Brief Description of Proposed Amendment:

The City of Camas (City) has submitted a comprehensive update to their Shoreline Master Program (SMP) for review and approval by the Department of Ecology (Ecology). This submittal is required to comply with the Shoreline Management Act (SMA) and the SMP Guidelines requirements (RCW 90.58 and WAC 173-26 (Part III) respectively). The updated master program contains locally tailored shoreline management policies, regulations, a shoreline designation map (Appendix A), administrative provisions (Appendix B) and critical area provisions (Appendix C). Additional reports and supporting information and analyses are included in the submittal and noted below.

FINDINGS OF FACT

Need for amendment: The proposed amendment would replace the City’s existing SMP in its entirety. The amendment is needed to comply with the statutory deadline for a comprehensive update of the City’s local Shoreline Master Program pursuant to RCW 90.58.080 and 100. This amendment is also needed for compliance with the planning and procedural requirements of the SMP Guidelines contained in WAC 173-26 (State master program approval/amendment procedures and master guidelines) and WAC 173-27 (Shoreline management permit and enforcement procedures). The City’s SMP was originally approved by Ecology in 1978, comprehensively updated in 1998 and last amended in 2009.

Section 1.5 of the submitted SMP describes the purpose of the Program:

1. To guide the future development of shorelines in the City in a positive, effective, and equitable manner consistent with the Act;

2. To promote the public health, safety, and general welfare of the community by providing long range, comprehensive policies and effective, reasonable regulations for development and use of the City’s shorelines; and

3. To ensure, at minimum, no net loss of shoreline ecological functions and processes and to plan for restoring shorelines that have been impaired or degraded by adopting and fostering the ... policy contained in RCW 90.58.020, Legislative Findings for shorelines of the state....

Because surface waters flow irrespective of political boundaries, this SMP update was accomplished through a coordinated planning effort by all the Clark County jurisdictions (Clark County Coalition). Among the goals identified and agreed to by Coalition members were to:

- develop consistent goals and policies and shoreline designations for shared shoreline resources
- allow the cities to pre-plan for their Urban Growth Areas (UGA)
- use a regional approach to public participation, the Inventory and Characterization and the identification of restoration opportunities
Ecology finds that the City has documented the need to amend and update its shoreline master program.

**Documentation of current conditions:** Seven cities (Battle Ground, Camas, La Center, Ridgefield, Vancouver, Washougal and Yacolt) and Clark County collaborated as a group (Clark County Coalition) in obtaining grant funding and developing shared documents including a comprehensive Clark County Shoreline Inventory & Characterization. The information was organized around the two major watersheds: WRJA 27 Lewis River and WRJA 28 Salmon Creek. This is presented in two volumes, with Volume 1 addressing the county as a whole and Volume 2 containing chapters focused on the urban areas. Vol. 2, Chapter 2 contains information on the shorelines in the City of Camas including those in the City’s UGA.

The Camas SMP will regulate activities along six shorelines: Columbia and Washougal Rivers, Lacamas Creek, Fallen Leaf Lake, Lacamas Lake and Round Lake.

Shoreline modifications are present on all of these waterbodies with the most urbanized area located along the Columbia River near the confluence of the Washougal River. This area is largely industrial, developed with the Georgia-Pacific Camas Mill, two crossings of SR-14 and the BNSF railroad tracks paralleling the shoreline west of the Washougal River. Along the Washougal, commercial and industrial uses are present near the mouth but as you move upstream, the shoreline is encompassed by the Camas-owned Washougal River Greenway. Modifications include old gravel ponds and levees, riprapped banks and three significant bridge crossings. Most of Lacamas Creek within Camas flows through Lacamas and Round lakes. Camas Mill has a significant water right which diverts water out of Lacamas Lake and reduces flows in the lower portion of Lacamas Creek. Lacamas and Round lakes both have dams which control the water levels. Shorelines along the lakes are characterized by residential development and park land. The eastern side of Lacamas Lake is paralleled by SE Leadbetter Road and lined with riprap. Lacamas Creek, Lacamas Lake and Round Lake have all had historic water quality impairments. Fallen Leaf Lake is partially developed with a park and receives a significant amount of stormwater from an upland residential development.

Ecology finds that the June 2010 Clark County Shoreline Inventory & Characterization, Volume 1 and Volume 2, Chapter 2 adequately inventory and analyze the current conditions of the shorelines located in Camas. These documents synthesize existing information and were used to inform the master program update as well as provide a basis for future protection and restoration opportunities in the City’s shoreline jurisdiction. The reports appear to be consistent with the Shoreline Guideline requirements in WAC 173-26-201(3)(c) and (d).

**Shoreline Use Analysis:** As part of the Coalition’s development of the Shoreline Inventory and Characterization Report (ESA Adolfson, 2010), data was collected to address the SMP Guideline requirements to project shoreline development trends and identify potential use conflicts to ensure preference is given to uses that are unique to or dependent upon a shoreline location. The County-wide analysis is contained in Volume 1, Chapter 4. In addition, a separate report “Assessment of Water-dependent Commercial, Industrial, and Recreational Uses for Clark County Coalition SMP Update” (BST Associates, May 2010), contained in Appendix D to Volume 1, was produced. This report primarily focused on the Columbia River (which is where the majority of these uses are located) and

---

1 WAC 173-26-201 (3) (d) (ii) and WAC 173-26-201 (2) (d)
inventoried existing commercial, industrial and recreational water-dependent uses. Estimates were made of the amount of utilized, vacant and under-utilized waterfront land and BST Associates provided a demand estimate which forecasts future demand for cargo terminals, water-dependent industry and boating access (e.g. marina moorage and boat ramps). Volume 2, Chapter 2 of the Inventory & Characterization more specifically describes existing and potential uses in Camas and identifies opportunities for potential restoration and public access.

