POTENTIAL CUMULATIVE IMPACTS REGARDING
REVISED SHORELINE MASTER PROGRAM

Introduction

The Shoreline Management Act guidelines require local shoreline master programs to regulate new development to maintain no net loss of shoreline ecological functions. While some impacts are immediate and can be directly addressed through avoidance and mitigation, other impacts are cumulative in nature. Individually, the action may not result in a significant impact, but the composite of many similar actions over time may lead to a significant cumulative impact to the ecosystem. For example, the creation of a small area of impervious surface may have only a negligible impact on the environment. The creation of numerous impervious surfaces that, in total, result in a significant change in the amount of such surface in shoreline areas over time could lead to significant impacts, such as: water quality degradation, increased peak storm flows, channel erosion, decreased vegetation and habitat areas, increased local water temperatures, and other potential impacts.

The guidelines state that, “To ensure no net loss of ecological functions and protection of other shoreline functions and/or uses, master programs shall contain policies, programs, and regulations that address adverse cumulative impacts and fairly allocate the burden of addressing cumulative impacts. Evaluation of such cumulative impacts should consider:

1. current circumstances affecting the shorelines and relevant natural processes;
2. reasonably foreseeable future development and use of the shoreline; and
3. beneficial effects of the RSMP and any established regulatory programs under other local, state, and federal laws.

Therefore the analysis in Sections 1 through 5 below is set forth to meet the accumulative impact requirements of WAC 173-26-186. Please note the following terms and their abbreviations which are referenced throughout this report: RSMP means the subject Revised Shoreline Master Program; SMA means the Shoreline Management Act; RCW 90.58; UGA means the Urban Growth Area as delineated in municipal comprehensive plans.

1. Shorelines Overview

The analysis in this report is based consideration of the following data:

- Review of building permits issued since 1990,
- Analysis of land use as depicted on 2004 DNR and Avista Utilities color air photos,
- Review Spokane County Assessor’s current use assessment data
- Review of “reasonable use exceptions” since 1997 issued pursuant to Spokane County Critical Areas Ordinance,
- Review of Joint Aquatic Resources Permit (JARPA) actions
- Review of shoreline management “exemption logs” maintained since 1986
- Review of shoreline substantial development permits
- Review of floodplain approvals
- Review of Spokane County current use assessment maps
- Consideration of NRCS soils data for Spokane County
- Review of rezone and platting activity
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Review of Type IV timber land use conversion approvals issued by Spokane County

Additional information considered in the development of the below information includes the Spokane County Conservation District 2005 Stream Inventory and Analysis which provides a comprehensive description of stream shoreline conditions on a reach by reach basis. Also considered is the URS Corporation 2002 Spokane County Lake Shoreline Inventory and Assessment which provides a comprehensive description of lake shoreline conditions. Shoreline conditions are further evaluated in the 2005 Landau Associates Report which characterizes shoreline functions and processes.

An Overview of Land Use and Ownership Patterns
Based on an evaluation of the above specified data very little new development on vacant property has occurred within 200 feet of the shoreline since 1986. The development that has occurred consists mostly of improvements to existing developed property, usually installation of minor modifications to existing homes or major rebuilds of single family homes, resulting in essentially new homes with larger footprints. Also, numerous exemptions were issued for installation of new docks or for modifications to existing docks. The docks involved serve primarily single family homes. A few new homes were constructed and additional land cleared for installation of landscaping normally associated with single family development. It is noted that much new development on vacant property near shorelines is often located just outside of the 200-foot SMA jurisdiction. There have been a few modifications to commercial structures, usually involving resort structures located on lakes.

For the most part there has been a minimal amount of platting activity in shoreline areas and there has been virtually no rezoning of shoreline property initiated by landowners. All rezoning of shoreline properties occurred as a result of programs to comprehensively rezone the unincorporated area of Spokane County in 1991, 2002 and 2005. Almost all new parcels have been created through Spokane County’s “Certificate of Exemption” process which applies to the creation parcels 10 acres or larger in size. New homes on these properties are often located outside of the 200-foot SMA jurisdiction. However, it is noted from the color air photo maps and on-site observations by Spokane County and Spokane County Conservation District (SCCD) staff that the landowners are clearing trees and shrubs between their homes and the shoreline to achieve water views and to install landscaping normally associated with residences. Much of the land clearing seems to be occurring on Lake Spokane Shorelines.

Nearly all subdivided property fronting on streams and lakes were recorded in the first half of the 1900s, prior to the existence of modern day platting laws. Only a few lots with water frontage have been created through modern platting regulations in the past 55 years. Nearly all platted shoreline property was divided prior to the adoption of the SMA and nearly all of the smaller lots (less than 5 acres) have been developed, mostly with single family dwellings. However, numerous parcels have been created in shoreline areas through Spokane County’s “Certificate of Exemption” process. Essentially, these are parcels that are allowed to be created without platting because such divisions are specifically exempted from platting regulations by the State Subdivision Statute, RCW 58.17. Parcels created through this process are 10 acres or larger in size.

