TO:               City Council
FROM:            Ben Shumaker
DATE:            July 20th, 2017
SUBJECT:         Port of Skamania Stevenson Waterfront Shoreline Restoration (SHOR2017-01)

Introduction

On April 27th, 2017 the Stevenson Planning Department received an application from the Port of Skamania to complete its Stevenson Shoreline Restoration and Enhancement Project. The project intends to arrest 450’ of severe bank erosion, restore aquatic habitat along 1,250’ of Columbia River bank and extend the shoreline on average 78’ to the south. An estimated 35,000 cu yd of rock and soil would be placed to restore the shoreline and enhance aquatic and riparian habitats. Materials for the fill will come, in part, from bar scalping and dredging activities in Rock Creek. Uses of the Columbia River shoreline area include a future development area, public access, recreational pathway, and habitat conservation areas. The proposed project restores the footprint of the historic river bank, which expands the riparian area by 2.15 ac (53%). The project requires a Shorelines Substantial Development Permit from the City.

Permit Procedures

The City Council established this date to hold a public hearing on the proposal because the estimated cost exceeds $250,000. The proposal was not referred to the Planning Commission for its review. The Council is asked to consider all relevant information available and evidence presented to it, and either grant, conditionally grant, or deny the permit. Planning Department staff recommends conditionally granting the permit subject to the attached draft Shoreline Substantial Development Permit.

Requested Action

The City Council is asked to consider all relevant information available and evidence presented at the public hearing and conditionally grant a Shoreline Substantial Development Permit for the Stevenson Shoreline Restoration and Enhancement Project (SHOR2017-01).

Possible Motion: “...move to adopt the Shoreline Substantial Development Permit (SHOR2017-01) as recommended by Planning Department Staff based on its satisfactory compliance with the Skamania County Shoreline Management Master Program and SMC 18.08”.

Prepared by,

Ben Shumaker
Planning Director

Attachments: 1-Staff Recommendation, 2-Use Map, 3-Application Materials.
PROPOSAL:
The applicant proposed to arrest 450' of severe bank erosion, restore aquatic habitat along 1,250' of Columbia River bank and extend the shoreline on average 78' to the south. An estimated 35,000 cu yd of rock and soil would be placed to restore the shoreline and enhance aquatic and riparian habitats. Materials for the fill will come, in part from bar scalping and dredging activities in Rock Creek. Uses of the Columbia River shoreline include a future development area, public access, recreational pathway, and habitat conservation areas. The proposed project restores the footprint of the historic river bank, which expands the riparian area by 2.15 ac (53%).

LOCATION:
The site is located along the Columbia River in downtown Stevenson from ~Stevenson Landing at Russell Avenue upstream to ~Leavens Avenue. Additional work will occur on Rock Creek.

USES:
Archeological Areas and Historic Sites; Commercial/Industrial Development; Dredging; Landfill; Recreation; Shoreline Protective Works; Wildlife.

KEY ISSUES:

PROONENT:
Port of Skamania
PO Box 1099
Stevenson, WA 98648
(509) 427-5484

APPLICANT:
Brian Bair, Bair LLC
181 McEvoy Lane
Stevenson, WA 98648
(360) 335-4307

ENGINEER:
Flowing Solutions
3305 SW 87th
Portland, OR 97225
(503) 297-6053

CITY STAFF:
Ben Shumaker
Shoreline Administrator
Nick Hogan
City Administrator
Frank Cox
Mayor
BACKGROUND

The proposal occurs over multiple tax lots and dozens of legal lots of record. Current development on the properties include a restaurant, vacant lands, a dilapidated single-family residence, recreational lands and pathways. The site is the subject of severe bank erosion threatening the buildings on site and was proposed as part of a coordinated effort to cope with the 2007 Piper Road landslide on Rock Creek. The proposal has been reviewed by the City (Critical Areas Ordinance), the County (State Environmental Policy Act), the State (Hydraulic Projects Approval), and US Army Corps of Engineers (Joint Aquatic Resources Permit Application). The City Council’s review under the Shoreline Management Program represents the final regulatory permit required for work on this proposal to begin. The request represents ~half of the full project approved by the US Army Corps of Engineers.