Ecology finds that Camas has adequately considered SMA preferred uses and the potential for use conflicts consistent with WAC 173-26-201(3)(d)(ii) and WAC 173-26-201(2)(d).

**SMP provisions to be changed by the amendment as proposed:** This comprehensive SMP update is intended to entirely replace the City’s existing SMP and will regulate approximately 26 linear miles of streams and lake shorelines along six waterbodies including two (Columbia and Washougal rivers) which are shorelines of statewide significance.

**Shoreline Jurisdiction:** The City proposes to define shoreline jurisdiction as two hundred feet from the Ordinary High Water Mark (OHWM); the floodway plus contiguous floodplain areas two hundred feet landward from such floodways and all associated wetlands. The City is choosing to include land necessary for buffers for critical areas as allowed per RCW 90.58.030(2)(d)(ii).

During the update process, Ecology made a jurisdictional determination that the waterbody known as Mill Pond shared the Round Lake Ordinary High Water Mark (OHWM). Because of that determination, the City included Mill Pond as a portion of Round Lake. During the local master program approval process, an appeal of Ecology’s jurisdictional determination was filed with the Shoreline Hearings Board (SHB). The SHB determined that Round Lake and Mill Pond share an OHWM but also determined that Mill Pond was a separate and distinct waterbody that was less than five acres in size and thus not a shoreline waterbody under the SMA (SHB Order #11-020). This decision necessitates a change to the City’s environment designation map deleting Mill Pond from shoreline jurisdiction (see Attachment B – Required Changes).

Assuming the City’s acceptance of the required changes in Attachment B to include the floodway plus contiguous floodplain areas landward two hundred feet, and to exclude Mill Pond as a portion of Round Lake, Ecology finds that the Camas SMP has appropriately defined shoreline jurisdictional limits consistent with the Act.

**Shorelines of Statewide Significance (SSWS):** RCW 90.58.020 specifically calls out SSWS for special consideration declaring the “the interest of all of the people shall be paramount in the management” of these shorelines. Camas has identified the Columbia and Washougal Rivers as shorelines of statewide significance.

The Shoreline Guidelines in WAC 173-26-251 requires that local master programs recognize the specific use preferences identified in the statute and provide for “optimum implementation” of the statutory policy. This is done by providing SMP provisions that implement: (a) statewide interest, (b) preserve resources for future generations and (c) give preference to uses identified in RCW 90.58.020.

Ecology finds that the SMP has identified shorelines of statewide significance, includes policies for management of these shorelines in Section 3.2 consistent with RCW 90.58.020, and includes provisions in the regulations aimed at implementing these policies. Consistent with WAC 173-26-251, the
Coalition Inventory & Characterization identified high quality ecological resources including wetlands and anadromous fish runs, and other resources of statewide interest such as archaeological and cultural resources, existing and potential public access, and the presence of and future need for international shipping facilities. The Restoration Plan identifies both programmatic and site-specific restoration opportunities.

Shoreline Master Program Goals and Policies: The goals and policies contained in Chapter 3 of this SMP are consistent with all the Coalition SMPs and address the elements outlined in RCW 90.58.100 General policy goals of the act and WAC 173-26-176 Guidelines for shorelines of the state.

Ecology finds that the City has addressed the requirement to establish policies per RCW 90.58.100(2) and WAC 173-26-201(2)(e).

Shoreline Designations: Assignment of shoreline environment designations is a fundamental aspect of the SMP update. Shoreline designations (the Coalition-preferred term in place of shoreline environment designations) were developed and analyzed county-wide. Designations were assigned based on ecological functions, existing and planned development patterns and on the community’s vision for the future. The process the Coalition went through is documented in the Clark County Coalition Shoreline Designation Rationale (ESA, June 2011). The following excerpt provides a brief description comparing the existing and proposed designations:

Proposed shoreline designations developed by the Clark County Coalition are aggregated and shown in Table 1 below. Most shorelines in Clark County are proposed to be designated Rural Conservancy – Resource Land, followed by Rural Conservancy – Residential, and Urban Conservancy.

**Table 1. Proposed Shoreline Designations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Shoreline Designations</th>
<th>Percent (%) of County Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Conservancy-Residential</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Conservancy-Resource Land</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Conservancy</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Intensity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Intensity</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing shoreline designations for Clark County, including all incorporated cities, are summarized as shown in Table 2 below. Currently, the majority of the shorelines (80 percent) of Clark County are designated as Conservancy or Rural Environments. Less than one percent of the shorelines are designated as Natural.
Table 2. Existing Shoreline Designations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing SED’s</th>
<th>Percent (%) Of County Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservancy</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Natural</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Conservancy</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban (including Urban High, Medium and Low Intensity)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Camas currently uses five designations in its SMP (% lineal feet): Natural (6%), Conservancy (40%), Urban High Intensity (29%), Urban Medium/Low Intensity (25%) and Aquatic (N/A).

