and Wildlife*
Kathlene Barnhart, *Kitsap County*
Jason Biermann, *Snohomish County*
Elizabeth Binney, *Pacific Ecological Consultants*
Misty Blair, *City of Tacoma*
Marta Branch, *San Juan LIO and San Juan MRC*
Teresa Brooks, *Kitsap Conservation District*
Stephanie Buffum, *Friends of the San Juans*
Joe Burcar, *WA Dept. of Ecology*
Analiese Burns, *Northwest Ecological Services*
Carrie Byron, *US EPA*
Roma Call, *Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe*
Alex Callender, *WA Dept. of Ecology*
John Cambalik, *Strait Ecosystem Recovery Network LIO*
Randy Carman, *WA Dept. of Fish & Wildlife*
Jose Carrasquero, *Herrera Environmental Consultants*
Lori Clark, *Island County Public Health*
Gail Coburn, *Seattle Public Utilities*
Gary Cooper, *City of Olympia*
Paul Crane, *City of Everett*
Mary Cunningham, *City of Everett*
Janet Curran, *NOAA Fisheries*
Kathy Curry, *City of Sammamish*
Shannon Davis, *Friends of the San Juans*
Jane Dewell, *WA Governor's Office*
Phill Dionne, *WA Dept of Fish and Wildlife*
Nives Dolsak, *University of Washington*
Erin Ewald, *Pierce Conservation District*
Nicole Faghin, *Washington Sea Grant*
Annika Fain, *Golder*
Jeff Fisher, *NOAA*
Larry Fisher, *WA Dept of Fish and Wildlife*
Larry Fisher, *WA Dept of Fish and Wildlife*
Diane Fitzpatrick, *Poulsbo Parks Commission*
Hugo Flores, *WA Dept. of Natural Resources*
Lola Flores, *Earth Economics*
Annette Frahm, *FrahmComm*
Hillary Franz, *Futurewise*
Donna Frostholm, *Jefferson County DCD*
Tim Gates, *WA Dept. of Commerce*
Wendy Gerstel, *Qwg Applied Geology*
Kelsey Gianou, *WA Dept. of Ecology*
Sam Gibboney, *San Juan County*
Heather Gibbs, *WA Dept. of Natural Resources*
Maggie Glowacki, *City of Seattle*
Cecilia Gobin, *Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission*
Matt Goehring, *WA Dept. of Natural Resources*
Michael Grady, *NOAA*
Jeremy Graham, *Mason County Public Works*
Michael Grayum, *Puget Sound Partnership*
Dennis Hanberg, *Pierce County*
Nicole Harris, *Coastal Watershed Institute*
Peter Havens, *Sound & Sea Technology*
Michelle Havey, *Hart Crowser*
Christa Heller, *WA Dept of Fish and Wildlife*
Diane Hennessey, *Hart Crowser*
Doug Hennick, *WA Dept of Fish and Wildlife*
Kathleen Herrmann, *Snohomish County MRC*
Kollin Higgins, *King County DNRP*
Eleanor Hines, *Surfrider Foundation*
Jennie Hoffman, *Adaptation Research and Consulting*
Sheila Hosner, *Office for Regulatory Innovation and Assistance*
Vikki Jackson, *Northwest Ecological Services*
Laura James
Jenna Jewett, *WA Dept of Fish and Wildlife*
Susie Kalhorn, *Sound Action*
Susan Key, *San Juan County*
Karla Kluge, *City of Tacoma*
Jim Kramer, *Kramer Consulting*
Josh Kubo, *Tulalip Tribes*
Kirk Lakey, *WA Dept of Fish and Wildlife*
Kelli Lambert, *Parametrix*
Sandra Lange, *WA Dept. of Ecology*
Amy Leitman, *Marine Surveys & Assessments*
Mike Levine, *Marine Surveys & Assessments*
Kevin Long, *North Olympic Salmon Coalition*
Kevin Lopiccolo, *Clallam County*
Michael Macdonald, *WA Dept of Transportation*
Leonard Machut, *WA Dept of Fish and Wildlife*
Bill Matthews, *Marine Surveys & Assessments*
Michelle Mcconnell, *Jefferson County DCD*
Randy Mcintosh, *National Marine Fisheries Service*
Franzi Mckay, *Futurewise*
Margaret Mckeown, *WA Dept. of Natural Resources*
Marlene Meaders, *Confluence Environmental Company*
Patty Michak, *Hood Canal Coordinating Council*
Heidi Milovich
Tina Mirabile, *AECOM*
Theresa Mitchell, *WA Dept of Fish and Wildlife*
Jason Mulvihill-Kuntz, *Lake Washington/Cedar/Sammamish Watershed (WRIA 8)*
Michael Murphy, *King County DNRP*
Theresa Nation, *WA Dept. of Fish & Wildlife*
Janet O'Connell, *Shoreline Project for Citizen Action Training School*
Clare Odonnell, *Futurewise*
Allison Osterberg, *Thurston County*
Heather Page, *Anchor QEA*
Michael Paine, *City of Bellevue*
Leo Ted Parker, *Snohomish County-RM*
Christine Parsons, *WA State Parks*
Dean Patterson, *Futurewise*
Doug Peters, *WA Dept. of Commerce*
Gina Piazza, *WA Dept of Fish and Wildlife*

Dawn Pucci, *Island County*
Dawn Pucci, *Island County Lead Entity*
Steven Quarterman, *Landau Associates*
Tim Quinn, *WA Dept of Fish and Wildlife*
Stacey Ray, *City of Olympia*
Brandy Reed, *King Conservation District*
Stewart Reinbold, *WA Dept of Fish and Wildlife*
Betty Renkor, *WA Dept. of Ecology*
Barbara Rosenkotter, *San Juan County*
Jenny Rotsten, *Sealevel Bulkhead Builders, Inc.*
Adrian Rowland, *Kapmarconsult*
James Selleck, *Hart Crowser*
Jim Shannon, *Hart Crowser*
Hugh Shipman, *WA Dept. of Ecology*
Dave Somers, *Snohomish County Council*
Betsy Stevenson, *Skagit County Planning*
Jeffree Stewart, *WA Dept. of Ecology*
Karen Stewart, *Snohomish County*
Nam Sui, *Marine Surveys & Assessments*
David Tetta
Heather Trim, *Futurewise*
Karla Van Leaven, *Aqua-Terr Systems, Inc.*
Chris Waldbillig, *WA Dept. of Fish & Wildlife*
Kim Waxler
Jim Weber, *NWIFC*
Ron Wesen, *Skagit County*
Daryl Williams, *Tulalip Tribes*
Amy Windrope, *WA Dept. of Fish & Wildlife*
Steve Zuvela, *Waterfront Construction, Inc.*