2. Streams Overview

Spokane River - West of the City of Spokane
In terms of land area ownerships of properties fronting on this segment of the Spokane River are in primarily large ownerships varying in size from 10 to over 100 acres. The ownerships over 10
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acres make up approximately 90% of this shoreline segment. The overwhelming majority of the shoreline in this 90% area is owned or controlled by Department of Natural Resources, Washington Department of Parks and Recreation and Avista Utilities Corporation and is undeveloped. Much of it is managed for timber production and will likely continue indefinitely in forestry use. The remaining 10% of this river segment consist primarily of small lots varying in size from 15,000 square feet to 10 acres most of which are developed with single family residences. A few are vacant and will likely be developed with residences in the foreseeable future as allowed by the RSMP and the underlying Comprehensive Plans and Zoning Codes.

The County Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code control the land use and development density of shoreline areas throughout Spokane County. Both documents designate this river segment as Rural Conservation (1 residence per 10 acres maximum density) with about 3% of the area classified as low density residential allowing up to 6 residences per acre located adjacent to the City of Spokane. The RSMP provides that new divisions of land must be designed so that new home sites are located outside of the 200-foot SMA jurisdiction. However this prohibition does not apply to the shoreline area designated Low Density Residential. The predominant land use along this river segment is a combination of very low density single family residential, agriculture production, timber production and outdoor recreation. Suburban residential densities exist in small portions of this river segment. These residences are located primarily on lots that were platted in the first half of the 1900s.

The RSMP designates the shorelines in this area a combination of Natural and Rural Conservancy. The RSMP allows the land uses on the shoreline permitted by the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code, unless the use is specifically prohibited by the RSMP. The RSMP provides that new divisions of land in the Rural Conservancy designation must be configured so that new residential structures are located outside of the 200-foot SMA jurisdiction.

It is reasonable to assume that some of the undeveloped properties within this stream segment will be developed in the foreseeable future, primarily with single family homes as allowed by the RSMP and the underlying Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code. The specific location, density and timing of development can not be predicted. However, as mentioned above the Comprehensive Plan promotes very low densities of development, low intensity uses except for the small fraction of area classified by the Plan for low density residential uses adjacent to Spokane. In addition to comprehensive plans, zoning codes and the RSMP, development potential will also be subject to the constraints embodied in the various floodplain and critical areas regulations.

**Spokane River – East of Spokane to the Idaho State Line**

Approximately 70% of the property (in area) in this segment is in large ownerships varying in size from 11 acres to several hundred acres. Several public agencies and three private companies own these large parcels. The public agencies owning land are the Washington Department of Parks and Recreation, Spokane County Parks and Recreation, Spokane Valley Parks and Recreation, Washington State Department of Parks and Recreation. The large public and private ownerships are used primarily for outdoor recreation with some agriculture and forestry uses. Approximately 30% of the land is in small ownerships varying from less than an acre to 10 acres. Most of these properties are occupied with a single family dwelling and not always within the SMA jurisdiction. Homes on parcels under 3 acres are usually situated within the SMA jurisdiction. There exists some vacant parcels which are bifurcated by the SMA jurisdiction which can be developed with residences, some of which will be within the SMA jurisdiction portion of the parcel and some outside of the SMA jurisdiction.
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Very little platting has occurred in the past 55 years in this river segment. Most land divisions that have occurred since 1978 were created through Spokane County’s “Certificate of Exemption” process. This process requires that new parcels be a minimum of 10 acres. Nearly all of the smaller parcels in this segment (under 10 acres) have been developed with single family homes many of which are outside of the 200-foot SMA jurisdiction. However, it is noted in the SCCD 2005 Study that many of the home owners have installed landscaping normally associated with residences and shoreline protection improvements within 100 feet of the ordinary high water mark.

The Spokane County Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code control the land use and development density of shoreline areas throughout Spokane County. These documents designate the Spokane River shoreline area east of Spokane to low and medium density residential development. A portion of the shoreline area in Millwood and the City of Spokane Valley are classified industrial due to their close proximity to existing industrial development. The predominant land use along this river segment is low and medium density single family residential and outdoor recreation (such as the Centennial Trail and public parks). There is a very small amount of agriculture and timber production. Medium residential densities exist primarily on small lots which were platted in the first half of the 1900s.

The RSMP designates the shorelines in this area a combination of High Intensity, Shoreline Residential, Urban Conservancy, and Rural Conservancy. The RSMP allows the land uses on the shoreline permitted by the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code, unless the use is specifically prohibited by the RSMP. The RSMP provides that new divisions of land in the Rural Conservancy designation must be designed so that residential sites are located outside of the 200-foot SMA jurisdiction. It is reasonable to assume that some of the undeveloped properties within this stream segment will be developed in the foreseeable future, primarily with single family homes as allowed by the RSMP and the underlying comprehensive plan and zoning code. The specific scope, location, density and timing of development can not be predicted. In addition to the comprehensive plans, zoning codes and the RSMP, development potential will also be subject to the constraints embodied in the various floodplain and critical areas regulations.