The proposal is located in an Urban Environment and involves Landfill including of rocks and soils along ~450 of the Columbia River waterfront in downtown Stevenson. This landfill includes soft armoring techniques to create Shoreline Protective Works for existing and future Commercial/Industrial Development. Portions of the landfilled area will be used for Circulation and Recreation, while other portions will be used for Wildlife purposes.

STANDARDS, FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

SMC 18 – ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Title 18 of the Stevenson Municipal Code is separated into three chapters. Chapter 18.04 considers the City’s procedures under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA). This Chapter is dealt with in brief based on previous permitting reviews. Chapter 18.08 addresses Shoreline Management, together with the adopted Shoreline Management Master Program, is the focus of this review. Chapter 18.13 focuses on Critical Areas and Natural Resources lands and is only mentioned in brief based on previous permitting efforts.

SMC CH. 18.04 ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY

This chapter considers whether projects are likely to have a probably significant adverse impact on the environment, requiring agencies to evaluate actions before they are taken. The chapter is separated into 11 articles covering various permitting and project review actions. Only 2 articles are relevant to this proposal as more fully discussed below.

CRITERION §18.04 ARTICLE III CATHERICAL EXEMPTIONS AND THRESHOLD DETERMINATIONS This article adopts Washington Administrative Code (WAC) sections related to the applicability and review process for projects under SEPA.

CRITERION §18.04 ARTICLE V COMMENTING This article adopts Washington Administrative Code (WAC) sections regarding the acceptance and issuance of comments for proposals reviewed under SEPA.

FINDING(S):

1. SKAMANIA County was determined to be the Lead Agency for this proposal under WAC 197-11-050 and WAC 197-11-924.
2. As Lead Agency, Skamania County issued a Threshold Determination of Nonsignificance (DNS) on September 15, 2010 under County File SEP-10-09.
3. The City commented on the County-issued DNS on September 21, 2010, concurring with several aspects of the County’s decision and expressing concerns about other aspects of the decision. Concerns were related to protection of City infrastructure in the proposal area, overall shoreline stability, selection of mitigation plantings, and coordination with City permitting procedures.
4. The proposal addresses several of the City’s previous concerns.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW: This project will comply with SMC 18.04 without conditions.
SMC Ch. 18.08 Shoreline Management
This chapter details the procedures for review according to the Shoreline Management Act. The chapter is separated into 25 sections detailing program administration and project review. Findings and conclusions are detailed below, and a greater focus is placed on the imperative sections of the project review process.

**Criterion §18.08.010 Through .090** These provisions establish the authority to review shoreline proposals and detail the regulatory applicability of the Shoreline Management Master Program.

**Finding(s):**
1. Section 18.08.020 specifically adopts the 1974 Comprehensive Plan as a standard of review and adopts the maps associated with the Skamania County Shoreline Management Master Program, but not the text of the program itself. This decision uses the 1974 Comprehensive Plan and both the maps and the text of the Shoreline Master Program as the standards of review.
2. The proposal is located on lands and waters under the jurisdiction of the Shorelines Management Act of 1971 and along a Shoreline of State-Wide Significance under SMC 18.08.070.
3. The proposal is considered a Substantial Development and must be consistent with the permit review under SMC 18.08.080.
4. The proposal does not involve a timber cutting permit and SMC 18.08.090 does not apply.

**Conclusions of Law:** This project will comply with SMC 18.08.010 through 18.08.090 subject to the review, and upon compliance with the conditions, contained herein.

**Criterion §18.08.100 Through .180** These provisions are procedure-oriented and dictate the application, notice, and review requirements for Shoreline Substantial Development Permits.