We were able to live stream parts of the event via YouTube. Here is a list of the participants:
Last Name, First Name, Email
Erin Ewald, ErinE@piercecountycd.org
Betsy Stevenson, betsyds@co.skagit.wa.us
Helen Price Johnson, H.Price_Johnson@co.island.wa.us
Pam Dill, PamD@co.island.wa.us
Elliott Menashe, elliott@greenbeltconsulting.com
Alison O'sullivan, aosullivan@suquamish.nsn.us
Alan Chapman, AlanC@lummi-nsn.gov
Carey Evenson, cevenson@colehourcohen.com
Amanda Azous, aazous@herrerainc.com
Mojgan Carlson, mcarlso@co.pierce.wa.us
Bill Thomas, pnwprospector@comcast.net
Teresa Brooks, t-brooks@conservewa.net
Alexis Blue, Alexis@coastalgeo.com
Bernice Tannenbaum, BERNICE.R.TANNENBAUM@leidos.com
Jamie Michel, JMichel@nosc.org

Attachment 4: Participant responses to permitting and mitigation questions

Survey that participants filled in at the final session of the forum. Number of responses turned in = 55

Participants were asked to write down their answers to the following three questions:

1. What ideas do you have about how to move the dialogue forward about permit effectiveness and mitigation?
2. What ideas do you have about how to collaborate to improve permit effectiveness and mitigation?
3. What do you envision as the next steps?

Responses:

Ideas to move dialogue forward? At state level: work to reduce use of exemption from shoreline permit for bulkhead construction for single family residences. At local level: provide the incetives to promote alternatives to bulkheads.
Ideas for collaboration? Provide training in soft shore for bulkhead contractors. Jurisdictions should prepare handouts for applicants regarding shoreline stabilization contractors in the area.
What are next steps? We need to come up with more ideas to make it easier to do the right thing in terms of shoreline stewardship.
****

Ideas to move dialogue forward? Quarterly forums to continue conversations & stay apprised of industry changes/improvements. A website (similar to a dashaboard) would be helpful to share ideas & rescources for all partners.
Ideas for collaboration? Fund state geotechnical independent review committee to provide expert analysis & recommendations for shoreline permits.
What are next steps? Develop guidance for soft shore protection & provide training to counties.
****

Ideas to move dialogue forward? Effective enforcement is needed to bring the permit system much neeed integrity.
Ideas for collaboration? Decide if HEA is the right model and use it at local, state, and fed levels if it is (or find a better model).
What are next steps? Improve political will to address environmental impacts.
****

Ideas to move dialogue forward? Connecting mitigation and the monitary of mitigation to the permit requirements. If mitigation is a requirement of a permit it must be monitored.
Ideas for collaboration? Working together with permit implementors (consultants and contractors) to montitor mitigation requirements or improve implenetation and construction techniques.
What are next steps? Develop mitigation teams to monitor the most inovative and newest mitigation techniques.
****

Ideas to move dialogue forward? More fincanical incentive for landowners to do the right thing. Remove local jurisdiction. Perverse incentives that do the opposite of the above.
Ideas for collaboration? Develop reciprocal programatic guidelines that are accceptable to multiple agencies/entities. (we have many programatic consultations in place w/ federal action agencies that really do help expedite federal permitting.
What are next steps? Move forward w/ state & local jurisdiction leaders to develop programatics, design criteria-based programatic permitting vehicles.
****

Ideas to move dialogue forward? When implementing offsite mitigation, through ILF, along marine shorelines include criteria that would favor work within the same drift cell as the project that your mitigating for.

Ideas for collaboration? NOAA'S HEA calculations need to incorporate "ecosystem services valvation" as a variable to consider.
What are next steps? Develop a stable funding mechanism to fund enforcement and monitoring at the local level that's not linked to permit fees.
****

Ideas to move dialogue forward? no response
Ideas for collaboration? no response
What are next steps? 1. People who idenified different report requirements & regulations from various agencies should call these out specificially, with examples. (meeting or individually). 2. Agencies, local governements look at this info/ think about how to address these should be discussed at agency level RE potential to address. 3. Agencies, local governments meet to begin discussion.
****

Ideas to move dialogue forward? I liked the idea of "no touch zones", where agreement on areas that need to be protected is reached, so that local development options are removed. TDR could provide $ to retire whatever development rights (D.R) are located in these areas. State tax $ needed to pay for D.R. Perhaps the PSP could facilitate the needed dialog about deciding where these areas are. It should not be a legislature decions- rather more of a scientific decision.
Ideas for collaboration? County's need to be open to interagency agreements w/ all municipalities to allow off-site mitigation. Suggest building on the landscape/watershed characterization model used by Ecology SEA. State $ needed to facilitate these agreements and pilot projects.
What are next steps? Explore law changes to implement a "flush" tax to be paid by all residents specifically for mitigation implementation (as described above in #1 + 2). Change SMA to remove allowance for shoreling armoring as a "given". Need to do this before sea level rises by more than 18".
****

Ideas to move dialogue forward? Helpful that you are including private sector voices in the converstaions/presentations. Also, the targeted audiences as noted with square one presentation and san juan county, to focus efforts.
Ideas for collaboration? Keeping one another informed and engaging towards an evolving, shared implementaion of best permitting practices- heard a lot of that in todays' presentations. Helpful knowing these examples… toward more regional consistency.
What are next steps? The sea level rise question perenially pops up in various phrasing. Some puget sound cities are doing forward-thinking work who could present what they have learned and how their work is proceeding, these could be a good focus for a forum or part of. Support legislative fix to SMA for an effective mechanism for enforcement, analagous to speeding tickets- would answer some of the complaints we hear about lack of enforcement.
****

Ideas to move dialogue forward? No response
Ideas for collaboration? No response
What are next steps? Successful restoration efforts on residental properties will be predicated upon regulatory flexibility that supports trade-offs to achive restoration efforts within the limits set by landowners. Example: restoration on shoreline, including bulkhead removal, will accomdate retro-fit of non confroming boat ramp & floating dock, and will do so within some type of programatic streamlined permitting process.
****

Ideas to move dialogue forward? All levels (fed, state, city, county) cordinate their needs in terms of reporting, required mitigation and desired outcome. Agreement on mitigation & monitoring of mitigation- what is most effective for a given situation? On-site vs in-leiu fee, etc.
Ideas for collaboration? Major gaps seem to be agreed upon, when it comes to single- homeowner sized projects- most obviously, lack of enforcement/accountabiity, both at permitting and mitigation steps. How can this be fixed/with what funding?
What are next steps? Take on steps to strengthen existing permit enforcement and mitigation planning so current codes can be meaningfully enforced.
****