**Little Spokane River (LSR) and Tributaries Subject to the SMA**

For brevity purposes reference to LSR in this analysis means the Little Spokane River and its SMA tributaries. Those SMA tributaries include portions of Deadman Creek and Dragoon Creek.

The properties fronting on the Little Spokane River (LSR) and its tributaries are primarily large ownerships varying in size from 10 to over 100 acres. These ownerships over 10 acres in size make up over 90% of the shoreline area. The overwhelming majority of the shoreline in this 90% area is owned or controlled by primarily private land owners. Much of the shoreline area within 3 miles of the LSR confluence with the Spokane River is publicly owned and is essentially undeveloped and is managed for passive outdoor recreation uses. The properties in the remaining 10% of the LSR shoreline areas are less than 10 acres with a few parcels less than 1 acre in size. Many of these smaller parcels (under 10 acres) are developed with single family homes and many of the remaining undeveloped small parcels will likely be developed with single family homes in the foreseeable future. Many residences on developed parcels over an acre in size are set back beyond the 200-foot SMA jurisdiction.

The Spokane County Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code control the land use and development density in shoreline areas. The LSR shoreline system is designated by those documents a combination of Rural Traditional and Rural Conservancy. Both designations provide for very low density residential development and encourage outdoor recreation, timber
and agricultural uses. The Rural Conservancy designation allows LSR shoreline areas to be
developed to a maximum density of one home per 20 acres or 1 home per 10 acres by way of a
cluster development process. The Rural Traditional Zone allows a maximum residential density
of one home per 10 acres. The predominant land use along the LSR is a combination of very low
density single family residential, agriculture production, timber production and outdoor
recreation. Suburban residential densities exist in the vicinity of Wandermere Golf Course near
the SR 395 crossing of LSR.

The RSMP designates the shorelines in this area a combination of Natural and Rural
Conservancy. The RSMP allows the land uses on the shoreline permitted by the Comprehensive
Plan and Zoning Code, unless the use is specifically prohibited by the RSMP. The RSMP
provides that new divisions of land in the Natural and Rural Conservancy designation must be
designed so that building sites are located outside of the 200-foot SMA jurisdiction. It is
reasonable to assume that some of the undeveloped properties within these stream shorelines will
be developed in the foreseeable future, primarily with single family homes as allowed by the
RSMP and the underlying comprehensive plan and zoning code. The specific scope, location,
density and timing of development can not be predicted. In addition to the comprehensive plans,
zoning codes and the RSMP, development potential will also be subject to the constraints
embodied in the various floodplain and critical areas regulations.

Latah Creek (Hangman Creek), Rock Creek, Pine Creek
The parcels over 10 acres in size occupy over 98% of the shoreline area on Latah Pine and Rock
Creeks. Parcels fronting on these shoreline segments include an abundance of 40, 80, 160 and
320 acre ownerships. The overwhelming majority of the shorelines in this 98% plus area is
owned or controlled by private landowners. Public ownership is confined to road right-of-ways
and bridge crossings. Most of the ownerships are in agricultural uses and likely will continue
indefinitely in crop and livestock production. Latah and Rock Creeks include numerous parcels
10 to 40 acres in size and many of them are developed with single family residents, many of
which include some agriculture activity. Many of the parcels in this size category are
undeveloped and are used for agricultural purposes and some timber production. Some of the
parcels are not being managed for any purposes.

The portion of the streams running through Rockford, Waverly and Latah are fronted by small
parcels under 1 acre in size. These stream fronting properties are occupied by a combination of
small residential and commercial uses and are designated by their respective municipal
comprehensive plans and zoning codes for a combination of residential, commercial and
industrial uses. Within these municipalities there is a minimal amount of shoreline property that
is undeveloped. The remaining 2% of these stream shorelines within the unincorporated area are
fronted by parcels under 10 acres in size and are either vacant or occupied by single family
residences.

The Comprehensive Plans and Zoning Codes of the municipalities through which these creeks
flow control the land use and development density in shoreline areas. The Latah, Rock Creek
shoreline system is designated by those documents a combination of Rural Traditional and Rural
Conservancy. Both designations provide for very low density residential development and
encourage outdoor recreation, timber and agricultural uses. These documents allow
unincorporated shoreline areas to be developed to very low density residential allowing a
maximum density of one home per 20 acres or 1 home per 10 acres by way of a cluster platting
process. The predominant land uses along these creek shorelines include a combination of very
low density single family residential, agriculture production, timber production and outdoor
recreation.
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The RSMP designates the shorelines in this area a combination of Natural and Rural Conservancy. The RSMP allows the land uses on the shoreline permitted by the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code, unless the use is specifically prohibited by the RSMP. The RSMP provides that new divisions of land in the Natural and Rural Conservancy designation must be configured so that building sites are located outside of the 200-foot SMA jurisdiction. It is reasonable to assume that some of the undeveloped smaller properties, under 40 acres, within these stream shorelines will be developed in the foreseeable future, primarily with single family homes as allowed by the RSMP and the underlying Comprehensive Plans and Zoning Codes. The specific scope, location, density and timing of development can not be predicted. In addition to the comprehensive plans, zoning codes and the RSMP, development potential will also be subject to the constraints embodied in the various floodplain and critical areas regulations.