In the updated SMP, there are five proposed designations: Natural, Urban Conservancy, Medium Intensity, High Intensity and Aquatic (Chapter 4). Medium Intensity is similar to the Guidelines-recommended Shoreline Residential and is proposed for those areas that are primarily residential but may also allow other types of development consistent with the SMP.

After receiving their June 2011 draft SMP and map from the consultant, the City began reviewing shoreline designations more closely and determined that a number of changes were merited based on the designation criteria:

- Lady Island – both the upstream and downstream ends – High Intensity to Medium Intensity
- Camas Slough north shoreline from SR-14 right-of-way downstream to a point even with the downstream end of Lady Island: High Intensity to Medium Intensity
- Either side of SR-14 causeway at mouth of the Washougal River: High Intensity to Medium Intensity
- Eastern shore of Washougal River upstream from SR-14 to SE 8th-extended: Medium Intensity to Urban Conservancy
- Western shore of Washougal River from Joy Street-extended to NE 3rd Avenue: Urban Conservancy to Medium Intensity
- Northeastern shore of Lacamas Lake at Camas/Washougal Wildlife property (Gun Club), landward of Leadbetter Road: Urban Conservancy to Medium Intensity
- Northeastern shore of Lacamas Lake between historic Leadbetter Mansion and Pomeria House: Urban Conservancy to Medium Intensity

As allowed by WAC 173-26-150, the City is pre-designating shorelines within its adopted Urban Growth Area. These areas will continue to be regulated by the Clark County SMP until annexation by the City. Designations in the UGAs were developed consistent with those within the City limits and were based on the designation criteria in the SMP.

Proposed designation changes were specifically discussed at the November 15 and December 20, 2011 Planning Commission meetings for the following areas: northeastern shore of Lacamas Lake in
the area of the Leadbetter Mansion and Pomeria House; northeastern shoreline landward of Leadbetter Road at the Gun Club; and the north shoreline of Camas Slough from SR-14 downstream to a point even with the end of Lady Island.

Ecology finds that the process of evaluation used to assign shoreline designations in the City and in the Urban Growth Areas was appropriately conducted. Ecology also finds that each shoreline designation in the SMP has a clearly stated purpose, designation criteria and policies. The Camas Shoreline Designations Map (provided in Appendix A) adequately maps the shoreline designations, assuming the acceptance of the required changes (Attachment B – Required Changes).

The designations and pre-designations provide a suitable framework for implementing shoreline policies and regulatory measures specific to each designation. Designation-specific regulations (see Use Table 6-1 and Chapter 6) have been developed that account for different shoreline conditions and assure implementation of the purpose of each environment designation and other policy goals of the SMA, and ensure protection of existing shoreline ecological functions.

General Master Program Provisions: Chapter 5 of the SMP includes policies and regulations that address critical areas (discussed separately below), archaeological, cultural and historic resources, public access, vegetation conservation and water quality, flood prevention and flood damage minimization. In addition, policies and regulations focused on restoration, site planning and development, and visual access are included.

Ecology finds that the City has included all the required general provisions in Chapter 5 of the proposed SMP consistent with WAC 173-26-221.

Critical Area Provisions: Camas has chosen to adopt their critical area regulations into the SMP and has located them in Appendix C. These provisions address the following critical areas: wetlands, frequently flooded areas, geologically hazardous areas and fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas.

Those elements in the critical area provisions inconsistent with the SMA and WAC 173-26 Shoreline Guidelines have been deleted including reasonable use exceptions and activities allowed without a permit. Additional changes, in response to requirements in WAC 173-26 include the addition of language in Section 5.4 Flood Prevention and Flood Damage Minimization and Section 6.3.12 Residential Development to address channel migration zones.

The City has specifically proposed to modify the stream Type S 150’ Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Area buffers in four locations (Section 5.3(2), pages 5-2 to 5-3):

2. The Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Area buffers for Stream Type S in Appendix C, Section 16.61.040 are modified as follows for the following areas:
   a. Columbia River, SR-14 to SE Third Avenue2 at twenty-feet (20’).
   b. Washougal River, lots fronting on First Avenue between SE Garfield Street and NE Third Street, twenty-feet (20’) from the top of slopes exceeding forty- percent (40%).
   c. Lacamas Lake buffers from OHWM shall not extend landward of NE Leadbetter Road.

---

2 This describes land that is zoned Heavy Industrial (HI) and at the adoption of this Program was occupied by the Georgia Pacific Mill.
d. Columbia River, lots fronting on SE 12th Avenue and SE 11th Avenue between SE Polk Street and SE Front Street, shall be twenty-percent (20%) of lot depth as measured from the OHWM.

That portion along the Columbia River from SR-14 to SE Third Avenue (2a above) fronts the Georgia Pacific Mill site and has been an operating mill for over 100 years. [COLUM_RV_03d (ESA, 2011)][COLUM_RV_03d-3 (Parametrix, 2011)]

Along the Washougal River, the lots fronting First Avenue between Garfield and Third Street sit at the top of a steep slope. These small lots were built out in the early part of the 20th century and there is little room for expansion unless lots are combined and redeveloped. Aerial photos show most lots developed at or near the proposed buffer already. [WASH_RV_01(ESA, 2011)][WASH_RV_01-3 (Parametrix, 2011)]

Along the Columbia River from SE Polk Street upstream to SE 12th Avenue is the River’s Edge community which has one undeveloped shoreline lot. Upstream of River’s Edge, along SE 11th Avenue to the city limits (Front Street extended) are approximately 7 large residential lots. [COLUM_RV_04a (ESA, 2011)][COLUM_RV_04a (Parametrix, 2011)]

Finally, Leadbetter Road runs along the northern shoreline of Lacamas Lake from NE Everett (at the southern end of the lake) to the city limits at NE 232nd. The northerly portion of the lake shoreline was recently annexed (2008) and a development agreement for much of that land is in place. The long term plan is to reroute much of Leadbetter Road away from the lake.

Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas (CARAs): The Inventory and Characterization (ESA, June 2010) shows that there are CARAs located within shoreline jurisdiction in Camas. Earlier comments from Ecology to the city of Vancouver and Clark County indicated the CARA could be “loosely” referenced. This comment was made because of how Vancouver’s code was structured to manage their CARAs. In reality, Vancouver’s locally adopted SMP clearly prohibits specific types of uses consistent with the provisions of their Water Resources Ordinance. In Camas, CARA provisions are included as part of the critical area code and will need to be added to Appendix C of the SMP (see Attachment B – Required Changes).

Frequently Flooded Areas: The City recently (March 5, 2012) received their final digital Flood Insurance Rate Maps (dFIRMs) from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). In anticipation of this effort, the Coalition used the preliminary dFIRMs for planning purposes and the information is reflected in the maps developed in the Inventory and Characterization. In addition to the updated maps, FEMA directed the City to revise their ordinance in order to remain in good standing in the flood insurance program. On May 21, 2012 City Council approved Ordinance No. 2647 revising the frequently flooded areas by repealing Camas Municipal Code (CMC) Chapter 15.28 and amending CMC Chapter 16.57.

The City has requested that Ecology incorporate the new dFIRMs and revised Frequently Flooded Areas Ordinance into the SMP. These proposed changes are set forth in Attachment C (Recommended Changes). The proposed changes are recommended because they are being made in response to FEMA requirements. However, by incorporating them now, the City will ensure consistent regulations
across all flood hazard areas both inside and outside shoreline jurisdiction. In addition, the City will avoid the need for a future amendment to their SMP.

Assuming the acceptance of changes identified in Attachment B-Required Changes, Ecology finds that the City has adequately defined and protected critical areas, including critical aquifer recharge areas, as defined in WAC 173-26-221(2), that the level of protection is at least equal to that provided by the City’s critical area regulations (RCW 90.58.090(4)), and that no net loss of shoreline ecological functions should be assured (RCW 36.70A.480(4)).

Shoreline Modifications: WAC 173-26-231(1) distinguishes shoreline modifications from shoreline uses by describing them as those actions “undertaken in support of or in preparation for a shoreline use.” The Guidelines further describe them as follows: “Shoreline modifications are generally related to construction of a physical element such as a dike, breakwater, dredged basin, or fill, but they can include other actions such as clearing, grading, application of chemicals, or significant vegetation removal.” As a general principle, WAC 173-26-231(2)(b) states that Master Programs shall “[r]educe the adverse effects of shoreline modifications, and, as much as possible, limit shoreline modifications in number and extent.” (WAC 173-26-231(2)(b)). This principle reinforces the mitigation sequence (WAC 173-26-201(2)(e)) and no net loss (WAC 173-26-186(8)) requirements of the SMP Guidelines.

The City’s Shoreline Inventory & Characterization Report, Volumes 1 and 2 (ESA, June 2010) documents extensive modifications including levees, bridges, old gravel pits and the Georgia-Pacific Camas Mill along the Columbia River. Most of the other waterbodies show impacts from increasing urbanization resulting in loss of riparian vegetation, armored shorelines, disconnection of associated floodplains, and fish passage barriers. There are also two dams located on Lacamas and Round lakes.

The Camas SMP limits modifications to those “where it can be demonstrated that the proposed activities are necessary to support or protect an allowed use or structure…” and only “when impacts are avoided, minimized, and mitigated to ensure no net loss” (see CSMP 5.1 and 6.4).

The SMP requires all permits be in hand before any land altering activities take place such as clearing, grading, filling and excavation (CSMP 5.1(4)). Fill waterward of the Ordinary High Water Mark is only allowed in limited instances by Conditional Use Permit (CSMP 5.7.2(10)), new dredging is limited (CSMP 6.4.2), and shoreline uses and developments must be located and designed to avoid the need for shoreline stabilization at the time of development and into the future (CSMP 5.1(3)).

New shoreline stabilization for new development is prohibited. New or replacement structures for existing development is limited unless need can be shown. The preference, when stabilization is shown to be needed is for softer techniques and minimization of the size and extent of new structures (CSMP 6.4.5).

The SMP also proposes to limit new piers and docks to shared/joint-use facilities on Lacamas Lake and prohibits all piers and docks on the Washougal River due to its shallow nature and the potential for channel migration (Table 6-1). Facilities allowed on a residential lot are clearly limited in number and dimensional standards are provided (CSMP 6.3.3.2 and 6.3.3.4). It is not clear, however, that moorage facility standards apply to marinas e.g. waste discharge, fueling facilities, and materials standards. This should be clarified (see Attachment C- Recommended Changes).