**Finding(s):**
1. The proponent submitted appropriate application forms on 4/18/2017.
2. Notice of application was published on 5/10/2017 & 5/17/2017. No interested persons submitted comments or requests for information or hearings on the application.
3. The proponents paid the appropriate fee for this proposal based on Resolution 243B, adopted April 21st, 2011, which supersedes the amount in SMC 18.08.120.
4. The proposal was submitted for review by the City Council at the 6/15/2017 regular meeting. The Council did not refer the proposal to the Planning Commission. Based on the estimated project cost, a public hearing was established for review of this proposal under SMC 18.08.160(6). Notice of this hearing was published on 7/12/17.
5. The City Council held a public hearing on 7/20/17 at which all relevant information available and evidence presented was considered. Based on this information and evidence, the Council finds it necessary to conditionally grant this permit.

**Conclusions of Law:** This project will comply with SMC 18.08.100 through 18.08.180 subject to the review, and upon compliance with the conditions, contained herein.

**Criterion §18.08.190 Through .220** These provisions include actions intended to occur after issuance of a permit by the City.

**Finding(s):**
1. The proposal is subject to the notice, appeal, revocation, and expiration provisions provided in these sections.

**Conclusions of Law:** This project will comply with SMC 18.08.190 through 18.08.220 upon satisfaction of conditions 1-3, below.

**Conditions:**
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1. **Prior to the Start of Construction** the proponent shall not begin work until 45 days from the date of filing of the final order of the Council with the Washington State Department of Ecology and Attorney General or until all review proceedings initiated within 45 days from the date of such filing have been terminated.

2. **During the Duration of this Project** the proponent shall comply with requirements from other federal, state and county permits, procedures and regulations.

3. **During the Duration of this Project** this permit shall be valid for 2 years from the date of approval by the Council. If the proposal is not completed within the 2-year period, the proponent may request City Council review and extension of the permit. Such request shall be submitted within the 2-year period of validity. Requests for extension are limited to 1 year at a time and subject to a maximum of 5 total years from the date of approval by the Council (2-year initial period of validity and 3 1-year extensions). Extensions will be granted by the Council only after finding that the proponent has made progress toward completion of the permit or that some other good cause exists for the extension.

**CRITERION §18.08.230 THROUGH .240** These provisions are related to the review of Shoreline Conditional Use Permits and Shoreline Variance requests.

**FINDING(S):**
1. The proposal includes uses permissible in the Urban Shoreline Environmental Designation and does not require a Shoreline Conditional Use Permit.
2. The proposal does not include any structures that would require a Shoreline Variance.

**CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:** This project will comply with SMC 18.08.100 through 18.08.180 without conditions.

**CRITERION §18.08.250** These provisions are related to violations of the City's Shoreline Management Program.

**FINDING(S):**
1. The proposal is not subject to enforcement or penalties based on violation at this time.

**CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:** This project will comply with SMC 18.08.250 upon satisfaction of the conditions contained herein.

**SKAMANIA COUNTY SHORELINE MANAGEMENT MASTER PROGRAM**
The Skamania County Shoreline Management Master Program (SMP) contains the policies applicable to proposals undertaken in shoreline areas. Key provisions related to this proposal include the Goals for Shorelines of State-Wide Significance, Master Program Elements, Use Activities, Environment Regulations, and Use Regulations. Findings and conclusions are detailed below based on the portions of the program that apply to this proposal.

**CRITERION SMP GOALS FOR SHORELINES OF STATEWIDE SIGNIFICANCE** This section of the SMP contains 13 goals intended to guide the review of projects along the Columbia River in Stevenson.