3. Lakes Overview

The inventory, analysis and characterization lists approximately 90% of the county’s lakes in the Shorelines Management Act jurisdiction as having all or large portions of their shorelines in proper functioning condition. Only three lakes listed are characterized with nonfunctional shorelines, including a portion of Williams Lake, where the entire eastern shoreline is undeveloped and ecologically intact, with both galleried riparian forests and intact Ponderosa pine forest and shrub-steppe upland ecotones. Many of these lakes also are characterized by extensive basalt cliffs in excess of 25 feet in elevation, supporting nesting birds and other wildlife unique to this environment, many priority species listed in Table 11.20.060A of the Spokane County Critical Areas Ordinance (CAO), and extensive associated wetlands which are classified as Category 1 and 2 wetlands in the county’s CAO. Talus slopes and other steep topography in excess of 30% slope are frequently found along Spokane County lakes, the free flowing and impounded parts of the Spokane River, and other streams in the county. Again, while its western and northern shoreline has areas of older, intensive development, Williams Lake exemplifies a Spokane County lake with extensive shorelines and associated wetlands of outstanding ecological integrity. As summarized above, these conditions are found at many other glacial scour and coulee lakes throughout the county.

Liberty, Newman and Silver Lakes –
Approximately 75% of the shoreline of Liberty Lake includes parcels varying in size from less from 12,000 square feet to 5 acres. Most of the parcels are under an acre in size and nearly all of them are occupied with residences. The western, northern and northeastern shorelines are essentially developed to urban residential densities. The remaining shoreline is in a few large ownerships, one of which is a Spokane County Park. The other private ownerships are undeveloped. The Comprehensive Plan designates the shoreline area as Rural Traditional (allowing a maximum density of 1 home per 10 acres) and Rural Conservation (allowing a maximum density of 1 home per 20 acres or a density of 1 home per 10 acres through the cluster platting process). Because the Lake’s shorelines are located outside of the UGA the densities can not be further increased due to the operation of RCW 36.70A, the Growth Management Act.

The RSMP designates the shorelines in this area a combination of Shoreline Residential, Natural and Rural Conservancy. The RSMP allows the land uses in shoreline areas permitted by the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code, unless the use is specifically prohibited by the RSMP. The RSMP provides that new divisions of land in the Natural and Rural Conservancy designations must be configured so that new residential sites are located outside of the 200-foot SMA jurisdiction.
It is reasonable to assume that some of the privately owned undeveloped property within the lake shorelines will eventually be developed as allowed by the RSMP and the underlying zoning. The specific scope, type and location of development can not be predicted. However, development will be very limited since the creation of new building sites within 200 feet of the ordinary high water mark will not be allowed by the RSMP when new parcels are created. The shoreline designated Shoreline Residential is substantially built out and since it located outside of the UGA densities will not be allowed to increase due to the operation of RCW 36.70A. In addition to the comprehensive plans, zoning codes and the RSMP, development potential will also be subject to the constraints embodied in the various floodplain and critical areas regulations.

Approximately 65% of the shoreline of Newman Lake includes parcels varying in size from less from 12,000 square feet to 5 acres. Most of the parcels are under an acre in size and most of them are occupied with residences or summer cabins. The remaining 35% of the shoreline consists of large ownerships, primarily privately owned. The Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code designate the entire shoreline area as Rural Conservation (allowing a maximum density of 1 home per 20 acres or a cluster plat of 1 home per 10 acres).

The RSMP designates the shorelines in this area a combination of Natural and Rural Conservancy. The RSMP allows the land uses on the shoreline permitted by the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code, unless the use is specifically prohibited by the RSMP. The RSMP provides that new divisions of land in the Natural and Rural Conservancy designation must be configured so that residential building sites are located outside of the 200-foot SMA jurisdiction.

It is reasonable to assume that some of the privately owned undeveloped property within the lake shorelines will eventually be developed as allowed by the RSMP and the underlying zoning. The scope and type of development and specific location can not be predicted. The specific scope, location, density and timing of development can not be predicted. In addition to the comprehensive plans, zoning codes and the RSMP, development potential will also be subject to the constraints embodied in the various floodplain and critical areas regulations. For example, the south shoreline of the lake is within a floodplain, and as result, the development potential of that shoreline is substantially limited.

Approximately 75% of the shoreline of Silver Lake is divided into parcels varying in size from 15,000 square feet to 10 acres. Most of the parcels are less than 5 acres in size and most of them are occupied with residences or summer cabins. There are few undeveloped properties in this parcel size range. The remaining 25% of the shoreline consists of large ownerships, primarily privately owned. The large parcels are either undeveloped, vacant or developed with residences. Some land is in agriculture use. The southeast and northwest shorelines are relatively undeveloped areas. The Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code designate nearly the entire lake shoreline area as Rural Conservation (allowing a maximum density of 1 home per 20 acres or 1 home per 10 acres by way of cluster development). Since the lake’s shoreline located outside of the UGA densities will not be allowed to increase due to the operation of RCW 36.70A.