The City’s critical area ordinance protecting fish and wildlife habitat areas has provisions establishing 150-foot riparian buffers along all shoreline streams and rivers (Type S). Four areas have been
identified as meriting reduced buffers (see discussion above under Critical Areas). CAO buffer widths can be reduced up to 25% provided the reduction is supported by best available science, the remainder of the area is left undeveloped in perpetuity (covenant, deed restriction or easement) and there is no degradation of habitat functions. The riparian buffer can be impacted if impacts are mitigated and there is no net loss of riparian habitat functions. The CSMP also defines setbacks which vary depending on the shoreline environment and proposed uses (Table 6-1). Vegetation conservation provisions require the retention of existing native riparian vegetation unless it cannot be avoided, and then removal must be minimized and impacts mitigated to ensure no net loss.

Ecology finds that the City has considered and addressed shoreline modifications as required in the WAC 173-26-231. The SMP limits clearing, grading and fill to that necessary when in conjunction with an allowed use, requires that shoreline stabilization proposals show need and limits the amount of overwater coverage by restricting piers and docks. Provisions in the SMP are crafted to reduce the adverse effects of shoreline modifications and as much as possible to limit the number and extent. Shoreline modification policies and standards are appropriate to the environment designation in which they are proposed, and preference is given to modifications that have a lesser impacts to ecological function.

Shoreline Uses: WAC 173-26-241 outlines specific common uses and types of development that can occur within shoreline jurisdiction. SMPs are to establish a system of use regulations and shoreline designation provisions that give preference to water-oriented uses or to uses that are consistent with the control of pollution and prevention of damage to the natural environment (WAC 173-26-201(2)(d) and 173-26-211). SMPs should also ensure provisions implement the policies of the SMA while protecting property rights, reduce use conflicts and assure no net loss of shoreline ecological functions.

The Camas SMP addresses applicable shoreline uses in Chapter 6 and Table 6-1. New agricultural activity and commercial timber harvest are prohibited in the city but the SMP includes regulations for conversion activities. Aquaculture is permitted and restoration is allowed in all environments. Water-oriented commercial and industrial uses are preferred. Regulations are also included for recreational and residential uses, utilities, mining, parking and transportation facilities.

Ecology finds that the Camas SMP adequately identifies uses common along the City’s shoreline, establishes a clear preference for water-oriented uses, accommodates water dependent uses, and clearly shows by shoreline designation, where certain uses are allowed, conditionally allowed and prohibited (see CSMP Table 6-1).

Cumulative Impacts Analysis: Listed as a Governing Principle of the SMP Guidelines, WAC 173-26-186 (8)(d) states “Local master programs shall evaluate and consider cumulative impacts of reasonably foreseeable future development on shoreline ecological functions and other shoreline functions fostered by the policy goals of the Act.” To ensure this, SMPs shall contain policies, programs and regulations that address adverse cumulative impacts, including those resulting from exempt development, and fairly allocate the burden of addressing cumulative impacts among development opportunities.

An initial Cumulative Impacts Analysis (CIA) report was developed to assess the March 2011 Coalition Draft SMP. This report took a county-wide look at possible cumulative impacts of “reasonably foreseeable future development” under the policies and regulations of the draft SMP by assessing existing conditions of Clark County shorelines, as documented in the Inventory &
Characterization report as well as accounting for beneficial effects of other established regulatory programs. At the time, critical area provisions were not included in the Coalition draft SMP, and the report made clear that “a few issues must be addressed before finding that the Coalition Draft SMP will maintain existing shoreline functions: 1) the functional relationship between critical areas buffers and setbacks in shoreline jurisdiction; 2) consistency between proposed shoreline designations and the findings of the Inventory & Characterization Report in a few instances; and (3) refinement of shoreline use and modification standards in a few instances.”(ESA, May 2011)

In June 2011, a complete draft SMP was issued for Camas. This was accompanied by a Coalition Draft CIA (ESA, June 2011), a Camas-specific Draft CIA (ESA, June 2011) and a No Net Loss Summary memorandum (ESA, June 2011). These documents acknowledged revisions made in response to the earlier draft CIA including designation changes that were more protective and adjusting structure setbacks, particularly in the Urban Conservancy designation. The June 2011 reports still found the potential for cumulative impacts and net loss of shoreline ecological functions in certain shoreline reaches and recommended the City address the following:

- Strengthen administration of exemptions to assure exempt activities, particularly single-family residential development, are consistent with the SMP;
- Re-evaluating shoreline designations, particularly on the Washougal River
- Adding additional protections for shorelines of statewide significance
- Limiting single-use piers and docks;
- Consider increasing the proposed setback of 20 feet for water-related and water-enjoyment recreational uses in the Natural and Urban Conservancy designations, especially related to trails; and
- Establish a citywide shoreline restoration program.

The locally adopted SMP includes the following changes in response to these June 2011 recommendations:

- Shoreline exemptions will be tracked over time (Appendix B, Section XI)
- Shoreline designations were re-evaluated and a number of changes made (see above discussion on pages 4-6)
- Single-use piers and docks have been limited (see Table 6-1, Footnote 3). Piers and docks are prohibited on the Washougal River and limited to joint/shared-use only on Lacamas Lake
- Trails are limited to low intensity recreational development and design and development standards are set forth in the “Camas Park, Recreation and Open Space Comprehensive Plan”
- The City adopted the Clark County Coalition Restoration Plan