**FINDING(S):**
1. The proposal is located along the Columbia River, a Shoreline of State-Wide Significance.
2. The proposal is consistent with the goals for development in these areas because it:
   a. Addresses multiple local problems and balances and multiple proposed uses in a way that advances toward the City's goal to "consider state-wide interest over local".
   b. Will restore and "preserve natural shoreline character".
   c. Has foresight by addressing multiple ongoing local problems and its solutions "consider long term benefits (20-30 years) over short term (5 years)".
   d. Includes mitigation, monitoring, and contingency plans that "protect shoreline ecology and resources"
   e. Includes public visual and physical access areas that "provide public access to publicly
f. Includes public visual and physical access areas that “provide public recreation opportunity along shorelines”.

g. Proposes uses and development that have no impact on and “protect public right of navigation” on the Columbia River.

h. Has a location and surrounding properties that are publicly owned and “recognize and protect private property rights consistent with the public interest”.

i. Has a location, design, and timing which “preserve and protect fragile natural resources and culturally significant features”.

j. Has a site location and characteristics bearing no relation with a goal to “establish criteria for orderly residential growth”.

k. Balances multiple proposed uses and advances toward a goal to “promote reasonable and appropriate use of the shorelines which will promote and enhance public interest”.

l. Has been designed and permitted in a way that will “maintain a high quality of environment along shorelines”.

m. Includes mitigation, monitoring, and contingency plans that will “protect shorelines against adverse effects to public health, land, vegetation, wildlife, water and aquatic life”.

**CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:** This project will comply with the SMP’s Goals for Shorelines of State-Wide Significance upon satisfaction of the conditions contained herein.

**CRITERION SMP MASTER PROGRAM ELEMENTS** This section of the SMP contains goals and policies related to 7 specific program elements.

**FINDING(S):**

1. **ECONOMIC Development.** The proposal includes the establishment of areas where future commercial and/or industrial development can occur and advances toward the Economic Development Element’s goal to “encourage economic development along shorelines that will enhance the quality of life for the residents of Skamania County with minimum disturbance to the environment”.

   a. The lack of specific proposed uses prevents the Council from applying the specific policies of the Economic Development Element of the SMP.

   b. The proposal as proposed at this time is consistent with the Economic Development Element of the SMP.

2. **Public Access.** The proposal includes non-motorized public physical access areas at Leavens Point and visual access areas by reestablishing of a previously-existing waterfront pathway. This proposed access will “assure safe, convenient and diversified access for the public to public shorelines of Skamania County”.

   a. This proposed physical and visual public access complies with the City policy to “retain existing public access and develop additional access where such intrusions will not endanger life or property nor interfere with the rights inherent with private property. Access to shorelines should also include foot trails and public right of ingress-egress”.

   b. The proposal replaces a sheet pile visual access point with a natural rock slope and its “access to shorelines should not have an adverse effect on unique or fragile natural features”.

   c. The proposal, as designed, aligns with the City’s policy “to encourage uses which have public access as a planned feature”.

   d. The proposal has been designed to align with the City’s policy “to discourage those uses which curtail or reduce existing free movement of the public unless such restriction is in the interest of public health, safety or necessary to the use proposed”. Any reduction in the free movement of the public is based on a necessary inclusion of conservation elements for wildlife uses.
3. Circulation Element. The proposal includes a pathway that connects to, supplements and correlates with the major thoroughfares, transportation routes, terminals and other public facilities. The proposed pathway helps “develop safe, convenient and diversified circulation systems to assure efficient movement of people during their daily and other activities with minimum disruptions to the shoreline environment and minimum conflict between the different users”.

   a. The City Council’s review of this proposal complies with and supports the policy stating “sites proposed for circulation developments must be evaluated and determined to be the most suitable areas under consideration”. The location between the future development area and the habitat conservation area is ideal for this proposal.

   b. The phased timing of the pathway’s construction ensures that the proposal complies with the City policy stating “there must be assurance that the effects of site preparation, construction and use shall be performed in such time period and so regulated as to have the least possible undesirable affect upon the shoreline natural features, scenic quality and ecological system”.

   c. The proposed pathway provides visual public access to the waterfront and complies with the City’s policy stating “it must be demonstrated that the proposed use is of such a nature as to require a location within the shoreline”.

   d. The circulation included within the proposal’s balance of permissible shoreline uses advances the City policy stating “the proposed use should not be one of such a nature to serve as a focal point for other unwarranted shoreline developments to be generated by cause of its presence”.

   e. The proposed pathway advances the City policy stating “Circulation proposals, in shoreline areas, should provide areas for off road rest and scenic stops where the topography and natural features warrant”.