Ideas to move dialogue forward? Website showing all mitigation in-lieu fee programs for all jurisdictions. Stricter inter jurisdiction co-operation quarterly mtgs to discuss issues & redundang. Work with county/city jurisdictions to I.D. off site & on site mitigation priorities.
Ideas for collaboration? FEMA/County/City/USACE/NOAA/USFWS discussions to I.D. information needs that can incorporate all issues of concern- much like a JARPA. 1 > minute opps. Eduation lead entitities (city/county) to help establish all permit needs to realy @ pre-app mtgs.
What are next steps? Get all jurisdictions (including tribes) to the next mtg & a the table to discuss these issues.
****

Ideas to move dialogue forward? Agencey coordination between locals, state and federal (triblal too) agencies so that an applicant can get info on all permits in one location. Longterm- take local gov out of environmental permit business except (they can do building permit inspections). Have ecolgoy run permits for state by watershed similar to oregon model. Ecology can then collaborate w/ corps to streamline permits from there.
Ideas for collaboration? WSDOT has a model of working with all permit agencies (local, state, fed) at the beginning of a project where they all come to site visit at same time. If there was a way to do this by video conference call to introduce several projects to all agencies- at once and get their feedbakc this would be more effective. For mitigation- must do enforcement follow up. collaborate with
What are next steps? See above (ecology part). Collaborate with builders associations, developers, business community to ask them how the process can be more effective and efficient. Change perception that permitting is a pain- get sate to help w/ handbook about this?
****

Ideas to move dialogue forward? Communication between different permitting entities and stakeholders such as tribes & NGOs to share what each body needs (eg information & data, clear understanding of other regulatory process) and what they can provide for each other in order to produce well-implemented and consistent permitting.
Ideas for collaboration? Per #1 perhaps a framework of coordination. Each entity would need to coordinate internally to determine their needs/contributions and then have a framework where the entities can compare notes and develpe a system for meeting the needs of themselves & each other. Could happen once or be a continual process (eg 3-5 years). would need to be transparent.
What are next steps? Funding and a superhuman coordinator! (to above statements).
****

Ideas to move dialogue forward? I know its hard, but all regulatory entities need to be present at these types of meetings (eg corps, tribes). But even with them represented, those people are not the ones that can affect change in the bureaucracy… and getting them to participate in the WHOLE meeting- not just dropping by for an hour or two!!
Ideas for collaboration? what about a single government entity created to do all the compliance and effectiveness monitoring for all fed/state/local permits. Each agency provides $ and/or staff to the entity to carry out these tasks. Where would $ come from? Maybe a portion of permit fees? This way there is one central clearing house for data collections interpreations and dissenination.
What are next steps? I'm not sure- but its easy fro permit agencies to get caught up in finding the flaws in coming up with a perfecet design instead of looking favorably upon incremental improvements/benefits that may not be perfect.
****

Ideas to move dialogue forward? Clearly define the problem(s). What do we mean when we suggest that permits are not effective? You need to understand a problem, and agree on the problem, before you go about solving it. Is the problem streamlining, coordination, ineffective monitoring, contrary opinions, lack of technical knowledge, etc? these are very different problems requiring different soultions.
Ideas for collaboration? Is lack of collaboration the problem?
What are next steps? Narrow the scope of the conversation. Topically, geographically, other means. Useful to meet w/ more groups, broader audience but this may in itself, make identifying & solving problems more difficult.
****

Ideas to move dialogue forward? For the dialogue to move forward people need to see that the current dialogue is resulting in productive action. We need to see more agencies commit to dedicate $ and time to implementing ideas developed at the forum.
Ideas for collaboration? Standard methods need to be developed to improve collaboration.
What are next steps? Do more. Talk less. Lets see if any of the ideas being suggested will work.
****

Ideas to move dialogue forward? Workshops that include realators, developers & landowners, along w/ agency staff. (maybe regional?)
Ideas for collaboration? Better tracking and onsite review (>1) w/ data collected to widely accessible datatbase. This obviously requires funding to implement.
What are next steps? Coordination & cooperation between state agencies & local governments to improve consistency on permitting & enforcement.
****

Ideas to move dialogue forward? Run a pilot project for each county with an online permit-tracking system. That is collaborated on at all levels. Include applicants (all types), regulators, planners, non-profits, etc.
Ideas for collaboration? I like the idea of collaborating w/ multiple agencies on an online "sharepoint-style-work-flow" that would help keep all parties in the loop and on tack with notifications, as permits are approved/commented on.
What are next steps? Use suggestions fro mthe discussion to bring in the correct people and plan recommendations for agencies to review & approve. Best suggestions of the day were to 1. come up w/ financial comparisions for homeowners (tech. assistance) to better understand and make decisions on hard vs softshore armor and 2 hire a state geotech to do independant reviews of landowner- hired determinations.
****

Ideas to move dialogue forward? There needs to be a impact & mitigation schedule used by all local, state & federal agencies that would assign impact points for various project components & mitigation points for various mitigation options. This would allow applicants to asses their project in advance to determine if they can mitigate.
Ideas for collaboration? As a consultant working w/ all local, state, & federal agencies it would be beneficial to reduce agency overlap on reviews. Also, if all locals would adopt the JARPA for shoreline permitting & not use separate forms. Provide a website to list options for offsite mitigation.
What are next steps? Reduce the tiered approach to permitting if possible; local state & federal permit requirements make for a costly & drawn out process. Can a regional permit agency be developed as a one-stop process for applicants.
****

Ideas to move dialogue forward? 1. City/county requirements for documents & reporting- make the requirements consistant with federal/state requirements. That way applicants prepare one document. 2. When studies are prepared for an area, make them publicly available on city/county website.
Ideas for collaboration? 1. Multi-agency coordination- either on site or in pre-app meeting with applicants. 2. Create conisistant requirements so that applicants can mitigate appropriately.
What are next steps? Need a proponent, including sate legislation, to require permit steamlining. Currently, this has been proposed on WSDOT projects but what about for smaller projects?
****