The City asked the consulting firm Parametrix to do additional analysis of cumulative impacts based on the proposed SMP policies and regulations. The December 12, 2011 No Net Loss Summary Reevaluation memorandum and attached Revised Cumulative Effects Analysis, Matrix of Potential Impacts by Reach concludes that the June 2011 (ESA) determination of potential loss of ecological functions along portions of the Camas shoreline resulted, in part from “an overly generalized methodology used in measurement” because of the county-wide scale, which could not account for specific conditions found in Camas. The December 2011 memo concludes that the SMP will likely achieve no net loss of ecological function over time.
Ecology finds that Camas has evaluated the cumulative impacts of reasonably foreseeable future development over the next 20 years. To assure no net loss, the City has adjusted the policies and regulations of the SMP to address the potential for net loss of shoreline ecological functions as identified in the draft CIA reports. The locally adopted SMP appears to fairly allocate the burden of addressing cumulative impacts among development opportunities. Ecology finds that the City’s SMP and supporting Cumulative Impact Analysis are consistent with the SMP Guidelines governing principle (WAC 173-26-186(8)) as well as the legislative intent of the Shoreline Management Act under RCW 90.58.

Restoration Plan: Local SMPs are required to include goals, policies and actions for restoration of impaired shoreline ecological functions (WAC 173-26-201(2)(f); WAC 173-26-186(8)(c)). Over time, the goal for these provisions, when implemented, is to improve the overall condition of habitat and resources within the shoreline area of each city and county (WAC 173-26-201(2)(c)).

Camas, in coordination with the other members of the Clark County Coalition, developed a restoration plan based on the information gathered in the Inventory and Characterization (ESA, 2010). The Final Shoreline Restoration Plan (ESA, June 2011) identifies specific and programmatic restoration opportunities and actions for each watershed and waterbody. Table 2-1 of the Plan identifies suggested restoration goals, objectives, actions and success measures; Chapter 4 focuses on restoration priorities and Chapter 5 along with Appendices C and D identifies restoration actions. Existing programs, partners, general timelines and benchmarks and monitoring and adaptive management strategies are also discussed in the document.

The City’s SMP includes both policies in Chapter 3 and regulations in Chapters 5 and 6 that permit and promote restoration efforts along all City shorelines and explicitly link restoration actions to the Clark County Coalition Shoreline Restoration Plan (ESA, June 2011).

Ecology finds that the Shoreline Restoration Plan (Appendix D) is based on appropriate technical information available to the City (and the Coalition) during the SMP update. The Restoration Plan can serve as an effective tool for the City, non-profit organizations and the public to collectively improve shoreline conditions over time. Such restoration efforts are understood to help achieve the no-net-loss standard of the SMP Guidelines (WAC 173-26-186; WAC 173-26-201).

Amendment History and Review Process:

Amendment History: Camas initiated a comprehensive update to their SMP as part of a collective effort with Clark County and the six (6) other municipalities (the cities of Battle Ground, La Center, Ridgefield, Vancouver, Washougal, and the Town of Yacolt). The eight jurisdictions (Coalition) began coordinating through an Interlocal Agreement signed in May 2009. The County and cities pooled their grant resources (approximately $1.17 million) and work began in September 2009 consistent with a scope of work described in SMA Grant No. G1000058. The grant was managed on behalf of the entire Coalition by the City of Vancouver.

As a group, the Coalition agreed to be as consistent as possible in goals and policies across all updated SMPs, formed a Project Management Team (PMT) to guide the process consisting of representatives of all the jurisdictions, and hired a single consultant (ESA, formerly ESA Adolfson). The Coalition worked closely through June 2011 developing documents and implementing a public outreach effort on a county-wide basis. Two committees were formed: a Shoreline Stakeholders Advisory Committee
(SSAC) and a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). In addition, an Independent Science Review Panel (ISRP) was used to review the application of scientific information throughout the process. A County-wide draft Shoreline Inventory and Characterization was issued in April 2010. Ecology provided written comments in a brief memo and via comment matrices in April and May 2010. A revised Shoreline Inventory and Characterization, Volumes 1 & 2 was issued June 2010.

Other documents produced as a Coalition include: Shoreline Management Strategy, Public Participation Plan, Clark County Shoreline Restoration Plan and a Shoreline Designation Rationale. The Coalition also produced an early draft master program in March 2011 which received extensive public comment and review including comments from Ecology. Subsequent drafts for each jurisdiction were produced in June 2011 for individual local adoption processes.

Public Participation: The Public Participation Plan updated quarterly, documents all public participation efforts proposed and carried out. As a Coalition, the initial three phases of the update process included workshops for all elected officials and planning commissions. These workshops were held in October 2009, April-May 2010 and October-November 2010. The Camas Planning Commission and/or City Council participated in 3 public workshops through May 2011. Coalition open houses were held in October 2009, March 2011 and August 2011. Visioning meetings were held March 2010.

Shoreline Stakeholders Advisory Committee (SSAC): This committee included representatives with interests in ports, commercial and industrial businesses, residential development, environmental issues and shoreline property owners. A representative of the Cowlitz Tribe was also named. The SSAC held 22 meetings from October 2009 to June 2011 and focused on reviewing goals, policies, and regulations and shoreline designation maps. They met jointly with the TAC on a number of occasions and were invited to review the technical documents.

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC): This committee included representatives from local, state and federal resource agencies and included citizens with expertise. A representative of the Cowlitz Tribe was named on the committee. The TAC met 12 times from October 2009 to June 2011 and was tasked with reviewing the technical documents including the inventory and characterization, the restoration plan and the cumulative impacts analysis and no net loss report.