The RSMP designates the shorelines in this area a combination of Shoreline Residential, Natural and Rural Conservancy. The RSMP allows the land uses on the shoreline permitted by the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code, unless the use is specifically prohibited by the RSMP. The RSMP provides that new divisions of land in the Natural and Rural Conservancy designation must be configured so that building sites are located outside of the 200-foot SMA jurisdiction.
It is reasonable to assume that some of the privately owned undeveloped property within the lake shorelines will eventually be developed as allowed by the RSMP and the underlying zoning. The specific scope, type and location of development can not be predicted. However, since the RSMP requires new divisions of land in Natural and Rural Conservancy Designations to be configured so that all new building sites are be located outside of the 200-foot SMA it is expected that residential densities in Silver Lake shoreline areas will remain as they now exist. Since the lake’s shoreline located outside of the UGA densities will not be allowed to increase due to the operation of RCW 36.70A. The specific scope, location, density and timing of development can not be predicted. In addition to the comprehensive plans, zoning codes and the RSMP, development potential will also be subject to the constraints embodied in the various floodplain and critical areas regulations.

Shelly Lake
Approximately 70% of the shoreline of Shelly Lake is developed with single family dwellings at an urban density. The north, west and south shoreline segments are developed with residences and the shoreline has been significantly modified to prevent shoreline erosion. The eastern shoreline is undeveloped and is characterized by rock outcroppings. All the parcels on the north, west and south shorelines are within several plats and which include under a half acre in size. The east shoreline is a large private ownership. The Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code designate the north, west and south shorelines as Low Density Residential. The eastern shoreline is designated

The RSMP designates the north, west and south shorelines as Shoreline Residential the eastern shoreline is designated Shoreline Residential. The RSMP allows the land uses in shoreline areas permitted by the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code, unless the use is specifically prohibited by the RSMP. It is reasonable to assume that some of the privately owned undeveloped property on the eastern shoreline of the lake will eventually be developed as allowed by the RSMP and the underlying Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code. However, development will be very limited due to rocky nature of the shoreline and due to the fact that the southern portion of this segment is within a floodplain. The specific scope, type, density, timing and location of development can not be predicted. In addition to the comprehensive plans, zoning codes and the RSMP, development potential will also be subject to the constraints embodied in the various floodplain and critical areas regulations.

All other Lakes Subject to SMA
The ownerships of the properties fronting on the other lakes in Spokane County are primarily in large ownerships varying in size from 10 to over 100 acres. The ownerships over 10 acres make up approximately 90% of this shoreline segment. The overwhelming majority of the shoreline area is privately held. There are a few public ownerships which are used as roads or are developed as recreation areas. Very little shoreline area is managed for timber production. Many lake shoreline areas south of Cheney are in agriculture uses. Several small private resorts exist on some of the lakes such as Williams, Badger, Amber and Downs. There are a few enclaves of small lots, many developed with residences and summer cabins. Nearly all of the small lots are in plats recorded in the first half of the 1900s. Small-lot residential enclaves exist on Eloika, Clear, Badger, Williams and Reflection Lakes. A few medium size parcels exist on these lakes, between 10 and 80 acres with many occupied with residences. The balance of the shorelines on these lakes is vacant, undeveloped land and in large ownerships 40 acres and larger. A very small fraction of these shoreline areas are in timber production.

Most of the lakes in this section are located in the southwest quadrant of Spokane County. Many of the shorelines in this area are dominated with basalt outcroppings steep embankments (bluffs,
cliffs, 30 degree or greater slopes) and other environmentally limiting features (floodplains, wetlands) which reasonably preclude residential, commercial, industrial and recreation improvements within 200 feet of the ordinary high water mark.

Approximately 90% of these shoreland areas are designated Rural Conservation by the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code allowing a maximum density of 1 single family dwelling per 20 acres or 1 residence per 10 acres through the cluster development process. Other uses encouraged by this designation include agriculture, timber production, outdoor recreation and other low intensity uses. Approximately 10% of these shoreland areas are designated Rural Traditional by the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code allowing 1 single family dwelling per 10 acres. Other uses encouraged by this designation include agriculture, timber production, outdoor recreation and other low intensity uses. The creation of additional housing sites will not occur on the shorelines designated Natural and Rural Conservancy since the RSMP requires new divisions of land be configured so that all new housing sites will be located outside of the 200-foot SMA jurisdiction in these designations.

The RSMP designates the lake shorelines a combination of Natural, Rural Conservancy, and Shoreline Residential. The Shoreline Residential designations are confined to lake shorelines that were platted into small lots in the first half of the 1900s and developed with residences. There is very little vacant/undeveloped lots on shorelines in this designation. The RSMP provides that new divisions of land must be designed so that home sites are located outside of the 200-foot SMA jurisdiction. The predominant land use along this river segment is a combination of very low density single family residential, agriculture production and timber production. Suburban residential densities exist in spots which were platted in the first half of the 1900s.