Ideas to move dialogue forward? As a geologist,I've been hired to do site assesments, scope erosion/landslide processes & impacts, and be a 3rd party reviewer for both private landowners and gov agencies/municipalities. Counties are short on staff w/ earth science/geotech background to do thorough app/report reviews. I would advocate for cities/counties/regions (whatever the appropraite scale) forming rotating pool of geotech professionals/peers who can be called on- at fixed rate- for 3rd party reviews. this could be require under licensing as professional delication. Review training and guidelines would likely be needed.
Ideas for collaboration? Bring discussion back to project level and local contacts for continued discussions. I see the need for on-going discussion that is often most effective wen take up with staff/collegues w/whom one already has a working relationship. As many of today's speeches mentioned, change will require patience and persisstance. Also requires the range of stakeholders and disciplines in the discussion & idea development.
What are next steps? Select leads, form committees w/ clear product/outcome timelines. Probably should first clearly identify needs and objectives of permitting agencies with respect to geotech reviews. What are the necessary criteria for approving/denying different types of permit apps? *note: W.R.T. mitigation- need to make sure that gets its own design review to assure proper function of physical processes- wetlands, groundwater, etc.
****

Ideas to move dialogue forward? Does mitigation work on shoreline planning of eelgrass etc that would absorb & provide carbon sequestration & rising sea levels? Any ocean acidification mitigation? Get more Tracy Johnanesons

who can advise homeowners on soft shore armoring. CE's are there any standards for edcuation for consultants on planning/permitting staff?
Ideas for collaboration? 1. Shoreline owners education programs. 2. Outreach strategies to reach shoreline owners. Incentives to homeowners to remove bulkheads. 4. Mitigation WIRA's.
What are next steps? Skype groups for people working on different projects like shoreline owners ed. 2+3
****

Ideas to move dialogue forward? Money is always discussed as a barrier. Are there any was to move "past money"… take it ouf of the equation. Have market based approach or trading services or… fair/equatable = enforcement + monitoring.
Ideas for collaboration? More joint agency permits & documents: 1 step review like oregon example.
What are next steps? 1. We need guidance (agency) on the definition of "avoidane" and "miminization". Right now it is just a game to get mitigation. 2. Shoreline "banks" & ILF. 3. Acceptable rating system to evaluate quality & value of A) shorelines B) streams/ripairan. Simalar to what is used for wetlands so can predictiably & effectively determine mitigation & buffer widths.
****

Ideas to move dialogue forward? Forum & conferences as this one is a great way to keep the conversation going. Individualized or location specific workshops can also get good conversations going at a smaller scale. Many shoreline groups have quarterly meetings making more public can also be a great way to initiate conversations.
Ideas for collaboration? Standardize requirements from local to federal level in one site. Knowing where to look is sometimes extremely difficult- making it easier and redily available- perhaps its own web page for WA state.
What are next steps? Keep organizing events like these.. More conversations and communication between agencies local to state.
****

Ideas to move dialogue forward? Monitoring and enforcement: needs, purpose, regs, how & methods.
Ideas for collaboration? Web resources list and/or redirection. One-stop permitting specialists w/ (partial) delegated authority from permitting agencies.
What are next steps? Focused, specialized topical approaches. Consider geographic based and constuction specific biological evaluation development or at least, a comprehensive documentation of the species (ESA, EFS, and perhaps WA priority species) and the environment to assist with project permitting.
****

Ideas to move dialogue forward? make sure any group that comes on this has advisors/participants from fed-state-local permit agenceis & consultants & developers (&tribes) to trouble-shoot methods being explored.
Ideas for collaboration? It's good to hafve a speatic project or effort (policy? Law? Program?) to work on, get diverse parties together to work out details and then see if through to end (ie, new policy or law or successfully monitired program)
What are next steps? No response
****

Ideas to move dialogue forward? Incentives are challenging to fund. Consider farther: Demonstraion projects, Education, TDR/ILF programs.
Ideas for collaboration? No response
What are next steps? Smaller working groups drawn from agencies, departments and prive sector in areas with closely reatlated circumstances. Keep the discucssion going. This is useful.
****

Ideas to move dialogue forward? This forum and subsequent similar discussions are going to be the key to moving forward. The discussion has to include all levels of the suer groups which this forum has done quite a good job of tapping into. It would be great to see smaller more informal meetings of this group on more frequent basis (monthly if possible), much like a professional group. People wouldnt be able to attend each one but it would provide a venue for this discussion to continue.
Ideas for collaboration? It was mentioned earlier but using the benefits of technology to streamline and track permits, project impacts & mitigation. We need to start using a common language too, at the very least identify a project for tracking purposes.

What are next steps? Larger discussion groups to bring together more ideas to make this process easier and work for all user groups.
****

Ideas to move dialogue forward? Explore central permit system in person. Address green shores with state level permit. Exact permit
Ideas for collaboration? Convene task force.
What are next steps? Get high level by-in.
****

Ideas to move dialogue forward? Continue forums, case/pilot studies to streamline process amongst regulaters. Include development community.
Ideas for collaboration? Have round table discussions. Increase # of babk & ILF opportunities to those jurisdictions that don't currently have them.
What are next steps? Streamling. Consolidation of report templates amongst agencies. Standardize permitting process amongst regulators.
****

Ideas to move dialogue forward? We have feedback on what is/isn't working, lets identifty all the information we do have, analyze it (which we've done a little of today) and identify what changes are most needed & which ones are most feasible, then work with appropriate people to effect change, but include feedback loop to improve system w/ lessons learned.
Ideas for collaboration? Adaptive management/feedback loops should be built in so that there is a steady stream of communication through the process. A system or group to faciliate collaboration where needed.
What are next steps? Use existing technology we have to streamline & improve. Look at other systems that can serve as examples.
****

Ideas to move dialogue forward? Bring in high level policy experts such as Bill Buckeleshouse to brainstrom ideas at government level. Involve Govenor's Office of Regulatory Authority to form think tank. Create statewide incentives for better locla permitting & give cash rewards. Create minimum enforcement program goals that must be met by local gov or state take over of program units occur.
Ideas for collaboration? Remove single-family bulkhead exemption. Create political will to support regulators. Increase state oversight. Change full cost of issuing permit.
What are next steps? High level policy think tank to develop next steps.
****

Ideas to move dialogue forward? More representation from the regulated community. Learn from Big Business- take a page from the for profit world re: efficiency & cusomer service & disred outcomes.
Ideas for collaboration? To allow for & organize a more top down appraoch to reform (while being informed from the bottom up): have each agency/ tribe appoint a single, senior staff w/ decision-making authority to an executive task force to tackle permiting effectiveness reform. Begin w/ a pilot project in a single county. Ideal outcome would be "form-based code" for environmental impacts. (I recognize there are major complecations & pitfalls in this approach!)
What are next steps? Continued disccussion to define the problems. Agree on a process to reach a decision (eg see #2 above). Revise the system (at all levels of gov)
****

Ideas to move dialogue forward? Determine how to share ideas from Forum with various agencies and/or constituent groups. Determine how ideas might inform or prompt need for regulatory or policy changes, locally or at the state legislature.
Ideas for collaboration? The concept of a "one-stop-shop" for permittees is appealing, where various applicable local, state and federal permits are identified and applications are available with available technical assistance. Inter-agency review teams are a great idea at the beginning of the process- helps to provide coordination and improved understanding of different interpretations and requirements. Also provides certainty to applicants. Share resources/studies/reports that apply to multiple projects.
What are next steps? Would be great to get feedback/ideas from "regulated" community to understand their needs/desires.. Summarize examples of what's working and references/resources; perhaps a basic website with links. Get rid of single family exemption in current state law.