4. Recreation Element. The Public Access and Circulation elements of the proposal also address the necessary preservation and expansion of recreational opportunities and “assure diverse, convenient, and adequate recreational opportunities along the shorelines of Skamania County for the local residents and a reasonable number of transient users”.

   a. The proposed recreational amenities have been reviewed under the City’s Critical Areas Ordinance and include pedestrian pathways and non-motorized access to the Columbia River. These aspects comply with the City Policy stating “recreation uses should be of a safe and healthy nature and meet standards that will preserve the integrity of the environment”.

   b. No specific uses are proposed for the future development area, which could be used to advance the policy stating that “private recreational developments should be encouraged in conjunction with public uses”.

   c. The proposal adds a physical recreational access point to the Columbia River which will help “provide sufficient shoreline recreational opportunities for local citizens so that the at-home recreational needs are met and not allow an over-emphasis on tourism to render the county unpleasant for local residents”.

   d. The proposed non-motorized public access and circulation system complies with the City policy stating “Areas for recreational use should be compatible with other uses on the shorelines”.

   e. The proposal is located on public lands and unrelated to the City policy stating “encourage state and local government to acquire shoreline property for public recreation. And, to encourage development by the private sector on public lands on a lease basis for use by the public”.

5. Shoreline Use Element. The proposal includes an intricate and balanced pattern of uses
within the shoreline area which “assure appropriate development in suitable locations without diminishing the quality of environment along the shorelines of Skamania County”.

a. The proposed balance of uses mixes future development, pedestrian circulation, habitat conservation, and non-motorized recreation “to promote the best possible relation of land and water uses, and assure a minimum of conflict between these uses”.

b. The proposed balance of uses has been managed to “assure that individual uses are placed on appropriate sites”.

c. The proposal has been designed to “discourage improper uses of land and water”.

d. The proposed mix of uses acts to “reserve land and water areas of specific nature for uses which require particular type of lands and waters”.

6. Conservation Element. The proposal’s restoration and conservation of habitat areas along the shoreline will “assure preservation of unique, fragile and scenic elements, and of nonrenewable natural resources; assure continued utilization of the renewable resources”.

a. The proposal’s review under the City’s Critical Areas Ordinance has identified the habitat impacts of the proposal and the conditions included as part of that review “assure that resource management procedures are performed in accordance with the best interest of the citizens and with minimal adverse effect upon the environment and ecosystem of the particular area”.

b. The proposal includes elements which improve and “preserve scenic and aesthetic qualities of the shorelines”.

c. The proposal’s design and its construction timelines “protect wildlife habitat within shoreline areas and preserve habitats of rare and endangered wildlife species”.

d. The proposed removal of sheet pile at Leavens Point and rehabilitation of eroded areas aligns with the City policy to “restore damaged features and ecosystems to a higher quality than may currently exist”.

7. Historical/Cultural Element. The proposal has been proposed in a manner that will “protect, preserve, and restore sites and areas having historical, cultural, educational and scientific values”.

a. Sites containing cultural, historic or prehistoric uses are not known to exist in the project area and the proposal therefore advances the City policy stating “Such sites should be made available to the general public; however, access to sites may be by foot trail, boat or other means of less convenience than paved roads”.

b. There are no properties or sites that are listed or eligible for historic designation by the State Historic Preservation Officer. The SEPA related to this proposal identifies a process for inadvertent discoveries that will help advance the City policy stating “Suspected significant sites and newly discovered sites should remain free of other intrusions until their value for retention is determined and alternatives are explored”.

c. As currently understood and unless resources are discovered during construction, the proposal will not affect the City policy stating “the existence of a determined significant site need not preclude all other uses of an area but rather these uses should be compatible with that of the site area having historical or cultural values”.