It is reasonable to assume that some of the privately owned undeveloped property within the lakes shorelines will eventually be developed as allowed by the RSMP and the underlying zoning. The specific scope, type and location of development can not be predicted. However, since the RSMP requires new divisions of land in Natural and Rural Conservancy Designations to be configured so that all new building sites are be located outside of the 200-foot SMA it is expected that residential densities will remain as they now exist. Since the lakes shoreline located outside of an UGA densities will not be allowed to increase due to the operation of RCW 36.70A. In addition to the comprehensive plans, zoning codes and the RSMP, development potential will also be subject to the constraints embodied in the various floodplain and critical areas regulations.

4. Reasonably Foreseeable Future Development

Cumulative impacts to the shoreline environment may result from a wide range of possible actions. Consistent with the guidelines, an appropriate evaluation of cumulative impacts on ecological functions will consider reasonably foreseeable future development and use of the shoreline that is regulated by the shoreline master program, as well as actions that are caused by unregulated activities and development exempt from permitting. The guidelines, recognize that methods of determining reasonably foreseeable future development may vary according to local circumstances, including demographic and economic characteristics and the nature and extent of local shorelines. The focus of foreseeable development is essentially a function of the operation of the extension of past development patterns into the foreseeable future, uses allowed by the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code, and the application of other local and state development regulations.
Local Land Use Controls

As specified in Section 1 the municipal comprehensive plan and zoning codes and Section 5 of the RSMP together identify which specific uses and development densities are allowed in each shoreline designation. These documents are essentially the controlling documents as to how the shorelines are utilized. The RSMP (specifically Sections 4 and 5) is essentially an environmental protection document as opposed to regulating uses of land as is the case with comprehensive plans and zoning codes. Section 5 of the RSMP is the primary regulatory tool which implements the overall RSMP. Section 5.2 sets forth general regulations applicable to all uses in all environment designations. Section 5.3 identifies 18 specific use activities warranting special consideration.

Section 5.3 specifies which environments these 18 use activities are allowed and the performance standards to which they are subject. The use activities are as follows: Agriculture, Aquaculture, Forest Management Practices and Land Clearing Activity, Commercial, Marinas, Mining, Signs, Residential, Utilities, Water-Related Industries, Solid Waste Disposal, Roads, Railroads and Bridges, Archeological Areas and Historic Sites, Recreation, Fill, Dredging, Docks and Buoys, Shoreline Protection. Section 5.3 specifies that commercial uses, marinas, mining, Industry, solid waste disposal, new roads are prohibited in the Natural Environment. Industry and mining are prohibited in the Shoreline Residential designation. All other use activities are allowed in some form, subject to varying restrictions in all 5 environmental designations. The general restrictions listed in Section 5.2, entitled General Regulations, Section 5.3, entitled Specific Use Activity Regulations together with Section 4 requirements mandate no-net-loss of shoreline ecological functions and are intended to prevent an adverse cumulative impacts in shoreline areas over an extended period of time.

Municipal zoning codes are the primary regulations specifying land usage and development densities (by way of minimum lot sizes, lot widths, setbacks and other performance criteria). Municipal zoning codes will also be the documents which largely determines lot setbacks, building height limits, building bulk and to some extent lot coverage. Section 5 imposes additional density restrictions for the Natural and Rural-Conservative environmental designations. Section 5.8.3.2(b) requires that residential building sites on newly created parcels be located outside of the 200-foot SMA jurisdiction. Section 5.2.1(10) requires lot coverage maximums exceeding those required by municipal zoning codes.

Generally, the documents controlling land use and density of development in the unincorporated areas of Spokane County are the County Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code. These documents provide for very low densities of development and land utilization in shoreline areas located outside the Urban Growth Areas (UGA). Nearly all areas outside the UGA are zoned Rural Traditional and Rural Conservation. Both of these zones are consistent with the goals and policies of the RSMP. Shorelines within a UGA are subject to urban residential, commercial and industrial zones. The shorelines within Rockford, Latah and Waverly (also within a UGA) are designated as Urban Conservation. Spokane River shorelines between the City of Spokane and the Washington-Idaho boundary (including within the City of Spokane Valley and Liberty Lake) are zoned for a combination of industrial, commercial and urban residential uses. However, the RSMP designates these UGA shorelines Shoreline Residential, Rural Conservancy and Urban Conservancy, all of which significantly limit non-water related commercial and industrial uses. The RSMP essentially prohibits new non water related industries and commercial uses. The Rural Conservation designates discourages the creation of new housing sites within the 200-foot SMA jurisdiction. Approximate one mile of the south side of the Spokane River running eastward of the Argonne bridge in Millwood is proposed for High
Intensity Use due to the fact that an industrial use lies near the shoreline in that vicinity. This is the only High Intensity designation in the RSMA.

Trends
Base on the review of the data listed in Section 1 above the following has been determined:

1) Very little development on vacant shoreland has occurred in the past 15 years.

2) Most development consists of improvements of existing developed property.