****

Ideas to move dialogue forward? More focus on the customer's needs and opinions? Where are they in the dialog? Also, effective permitting with attentive customer service is expensive and requires highly trained and motivated staff. Ensufficient to support.
Ideas for collaboration? Collaboration is limited because each agency (local, state, and federal) is responding to a set of specific legislative requirements that are not that mallable that they can be changed. Fund interagency forums on particular permitting topics.
What are next steps? To fully improve process need: 1) changes to legal framework: eg. Collapse SMA and CAO into single regulatory framework. 2) establish interagency forums. 3) work to expand mitigation options including in-lieu fee.
****

Ideas to move dialogue forward? Support coordinated regional approach- need multiple sectors represented and need to work to ID opportunities & challenges with each region. Region could be water shed or other geographic boundary.
Ideas for collaboration? Same as above- a regional approach in necessary to capture relevant issues & opportunities.
What are next steps? These forums are helpful to stimulate ideas, but each region or watershed need to keep a local conversation going. Emphasize that this will not happen overnight- it takes a commitment by all participants.
****

Ideas to move dialogue forward? Many of the questions/ideas generateed have likely been explored by some or even most juisdictions. It seems like parsing those out or smaller group discussions would be effective. Many of us have already explored potential solutions but have run into some sort of barrier thus additional discussions with others could help move ideas/solutions forward.
Ideas for collaboration? In other words, we have gotten this far on a pontential solution but here is where the ideas "died". How do we move it forward with additional effort?
What are next steps? No response
****

Ideas to move dialogue forward? PSP to form a workgroup of local, state, fed & tribes to reduce redundancy in the info required for permitting. Same groupe to streamline permit process for restoration (includes bulkhead removal). Sorry, brain has stopped working. I'll help w/ planning the next forum. :) Science then design.
Ideas for collaboration? Pre-application site visits for SFR shoreline projects; have staff from local, WDFW, DNR, Ecology Corps, NOAA, etc come once a month (if needed) to San Juans.
What are next steps? No response
****

Ideas to move dialogue forward? Streamline the permitting process.
Ideas for collaboration? Continued dialogue at meetings like this. Central database to track permits.
What are next steps? Different agences working together to streamline the process.
****

Ideas to move dialogue forward? No response
Ideas for collaboration? No response
What are next steps? Great forum! Second I attended, keep them coming. Well done. Thank you.
****

Ideas to move dialogue forward? Add the development community into this process. At our city, we provide pre-application services including site visits, permit process guidance and faciliation with WDFW & ecology. I find that I spend a lot of my time helping applicants try to modify their proposal to avoid/min. until they don't need a permit or can utilize an exemption. We already use the SARPA for all CAO & SMP applications.
Ideas for collaboration? Pre-application services coordinated on the local/state/or federal level (both with all relevant agencies) to review project & determine required mitigation. *Additionally, (if the potical will exists) we (the local, state, fed) could offer recommended site specific non compnesatory restoration that if added to the project would make the no net loss determination easier to make & therefore shorten the time frame & level of effort required to process the permit. 2 tracks: 1. Standard required mitigation= standard 120 day process standard fee. 2. Additional voluntary restoration component= reduced timeline reduced fees say 1/2?

What are next steps? If this is going to result in changes it must start with state and federal guidance or leadership role to help facilitate the local jursidictions. At the city of Tacoma, we get a lot of support from WDFW but rarely get any responses or support from USACE or the agencies or the tribes.
****

Ideas to move dialogue forward? No response
Ideas for collaboration? (get outside our very comfortable box)- eliminate duplication. Set similar timelines, application docs, mitigation requirements & even monitoring reporting documents for local, state, fed environmental agences. Each agency would be responsible for a portion or section of permitting- but all would be working off the same permit. example: state- BA's, BE's, BO's & primary environmental review. fed- set mitigation reg. local- pre-app monitoring- report back to state & fed.
What are next steps? Federal rule changes to set up review process. Follow up state legislation & local.
****

Ideas to move dialogue forward? Organize the ideas… legislative action? State agency action? Which ones? Local &/or administrative action … and have separate conversations for each.
Ideas for collaboration? SMP/CAOs require pre-application or consult meetings for certain activities; invite local,state,fed & tribal representations to these meetings. Have all agencies using the same (or similar) studies/reports; definitions.
What are next steps? See #1
****

Ideas to move dialogue forward? review application requirements for reducing electronic permits that autofill across agency applications focus on actons versus talking about actions.
Ideas for collaboration? More multi-agency pre-application requirements/meeting better fund agencies to staff review coordination, post-permit follow up & enforcement.
What are next steps? Reduction in redundancy- increased effiency.
****

Ideas to move dialogue forward? Checking back with jursidctions & agencies on how they may have wlked away from meeting today & put a new idea into use. Did it work? New ideas? How are new SMP's changing the permitting process in local setting.
Ideas for collaboration? Having peronal from counties & cities focuses their different ideas seems helpful. Making connections with the other agencies involved in the shoreline permit process is key. The working relationships between city/county planners and WDFW, ACOE, etc will only help projects & permits. Have staff on hand that have backgound/education to review reports. For example havea geotech on staff to review a geotech reprot submitted.
What are next steps? Local jursidictions should put into place some of the ideas brought up today: updated fees, multiagency meetigns, mitigation banking and come together again to see how these are working. Incentives for "green" projects. Streamlined approvals.
****

Ideas to move dialogue forward? No response
Ideas for collaboration? I was very interested in the Pierce Co presentation on their electronic permitting system. If there was a way to communicate project details with other jurisdictions so they can consider the use of this program to improve the permit process and tracking of permits.
What are next steps? I agree with the idea about bringing in the development community.
****

Ideas to move dialogue forward? More local-level presenters, ie small/medium sized cities (especially those with limited staff resources).
Ideas for collaboration? No response
What are next steps? No response
****

Ideas to move dialogue forward? Focus on improving mitigation sequence implementation by stressing avoidance and minimization. Find ways to require that impacts to nearshore environments are mitigated in kind through ILF or banks that focus on similar areas.