All workshops, open houses and meetings of the advisory committees were open to the public and advertised in the local papers. Mailings to shoreline property owners (>5000) and interested parties were sent out during each of five phases. Additional presentations were provided to interest groups and a Shorelines Forum was co-sponsored by the Building Industry Association of Clark County and the Clark County Association of Realtors.

Independent Science Review Panel: The ISRP consisted of five scientists with expertise in hydrology, hydrogeology, habitat, ecosystem function and stream ecology. This panel focused on reviewing the science used in the technical documents.

Coalition Website: A website hosted by the City of Vancouver was created that included the project schedule, draft documents and maps, meeting notices, contact information and an e-mail link to submit comments throughout the process.

City Website: The City established an SMP webpage on their Planning website.
**Local Review Process:** Beginning July 1, 2011 each jurisdiction began working independently on their local adoption process. The Project Management Team continued to meet on an as-needed basis but most jurisdictions focused on their own internal decision processes.

The City indicates the proposed comprehensive SMP amendment originated from a local planning process (as part of the Clark County Coalition) that began in July 2009. The City created an ad hoc committee to provide policy-level assistance to staff on the SMP amendment. This committee met five times between June and September 2011.

The record shows that the Camas Planning Commission held public workshops February 15, August 16 and October 18, 2011. An open house was held October 6, 2011. Planning Commission held a public hearing on November 15, 2011, continued to December 20, 2011. Notice of this hearing was published in the *Camas-Washougal Post Record* on November 1 and 8, 2011. The record indicates City Council held a hearing on February 21, 2012 which was continued for deliberations to March 5, 2012. The affidavit of publication provided in the record indicates notice of this hearing was published in the *Camas-Washougal Post Record* on February 14, 2012.

With passage of Ordinance # 2643, on March 5, 2012, the City Council authorized staff to forward the locally adopted SMP to Ecology for approval.

*Ecology finds the record submitted adequately documents compliance with WAC 173-26-100 and 110.*

**State Review Process:** The proposed SMP amendments were received by Ecology for state review on March 14, 2012 and verified as complete March 23, 2012. Notice of the state comment period was distributed to state task force members, potentially interested tribes, and interested parties identified by the Coalition and the City on May 1, 2012 by mail and May 2, 2012 by email, in compliance with the requirements of WAC 173-26-120. The state comment period began on May 4, 2012 and continued through June 4, 2012. Notice was posted on the Ecology website for shoreline master programs: [http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/sea/shorelines/smp/mycomments/camas.html](http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/sea/shorelines/smp/mycomments/camas.html) and on Ecology’s Public Involvement Calendar. Ecology staff determined a public hearing was not necessary.

A total of three individuals and one state agency (Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife) submitted comments on the proposed amendments during the state comment period. Ecology sent all written comments it received to the City on June 21, 2012. On July 16, 2012, the City submitted its responses to issues raised during the state comment period to Ecology.

**Summary of Issues Raised during the Ecology Public Review Process:** Comments submitted generally focused on removing Mill Pond from shoreline jurisdiction, concerns about the proposed residential setbacks, public access and property rights.

The complete record of the responsiveness summary, including Ecology’s responses to the issues raised during the comment period, are available as part of the SMP amendment process record in Attachment D.

**Consistency with Chapter 90.58 RCW:** The proposed amendment has been reviewed for consistency with the policy of RCW 90.58.020 and the approval criteria of RCW 90.58.090(3), (4) and (5).
Consistency with “applicable guidelines” (Chapter 173-26 WAC, Part III): The proposed amendment has been reviewed for compliance with the requirements of the applicable Shoreline Master Program Guidelines (WAC 173-26-171 through 251 and 173-26-020 definitions). This included review of the SMP Submittal Checklist, which was completed by the City and provided with the submittal of the locally adopted SMP.

Consistency with SEPA Requirements: The City submitted evidence of SEPA compliance in the form of a SEPA checklist and issued a Determination of Non-Significance (DNS) for the proposed SMP amendments on November 1, 2011. Notice of the SEPA determination was published in the Camas Washougal Post-Record on November 1, 2011. Comments were accepted until November 15, 2011. Ecology did not comment on the DNS.

Other Studies or Analyses supporting the SMP update: Ecology also reviewed the following reports, studies, map portfolios and data prepared for the City and the Coalition in support of the SMP amendment:

These supporting documents include:

- Clark County Coalition Shoreline Management Strategy, June 2010
- Clark County Coalition Public Participation Plan, June 2011
- Clark County Shoreline Inventory and Characterization (draft) April 2010; June 2010
- Assessment of Water-dependent Commercial, Industrial, and Recreational Uses, May 2010
- Clark County Coalition Cumulative Impacts Analysis (draft) June 2011, December 2011
- Camas Cumulative Impacts Analysis (draft) June 2011
- Camas, No Net Loss Summary Memo (draft) June 2011
- Camas, No Net Loss Summary Reevaluation Memo (Parametrix) December 2011
- Revised Cumulative Effects Analysis, Matrix of Potential Impacts by Reach (Parametrix) December 2011
- Clark County Coalition Restoration Plan, (draft) October 2010, (Final) June 2011
- Clark County Coalition Shoreline Designation Rationale, June 2011

Summary of Issues identified by Ecology as Relevant to its Decision:

Shoreline jurisdiction: Shoreline jurisdiction is defined in the statute with some local options. The locally adopted SMP did not include the language about floodways. In addition, the Shoreline Hearings Board recently issued a decision (SHB 11-020) declaring Mill Pond in the City of Camas to be a separate and distinct waterbody that is not part of Round Lake. Mill Pond is also too small to be a shoreline of the state so the Shoreline Designations Map needs to be revised to remove Mill Pond.