3) Nearly all of the improvements relate to existing single family homes. The property owner either substantially improves existing homes/cabins or demolishes the existing home and builds a new larger modern home. Other related development includes docks, revetment maintenance, bank stabilization, water access improvements.

4) Commercial development that has occurred has been limited to redevelopment of property with a history of commercial use.

5) The small amount of new home construction on vacant property has been on infill property (lots) within plats approved prior to 1974.

6) The few new homes built on vacant property outside of plats are constructed on large parcels (10 acres or more) and often on the portions of the parcel located outside of the 200 feet shoreline jurisdiction.

7) The east side of Silver Lake is the only remaining platted area still filling in with new homes. Even Eloika Lake has very few areas/parcels where homes could be constructed within 200 feet shoreline jurisdiction.

8) The vacant land remaining around Spokane County Lakes and streams (and within 200 feet of the ordinary high water mark) has very limited development options due to terrain impediments such as bluffs, rocky conditions, inaccessibility, associated wetlands/marshes, floodplains or the land is in public ownership or private reserves and is being managed for tree, crop or livestock production or for transportation facilities, and in some cases, outdoor recreation uses.

Within the incorporated areas there are numerous parcels that can be more fully developed as allowed by municipal zoning codes and the RSMP. However, since development is limited by the RSMP to essentially residential development, water related commercial and industrial uses, the numerous uses allowed by zoning will likely not occur in the foreseeable future.

Outside of the UGAs, shoreline development will be limited primarily to existing parcels of record and to residential, recreation and water related commercial and industrial uses and to redevelopment.

5. Summary of Beneficial effects of the Revised Shoreline Master Program (RSMP)

The following is a summary of the beneficial effects of the RSMP which will assist in preventing long term cumulative shoreline impacts from permitted developments:

Section 2.8 sets forth concise goals and policies promoting the protection of shorelines and the restoration of previously degraded shoreline.
Section 3 sets forth specific policies for each shoreline designation that prohibit degradation of shoreline ecological function.

Section 4 sets forth a detailed administrative process to assure shorelines are not degraded when developed. The section provides for a wide variety of performance conditions that may be applied to assure shorelines are protected following permit approval.

Sections 5.2.6 and 5.3 set forth several provisions which prohibit net-loss of ecological function of the shoreline.

Section 6 sets forth a detailed process and criteria for evaluating shoreline substantial development (SSD) permits and developments exempt from SSD permits. Section 6 prohibits a net-loss of shoreline ecological function as a result of substantial developments and developments exempt from the SSD permit process.

Section 8 sets forth a detailed process for correcting violations of the RSMP. The enforcement process provides for mitigation remedies which restore degraded shorelines.

Section 12 sets forth 1) an outreach program to educated the public, and especially shoreline owners, to be effective stewards of shoreline resources; 2) a list of resource protection programs available to the public, providing technical assistance and financial incentives to protect shoreline resources or to restore degraded shoreline area; 3) a detailed description of shorelines needing restoration and benchmarks for restoration.

6. Summary of Beneficial Effects of Other Existing Regulatory Programs.

Spokane County and the participating municipalities in this SMP update effort have other land development regulations, other than their Shoreline Master Programs, that are intended to prevent significant degradation of environmental resources. Other development regulations in effect and applicable to shoreline areas are as follows:

Comprehensive Plans – These plans guide future land use and development densities usually for a 20 year time period. Many of the plans also include goals and policies Chapter 10 regarding the Natural Environment includes goals and policies encouraging conservation and wise stewardship of environmental resources.

Zoning Codes – These regulations control land use and development densities and are the primary tool for implementing the municipal comprehensive plan.

Floodplain Management Regulations – These regulations are intended to limit development to the extent that it does not compromise the functions of floodplains.

Critical Areas Ordinances – These ordinances regulation development locating in designated environmentally sensitive areas and are intended to prevent their degradation. These environmentally sensitive areas include riparian habitat, geohazardous areas, wetlands and aquifer recharge areas.

Stormwater Management Regulations – The intent of these regulations is to prevent soil erosion and protect water quality, minimizing shore degradation and water pollution.
State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) & local SEPA regulations – These regulations provide authority for local governments to require mitigation of adverse environmental impacts of development projects. Local government may use the authority of these laws to prevent shoreline degradation from developments requiring approval pursuant to other local regulations.

Environmental Health Regulations pertaining to wastes treatment systems – Typically local government agencies enforce these state regulations. The regulations are intended to prevent threats to public health from untreated or improperly treated sewage and thereby indirectly maintain groundwater and surface water quality.

Building Codes – These regulations apply to development on steep slopes in shoreline areas and are intended to prevent soil (& shoreline) instability, landslides and erosion.

Grading and Filling Regulations – These local regulations apply to grading and filling of land even if a specific structural development is not planned. The regulations are intended to prevent soil erosion, soil instability and ambient air quantify problems.

Subdivision Regulations – These local regulations may be used to insure proper design of subdivisions, short subdivisions and other divisions of land in shoreline areas to insure such divisions are consistent with the RSMP and assist in indirectly preventing shoreline degradation by application of plat restrictions and conveants.