Ideas for collaboration? Ensure federal partners (particularly the Corps) are part of this conversation moving forward.
What are next steps? Research reasons for previously abandoning the idea of a Puget Sound-wide ILF program. Follow up on work of NWIFC staff looking at regulatory gaps.
****

Ideas to move dialogue forward? There needs to be coordination at a state and federal level in terms of providing a joint effort for permitting. I think that funding for groups similar to programs like the Shellfish Intragency Permitting (SIP) team from the legislature is going to be a key component.
Ideas for collaboration? Certainly forums such as this one help to provide an understanding of current efforts, but there does not seem to be enough coordination with the regulatory agenices. Create a working body that acts as the coordinating agency would be helpful, but is not always possible with out funding.
What are next steps? Create a working group whose goal is to submit a plan to the legislature on improving permitting needs.
****

Ideas to move dialogue forward? State and federal rules need to show desire outcomes. Why require local government to enforce federal & state rules at the permit counter?
Ideas for collaboration? What is desired out come? Why need to adjust requirements if desired outcome is not happening.
What are next steps? Work on outcomes. Not all rules get desired outcome.
****

Ideas to move dialogue forward? The local SMP Shoreline inventory chapter, data & analysis is one of the most incentive products local govs getting these grants- they really should use it to the max. I think these forums are very good. Sometimes we must look backward to where we must go to move forward. Revisit and establish full use of the JARPA process (joint aquatic resources permit application) as a vehilce for submitting projeccts that will need numerous permits and need to be revisited by several responisible parties. They are online at ecology's website but arent required by lead agencies- only the USACE and bainbridge island always use them.
Ideas for collaboration? Maintain you good list of involved parties and encourage or faciliate sharing ideas and facts that can help the conversation & process, ie open GIS layers include the development ress and standards for vearious related codes and plans- that would help permit applicants alot. Say for the shoreline permits (SMP regs), CAOS, flood plain (NFIP projects, etc).
What are next steps? Something liket his again- building on what you have alread done and are doing. Maybe a 2-day thing with some break out sessions, ie for my idea above in 2, or in-lieu mitigation etc. It is easier and cheaper and more proactive gotta shoreline (and other target resources) when the local shoreline inventory, chraracterization and alaysis (SICA) is done very well, using all the available migitaion for th other assiocated agencies like WDFW, WDNR, NOAA, NGOS, interested residents, etc. After the local "SICA" is incorporated inot the local SMP, it should be used to help establish the necessary standards and development regs taht are "vetted" to protect the shoreline ecological functions & processes that are identified in the SICA. IF a local government applies those regs. to projects as the basic requirement a proporient must use. You would see etter to captilize because of a better sense of focuses amoung shoreline owners and better proctions for the shoreline. Use the REGS, that is what they are for- to provide consistancy for applicants & the resource is protected.
****

Ideas to move dialogue forward? Determine how compliance & connection for non-conforming structures and motivate stakeholdrs (ie landowners) to obtaind and follow permits. Provide support for the nessity of proper documenation of the envrionmental impacts for not only new armouring but bulkhead replacement projects.
Ideas for collaboration? Promotes pre-application meetings. Promotes & brainstorm alternative shoreline solutions how we promote movements of natural structure versus bulkheading. Can we promote faster permitting process for ecologically beneficial designs.
What are next steps? Good question. Let me think.
****

Ideas to move dialogue forward? This region should require annual mitigation for continuing impacts. The issue of mitigation shouuld not be confined to new projects.

Ideas for collaboration? WA state should assist local governments in quantifying the continuing impacts that each land parcel in causing. These impacts should be listed on the property deed and mitigated annually until the impact is removed.
What are next steps? Determine the sequence that impacts will be evaulated. For example evaluate bulkhead impacts first for all parcles in a jursidiction. Then buffer impacts, the stormwater impacts then septic impacts etc. until all impacts are quantified. Start mitigation requirements when the first type of impact is quantified fro all land parcels in the jursidiction.
****

Ideas to move dialogue forward? Try to coordinale mitigation requirements for local, state and federal agencies to use the same value soltuions onsite vs offsite (state vs USACE) NOAA DSAYS to USACE mitigation ratios/requirements.
Ideas for collaboration? Besides educating property owners about the attributes of their shoreline properties also education contractors- who do land clearing and vegetation removal regarding the impacts of these types of actions. If a contractor is hired for land distrubance actions in a shorelin area- they should be held accountable in making sure permits have been issued. Take licenses away from contractors who clear property illegally such as the case in the san juan islands whree the shoreline was cleared & it is not that likely that mitigation restoration will replace lost functions.
What are next steps? Stop allowing single-family bulkheads as an "execpt" shoreline review this requires changing political will to revise shoreling programs at state level.
****

Attachment 5: Post-event evaluation summary

Survey Monkey sent to all participants. Number of responses = 35

1. Logistics of the day

In general, the participants were happy with the logistics of the event:

- *Pre-registration process*: 94.3% rated as 6 or 7 out of scale 1 (poor) to 7 (excellent)
- *Day of the week (Monday):* 57.2% rated as 6 or 7 out of scale 1 (poor) to 7 (excellent)
- *Facility Location*: 68.6% rated as 6 or 7 out of scale 1 (poor) to 7 (excellent)
- *Facility (room accommodation):* 71.4% rated as 6 or 7 out of scale 1 (poor) to 7 (excellent)
- *Food:* 54.3% rated as 6 or 7; 34,3 % rated as 3,4, or 5 out of scale 1 (poor) to 7 (excellent)
- *Length of time (total) for the program:* 71.2% rated as 6 or 7 out of scale 1 (poor) to 7 (excellent)
- *Timing/pacing of the event:* 68.6% rated as 6 or 7 out of scale 1 (poor) to 7 (excellent)

Feedback suggested:

- To have a location which is easier accessible via public transportation and closer to I-5
- To slower the pace of the presentations might help start conversations
- To end the event closer to 3:30 pm to lose less participants at the end
- To guide the open mike session a little bit more to give more participants the chance to speak up
- To have a better audio system (especially for open mike session)
- To have a better selection for the lunch (food was too much bread, not enough for $10)
- To have a bigger screen so it is still visible from the back of the room