Attachment B specifies changes to Section 2.1(1) Applicability to include the floodway language from RCW 90.58.030 (2)/(b) and deleting Mill Pond from the list of shorelines. The definition for floodway is revised in Chapter 7.

Shoreline designations map: In addition to removing Mill Pond as a shoreline waterbody (see above), two mapping errors, inadvertently extending the Medium Intensity designation in areas that are designated Urban Conservancy, were identified by Ecology during review. These areas are located along the northeastern shore of Lacamas Lake (adjacent to SE Everett Road and along SE Leadbetter
Road northwesterly to the city limits). There have also been slight changes to the floodplain boundaries due to updated floodplain maps. A note will be added to the map directing applicants to look at the dFIRMs along with the designation maps to confirm the extent of shoreline jurisdiction in addition to any needed site specific analysis.

*Attachment B (Required Changes) specifies all the map changes needed.*

Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas (CARAs): The Inventory and Characterization indicates that critical aquifer recharge areas are located within shoreline jurisdiction (see Map 4 – Hydrology). Appendix C needs to address CARAs consistent with RCW 36.70A.480 (see also RCW 90.58.610) which requires that all critical areas within shoreline jurisdiction be protected by the SMP.

*Attachment B (Required Changes) identifies the need to incorporate the City’s critical aquifer recharge area provisions contained in Chapter 16.55 into the SMP.*

Therefore, Ecology finds that the proposed SMP as approved by Camas under Ordinance No. 2643 is not consistent with the applicable SMP Guideline requirements, as specifically identified in Attachment B (Required Changes). However, Ecology also finds that the SMP can be amended to ensure compliance with the SMP Guidelines through the City’s acceptance of Required Changes listed in Attachment B.

*Pursuant to WAC 173-26-120 Ecology has also identified Recommended Changes (Attachment C) to the SMP for consideration by the City.*

**CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

After review by Ecology of the complete record submitted and all comments received, Ecology concludes that the City’s proposed comprehensive amendment to its SMP, subject to and including Ecology’s required changes (itemized in Attachment B), is consistent with the policy and standards of RCW 90.58.020 and RCW 90.58.090 and the applicable SMP guidelines (WAC 173-26-171 through 251 and .020 definitions). This includes a conclusion that approval of the proposed SMP, subject to required changes, contains sufficient policies and regulations to assure that no net loss of shoreline ecological functions will result from implementation of the new updated master program (WAC 173-26-201(2)(c)).

Ecology also concludes that a separate set of recommended changes to the submittal (identified during the review process and itemized in Attachment C) would be consistent with SMA policy and the guidelines and would be beneficial to SMP implementation. These changes are not required but can, if accepted by the City, be included in Ecology’s approved SMP amendments.

Consistent with RCW 90.58.090(4), Ecology concludes that those SMP segments relating to critical areas within Shoreline Management Act jurisdiction provide a level of protection at least equal to that provided by the City’s existing critical areas ordinance.

Consistent with RCW 36.70A.480(4), Ecology concludes that those SMP provisions relating to critical areas within Shoreline Management Act jurisdiction assures no net loss of shoreline ecological functions necessary to sustain shoreline natural resources.
Ecology concludes that those SMP segments relating to shorelines of statewide significance provide for the optimum implementation of Shoreline Management Act policy (RCW 90.58.090(5)).

Ecology concludes that the City has complied with the requirements of RCW 90.58.100 regarding the SMP amendment process and contents.

Ecology concludes that the City has complied with the requirements of RCW 90.58.130 and WAC 173-26-090 regarding public and agency involvement in the SMP update and amendment process.

Ecology concludes that the City has complied with the purpose and intent of the local amendment process requirements contained in WAC 173-26-100, including conducting open houses and public hearings, notice, consultation with parties of interest and solicitation of comments from tribes, government agencies and Ecology.

Ecology concludes that the City has complied with requirements of Chapter 43.21C RCW, the State Environmental Policy Act.

Ecology concludes that the City's comprehensive SMP update/amendment submittal to Ecology was complete pursuant to the requirements of WAC 173-26-110 and WAC 173-26-201(3)(a) and (h) requiring a SMP Submittal Checklist.

Ecology concludes that it has complied with the procedural requirements for state review and approval of shoreline master program amendments as set forth in RCW 90.58.090 and WAC 173-26-120.

Ecology concludes that the City has chosen to exercise its option pursuant to RCW 90.58.030(2)(f)(ii) to increase shoreline jurisdiction to include buffer areas of critical areas that occur within shorelines of the state.

**DECISION AND EFFECTIVE DATE**

Based on the preceding, Ecology has determined the proposed amendments comprehensively updating the Camas shoreline master program are consistent with Shoreline Management Act policy, the applicable guidelines and implementing rules, once required changes set forth in Attachment B are approved by the City.

As provided in RCW 90.58.090(2)(e)(ii) the City may choose to submit an alternative to the changes required by Ecology. If Ecology determines that the alternative proposal is consistent with the purpose and intent of Ecology’s original changes and with RCW 90.58, then the department shall approve the alternative proposal and that action shall be the final action. Approval of the updated SMP and proposed alternative/s is effective fourteen (14) days from Ecology’s final action approving the alternative/s.