5. Cumulative Impact Mitigation

In summarizing the information in Sections 1 through 3 above, undeveloped portions of the shorelines are subject to little development pressure based on development trends dating to 1988. Most residential development pressure will occur on existing developed shoreline areas as a result of structure upgrades or replacements. Any commercial or industrial development will likely be an upgrade or replacement of an existing buildings and/or accessory structures and improvements. Industrial zoning which would allow for industrial development is located primarily along the Spokane River shoreline in the City of Spokane Valley. However, a substantial percentage of the shoreline in that city is publicly owned and is not available for industrial development.

As stated previously in this report the bulk of new development that has occurred on shoreline fronting property and will likely occur in the future is the upgrading of single family dwellings and accessory structures, and the development of new homes on vacant shoreline property. Assuming that home upgrades comply with the provisions and policies of the RSMP the cumulative impacts resulting therefrom should be very limited. The cumulative impacts resulting from new home development on vacant property should be quite limited due to the following significant factors:

1. There exists a very limited amount of shoreline property under 5 acres that is not already developed with a residence or some other use.
2. The RSMP does not allow the creation of new housing sites in the Natural and Conservancy shoreline designations, which said designations applying to approximately 95% of the shorelines in Spokane County subject to SMA (119 miles of lake shores and 652 miles of stream shorelines).
3. Nearly all undeveloped properties in the proposed Natural and Rural Conservancy Designations are 10 acres and larger. Aerial Photo analysis reveals that most residences
located on large shoreline parcels (10 acres or larger) are setback outside of the jurisdiction of
the SMA for a variety of reasons.
4. Spokane County Critical Areas Ordinance requires a 250-foot no disturbance riparian
protection buffer along 99.5% of the SMA streams which severely limits the development of
new residences and other uses.
5. Assuming new home development on existing vacant property within the SMA
jurisdiction fully complies with the provisions and policies of the RSMP, such development
should have a minimum or no cumulative adverse impacts to the shoreline.

Since the RSMP requires throughout the document that there be no net loss of shoreline
function resulting from development and assuming that the RSMP and all regulations
discussed in Section 4 are properly administered and enforced by local agencies the
cumulative impact of development allowed by the RSMP over an extended period of time
should be negligible. On the contrary, if the shoreline restorations are implemented as
contemplated in Section 12 of the RSMP and due to shoreline restoration mitigation measures
required by the regulatory processes illustrated in Sections 4, 5 and 6, the negligible
degradation suggested above may be offset by Sections 4, 5, 6 and 12 driven restoration
activities or required mitigation strategies. Since the cumulative impact is negligible there is
virtually no mitigation burden to be distributed to other persons or agencies beyond the
restoration and mitigation responsibilities contemplated in the RSMP. Additionally, this
conclusion also takes into consideration that the beneficial effects of the RSMP will be
operating in concert with the beneficial effects of the resource protection provisions of the
municipal resource protection regulations outlined in Section 4.

One caveat to this conclusion relates to forestry and agriculture use activities. Significant
long term shoreline degradation will continue to occur if Section 12 of the RSMP is not
timely and aggressively implemented. This program envisions educating and working with
agriculture and timber landowners to encourage a long term stewardship approach to the
treatment of shoreline resources. The program encourages providing technical information
on best management practices which will prevent shoreline degradation, yet enable them to
achieve their production objectives. This program recognizes that after-the-fact enforcement
does not prevent degradation and that a proactive program of education, technical assistance
and financial incentives will be more effective at minimizing or preventing long term adverse
cumulative impacts. The program set forth in Section 12 is intended to apply to all shoreline
owners as well as the general public having interest in protecting shoreline resources.

Another caveat relates to intentional or inadvertent violations of the Shoreline Master
Program. As has been the case in the past, there will always be shoreland owners and users
who aren't aware of the requirements of the SMP nor have awareness of sound stewardship
principals regarding wise management of shorelines and will proceed to alter the property and
degrade shoreline ecosystems. Of course, there will always be shoreland owners and/or users
who are aware of the SMP requirements and will intentionally degrade shorelands for a
variety of self-serving purposes. The cumulative impact of continuing illegal/inadvertent
actions will result in substantial degradation of shoreline ecology and aesthetics. Even
though cumulative impact analysis typically addresses the impacts of legitimate actions it is
noted here that the vast majority of shoreline degradation in Spokane County has resulted
from illegal actions or actions classified as “exempt” from the substantial development permit
requirements. The RSMP attempts to minimize, eliminate or otherwise remedy shoreline
degradation due to illegal and inadvertent actions by 1) pursuing a program, as illustrated in
Section 12 of the RSMP, to educate the public regarding sound shoreland resource
management techniques and availability of technical and financial assistance programs; 2)
rigorously pursue violators and compel remediation to include on-site restoration and/or enhancement actions as specified in Section 8 of the RSMP; 3) vigorously pursue oversite and monitoring of exempt activities as specified in Sections 6, 8 and 12 of the RSMP and; 4) pursue off-site shoreline restoration/enhancement actions as outlined in Section 12 of the RSMP.