2. Feedback on content in answer to "This session (structure and content) was valuable for me"

- **Morning 1st session:** *Evaluating the Shoreline Permitting Process:* 68.6% rated as 6 or 7 out of scale 1 (not valuable) to 7 (valuable)
- **Morning 2nd session:** *Efforts to Improve Permitting Process:* 71.4% rated as 6 or 7 out of scale 1 (not valuable) to 7 (valuable)
- **Morning discussion:** *Who is Trying Different Approaches to Permitting*?: 69.7% rated as 6 or 7 out of scale 1 (not valuable) to 7 (valuable)
- **Lunch presentation:** *Tribal Treaty Rights at Risk Initiative:* 37.14% rated as 6 or 7 out of scale 1 (not valuable) to 7 (valuable)
- **Afternoon 1st session**: *Cross-Communication Open Mike*: 60% rated as 6 or 7 out of scale 1 (not valuable) to 7 (valuable)
- **Afternoon 2nd session**: *Efforts to Improve Shoreline Permitting - Solutions for Multi-Jurisdictional Permitting and Mitigation*: 68.6% rated as 6 or 7 out of scale 1 (not valuable) to 7 (valuable)
- **Last session:** *Open Discussion Permitting and Mitigation*: 48.6% rated as 6 or 7 out of scale 1 (not valuable) to 7 (valuable)

Comments: All in all, participants found the presentations about permitting the most helpful. The lunch presentation was the least valuable for most participants (not enough in-depth, content on screen was not easy to read). According to the comments, people enjoyed the format of the day, the mix of presentations with open mike discussions. It was recommended to try to have more participants involved in the discussion and avoid having some individuals dominate (i.e. by using 5-min signs, strong facilitation, etc.). One commenter mentioned the idea of table-sized brainstorming for presentation to the larger group as this size of discussion usually pulls in people not as comfortable talking to such large groups and can better trigger ideas or reminders. Participants liked the narrow focus of the event and the continuing effort of the facilitators to keep it on track.

3. **Please list topics related to shorelines, including armoring, that you suggest should be the focus topic for future forums?:**

Responses (organized by category):

Permitting, Mitigation and Regulatory

- Nearshore mitigation and impacts assessments

- What can be done to make SMA enforcement effective?
- Pier, ramp and floats, appropriate mitigation multi-jurisdictional compliance, re: mitigation plans
- Legislative issues/constraints and how we can move forward in spite of them
- How land-use decisions early on will ultimately impact shoreline usage and impacts
- FEMA floodplain requirements and coordination with local SMP requirements, as well as state and federal requirements. How can we efficiently address this new layer of requirements?
- Soft bank protection: Permitting requirements
- How do we encourage better compliance?
- How do we pay for monitoring/enforcement?
- What is the right enforcement model
- Alternatives to armoring - Local requirements

Soft shore techniques and science

- Shoreline restoration techniques
- Puget Sound Science
- Shoreline Armoring
- Soft shore alternatives to hard armoring w/ just enough coastal process info
- Technical Science-including case studies of erosion protection and environmental benefit/impact of soft protection Social Science

Other shoreline design or use issues

- Wastewater management issues with older properties, especially with small lots.
- How to balance conflicting objectives - particularly when dealing with 'releasing' sediment sources ("feeder bluffs") and providing "erosion control", landslide mitigation, etc. for landowners
- What do we know about shoreline owners and publics attitudes, behaviors, motivations, etc. about shoreline health and how they manage their shoreline
- Marine riparian restoration & bluff reforestation in combination with slope stability issues and project implementation logistics

Shoreline science, monitoring

- Valuation of ecological functions present in nearshore ecosystems.
- What are people using to measure this and would tools like valuations and criteria building help this process
- Are the laws we are working with the right ones for long-term preservation of Puget Sound?
- State of the science presentation geared to Puget Sound and Lake Washington
- No Net Loss

Collaboration

- How to engage landowners

Education, outreach, social marketing, technical assistance

- How to engage the feds/tribes in both these types of forums and in project pre-app meetings.
- Meeting where applicants (bulkhead builders, consultants, landowners) are the main presenters to share their experiences and thoughts
- Session on conveying science to the public, dealing with misinformation, and making studies relevant to local shorelines
- How to get the appropriate education/tools/information to people that make these early land-use decisions
- Discussion of terminology and how it should be used to educate, appease, inform, even refute public concerns and perceptions along the shoreline.

4. **It would be helpful if you could provide your response to all or some of these three questions:**
   a. ***What scientific information do you currently use in your work related to shoreline management?***
   b. ***What scientific information do you need or would be useful for your work?***
   c. ***What other scientific information would be useful for your work in the shoreline arena?***

Responses (23 responses)

- Information on quantitative benefits of shoreline restoration
- What scientific information do you currently use in your work related to shoreline management? State Aquatic Habitat Guidelines, ACOE programmatic BE, topic specific guidance documents (USGS, or State Agencies), State Agency white papers, ACOE General Investigation, WRIA Salmon Recovery Plans or supporting analysis, SMP supporting analysis

(characterization, cumulative impact analysis or restoration plan)...etc. What scientific information do you need or would be useful for your work? Any updated research related to impacts of shoreline development, especially work that highlight management recommendations. There is a real need for geotechnical report guidance (same answer for last two questions).