Conclusions of Law: This project will comply with the SMP’s Master Program Elements upon satisfaction of conditions 4 through 7 below and the other conditions contained herein.

Conditions:

4. Prior to the Start of Construction of the Pedestrian Pathway the proponent shall complete the landfill work and establish conservation areas for wildlife.

5. During the Duration of this Project the proponent shall comply with all conditions of approval issued as part of the Critical Areas Permit for this project, City file CAP2014-01.

6. During the Duration of this Project the proponent shall comply with all construction windows and
conditions of approval issued as part of the state and federal permits for this project.

7. **During the Duration of this Project** the proponent shall implement an Inadvertent Discovery Policy similar to that articulated by the Cowlitz Indian Tribe during the 2010 SEPA review of this proposal.

**CRITERION SMP SHORELINE POLICY STATEMENTS FOR THE USE ACTIVITIES** This section of the SMP details specific policies for 21 types of uses that serve as “the criteria upon which judgements [sic] will be based in granting shoreline permits”. Of the 21 use activities, only 7 are detailed as relevant to this proposal: Archeological Areas and Historic Sites; Commercial/Industrial Development; Dredging; Landfill; Recreation; Shoreline Protection Works; and Wildlife.

**FINDING(S):**

1. **Inapplicable Uses Activities.** The proposal does not include the following use activities and the policies related to these activities have not been applied to this proposal: Agricultural Practices; Aquaculture; Compensation for Restricted Use of Private Property; Forest Management Practices; Log Storage and Rafting; Marinas; Mining; Outdoor Advertising, Signs and Billboards; Piers; Ports and Water-Related Industry; Residential Development; Road and Railroad Design and Construction; Solid Waste Disposal; Utilities.

2. **Archeological Areas and Historic Sites.**
   - The Washington Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation has been consulted to identify archaeological areas and historic sites. No listed historical sites or known archaeological areas are in the project vicinity.
   - As identified during the County’s 2010 SEPA determination and required above, this project is expected to implement an Inadvertent Discovery Policy.
   - The Inadvertent Discovery Policy includes appropriate protocols for stopping and restarting work if archaeological or historic resources are found.

3. **Commercial/Industrial Development.**
   - No specific type of future development is proposed on the upland areas of this site at this time, and it is not possible to evaluate whether such uses would be water-oriented.
   - The future development areas form the heart of the Port of Skamania County’s commercial/industrial use area.
   - No specific structures or developments are proposed at this time, and it is not possible to assess scenic impacts.
   - No parking facilities are proposed at this time.
   - Both physical and visual public access to the waterfront are integral parts of this proposal.
   - No specific commercial/industrial facilities are proposed at this time, and it is not possible to coordinate uses.
   - Standards for building setbacks and design, site coverage and landscaping are dealt with through other sections of the SMP and through the City’s Zoning Code.

4. **Dredging.**
   - The channel bar scalping, dredging, and landfill included in this proposal is permitted and strictly controlled by permits issued through the Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife and US Army Corps of Engineers.
   - The landfill portion of this proposal is part of the long term strategy for deposit of dredged materials.
   - The deposit of dredged materials has been reviewed by multiple state agencies and is permitted through appropriate state channels.
   - The dredging is unrelated to navigation channels, turning and moorage basins.
   - The dredging and bar scalping included in this proposal is based on the removal of materials in a rapidly accreting stream and not done for the sole purpose of obtaining landfill.
f. A Hydraulics Project Approval has been obtained for this proposal.

5. Landfill.
   a. The location of this fill project has been selected in a way that restores the historical shoreline of the Columbia River, and the uses of landfill include public access and fish and wildlife habitat restoration.
   b. Shoreline fill has been designed to improve ecological values and restores the historic shoreline of the Columbia River.
   c. Vegetation, soft armoring and natural rock slopes are proposed at the perimeter of all fill areas.
   d. Fill materials for this proposal are likely to come from a number of sources.
   e. This proposal requires a Shoreline Substantial Development Permit.
   f. A Hydraulics Project Approval has been obtained for this proposal.