- Anything I can get my hands on. A REFERENCE LIST would be most helpful!!!!
- Much discussion is occurring around mitigation but I am not aware of much information/science regarding what really can or cannot be mitigated in shorelines. For example, the data I am aware of indicates that much of submerged aquatic vegetation is very hard to mitigate - replanting or re-establishment isn't very successful, etc. And there already isn't a good track record for mitigating wetlands which we actually know much more about than nearshore habitats and species. More information regarding the impacts of shoreline armoring would be helpful. The public is very skeptical that armoring is actually an issue.
- Feeder bluff locations, location within drift cells/Shoreline process units, eelgrass bed presence/absence, forage fish spawning beaches, PSNERP Strategies report is an excellent tool for identifying bigger picture strategies for an area to either restore, protect, or enhance. Paul Cereghino (NOAA/WDFW) may be able to do a presentation on that. PSNERP/WDFW have many data layers available via GIS and now also available for use on iPad. Theresa Mitchell/Jenna Jewett (WDFW) may be able to help with that. Phill Dionne (WDFW) is doing some forage fish work and also Megan Dethier (UW) gave an excellent presentation the other day on her forage fish work related to bulkheads. A couple geo-techs to talk about how they do their assessment to comply with an applicant's permit needs - and ask them, do they always come to the conclusion that a bulkhead is necessary? What liability do they have if they say a bulkhead is not needed and then the house falls in a few years later? How risk averse are they in making these decisions? Do they have knowledge of shoreline processes and does that factor at all into their assessment? How do they determine the amount of sediment that a shoreline provides to the beach? So many questions for those that actually do these kind of reports for shoreline landowners! I can't remember the name off hand but Bay Marine bulkhead contractors has a geo-tech they normally turn to to write reports in support of bulkheads who may be a good candidate to do this. Of course we could have the likes of Hugh Shipman and Jim Johannessen talk, but I think most of us have heard them and/or attended their Coastal Training classes, so it might be interesting to get a geo-tech that we don't normally reach out to. And Elliott Menashe is always engaging, too. But I do think that if we want to break out of our boxes and learn more we need to extend invites to people outside our normal group of experts.
- Yes, Yes, yes
- It would be helpful to have more information about the gradient between a bio-engineered green shoreline and bulkheads. We see a lot of proposed bulkheads that are being described as green shorelines - at what point does a shoreline stabilization become a bulkhead?
- Shoreforms, drift cells, habitat models, topography, prevailing winds and currents, boat traffic patterns, road and utilities infrastructure and age. More detailed and broad wildlife habitat information, especially forage fish spawning beaches.
- Scientific information we currently use related to shoreline management include: biological analysis and geotechnical report. What would be helpful is some scientific data on project follow up. Specifically, seeing how differently designed soft bank protection projects are functioning.
- I use WDFW PHS, WDFW Salmonscape, USFWS NWI, USDA WSS, WADNR NHP.
- I currently use information on impacts to shoreline process and ecological functions from stabilization. I also use information on shoreline processes (e.g. drift cells) and biological information such as critical habitat areas, sensitive species biology, etc. I also utilize social scientific information on property owners' values attitudes and behaviors. Scientific information that would be useful to my work are results more specific to Puget Sound shorelines regarding shoreline armoring impacts, the differences in habitat quality between armored and unarmored sites. Also, scientific information on whether or not green/alternative approaches are improving habitat, especially for sensitive/endangered species use. Information on how well alternative stabilization is working (from the erosion control and habitat enhancement perspectives) compared to hard stabilization. Also, more social scientific information including behaviors and values around Puget Sound would be helpful.
- Scientific info currently in use: Dept of Ecology data from EIM website (water well data, geotech borings, etc.), shoreline photos/maps, wave energy (coastal atlas), geologic maps (published and interactive internet), LiDAR, existing site assessment and general geotech reports, etc. Sometimes also forage fish and veg data. 2. Definitely need more compiled results on the effects of bulkheads on beach substrate, beach processes, slope processes, other physical processes, and riparian habitat/conditions. It's relatively easy to have site-specific examples of negative effects, but not so for broader effects - reach or drift-cell scale. Need to find ways to fund appropriate longer-term studies - retrospective or future monitoring.
- Currently Use: Ecology's guidance on determining OHWM, WDFW riparian buffer info, agency interactive maps (Coastal Atlas, SalmonScape, WebSoilSurvey, Corps Wetland Delin Manual and Supplement, local SMP codes, Ecology's oblique shoreline photos, historic aerial photos Would be Useful: Local agencies GIS/photos/mapping of critical areas, topography,

utility lines, property lines (interactive maps such as Skagit County's are GREAT) Other: a rating system for shorelines to tailor buffers to specific values and functions (similar to wetland rating system)

- Ranking criteria to determine which portions of shorelines don't need bulkhead. Good enforcement information on a county by county basis. Back up from state and federal agencies to support local permitters to conduct the best permitting plans possible and back up enforcement. Fines to Counties for allowing unpermitted structures and bulkheads.
- Some of this information I currently have, some of it I still need... I use all information related to nearshore structures present. How many feeder bluffs are in a given zone, how much sediment is released by these? How many forage fish spawning areas are present? Amount of forage fish? Species?
- Currently use: WDFW PHS database Priority Sediment Source (feeder bluff) mapping Coastal Atlas (including DNR eelgrass layers and oblique/historical photos) Nearshore Assessments Needed: Updated geohazards and stream type data layers Buffers (consensus by agencies needed; each jurisdiction should not have to reinvent this science or try and determine which agency has the best data- Ecology vs. Dept. of Ag. vs. FEMA....) Baseline eelgrass mapping
- Want to learn about indicators that are being monitored to determine no net loss. Also am interested in monitoring and adaptive management approaches for salmon recovery.
- AHG work posted on the WDFW website and other studies related to impacts and benefits of buffers, benefits of vegetation, impacts of stabilization structures on habitat and ecological functions. 2) More specifics on impacts of stabilization structures so we can tell individual property owners that their bulkhead will have an impact on this, that and that. Also, cumulative impacts. 3) I'd like to have summaries of the more recent science on buffers, vegetation, and stabilization compiled into documents that we can refer to and give to the public.
- Large bibliography developed for SMP update--relies heavily on local studies of lake Washington and to some degree lake Sammamish. Need studies that demonstrate conclusively that green alternatives can protect property while increases shoreline habitat used directly by juvenile fish --clear link to societally desired benefit. Survey evidence that demonstrates a large majority of residents desire environmental benefit at the shoreline and are willing to pay.
- Science relating natural resources to economic value would be very helpful in developing market-based incentives and mitigation programs. Scientific studies detailing the social attitudes, behaviors, tendencies, etc. of shoreline property owners (and the regulated community in general) would be helpful. I'd like to see regulatory agencies seek input from the private sector re: improving process and efficiency of permitting systems.
- Information on the ecological effects of shoreline armoring on habitat would be useful.
- This question is too big to answer. I think the larger problem is that the science only goes so far at this point. We end up making a lot of assumptions based on the science when we take actions, but the actions have a large amount of uncertainty.
- All data driven research that sheds light on nearshore natural processes; and all data driven and anecdotal information on effective project planning and implementation activities. 2) More professional peer driven information sharing on data and anecdotal information about effective project planning and implementation activities 3) no comment

5. How valuable is this forum to you? Please describe briefly your feelings towards this forum:

Most respondents find the forum very useful. They enjoy the opportunity to learn about others work and to look for ways to collaborate and identify the topics that are most challenging and need combined efforts. One person commented that s/he finds the “exchange of ideas is motivation for change”.

Some comments:

- Very informative and useful to learn about what others are doing and ways to collaborate.
- Extremely valuable. THANK YOU!!!!
- Very helpful, it is worth the travel and time.
- Great to learn about things going on around the sound and seeing where we can plug in and take advantage of efficiencies in not duplicating work. If we can actually get the right people in the room to facilitate change (stream line permitting or anything else useful) that would be great!
- Very! It was refreshing to hear other's ideas. The forum felt very open and collaborative.
- I think this was a valuable exercise because I was introduced to other ideas and nuances of opinion I hadn't considered or was ignorant of.
- Excellent forum. Learned a lot and made some good connections!
- Very valuable, provided there are results to improved permitting processes.
- It was a good introduction, for me, to parties involved with many good ideas shared.