6. Recreation.
   a. The proposal includes public physical and visual access to the shoreline and facilitates recreational uses.
   b. The proposed new non-motorized physical access point relieves pressure from other access points along the Columbia River in Stevenson.
   c. The proposal includes a pathway that provides linear access and linkage between shoreline parks and public access points.
   d. Standards for views and scenic vistas are dealt with through other sections of the SMP.
   e. No parking facilities are proposed at this time.
   f. The proposed public access and pathway supplement the variety of recreational developments available to nearby population centers.
   g. The proposed recreation facilities help address an existing deficit in the overall supply of facilities in downtown Stevenson.
   h. No facilities for intensive recreation are proposed at this time.
   i. No recreational facilities requiring large amounts of fertilizers or pesticides are proposed at this time.
   j. Public health needs are an important part of developing recreational areas and should be considered in relation to this project.

7. Shoreline protection Works (SPW).
   a. The proposed SPW is designed to restore the natural shoreline and will not result in adverse effects to wetlands, which are not present on the site.
   b. The proposed SPW involves soft armoring to replace existing hard armored areas and was selected as mindful of anadromous fish needs.
   c. The proposed SPW includes new areas that allow physical public access to this public shoreline area.
   d. The proposed SPW’s soft armoring blends in with the surroundings and the proposed vegetation is mindful of nearby commercial development.
   e. The proposed SPW are included to protect existing commercial development from an actively eroding shoreline area and have also been reviewed according to the Landfill policies.
   f. The proposed soft armoring protects the natural character of the streamway and avoids channelization.
   g. No flood protection measures are proposed at this time.
   h. Again, no flood protection measures are proposed at this time.
   i. A Hydraulics Project Approval has been obtained for this proposal.
8. Wildlife.
   a. The proposal has been evaluated for impacts to rare and endangered wildlife and is subject to a Critical Areas Permit, City file CAP2014-01, based on its impact to habitat areas.
   b. No impacts to winter range for wildlife populations will be impacted are proposed at this time.
   c. No shoreline uses which would render nesting areas for waterfowl, hawks, owls or eagle species are proposed at this time.
   d. The proposal has been evaluated for impacts to wildlife resources, including anadromous fish, and is subject to a Critical Areas Permit, City file CAP2014-01, based on its impact to habitat areas.

**CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:** This project will comply with the SMP’s Master Program Elements upon satisfaction of conditions 8 through 9 below and the other conditions contained herein.

**CONDITIONS:**

8. **Prior to the Deposit of Landfill** the proponent shall evaluate the source of the landfill to ensure it will not contribute toxics or other pollutants that reduce water quality.

9. **Prior to the Start of Construction** the proponent shall consult with state or other public health officials to determine safety can be improved at the recreational facilities.

**CRITERION SMP ENVIRONMENT REGULATIONS:** This section of the SMP details policies that apply within specific Shoreline Environment Designations. The proposal is located in the Urban Environment, and the other 3 designation types are not detailed.

**FINDING(S):**
1. Inapplicable Environment Regulations. The proposal is located within an Urban Environment and subject to regulation thereunder. The proposal has not been reviewed according to the regulations for Natural, Conservancy, or Rural environments.
2. Urban Environment Regulation.
   a. Uses. The proposal includes the following use categories: parks, public and private; public access areas, routes and devices; landfills; shoreline protection works as part of another use or for protection of uplands; dredging. All uses are permissible in the Urban Environment, and no unlisted uses or listed conditional uses are proposed.
   b. Minimum shoreline Frontage and Lot Size. No changes are proposed to shoreline frontage or lot size and all conform to the City subdivision and zoning codes.
   c. Public Access. The proposal includes adequate public visual and physical access to the shoreline.
   d. Setbacks. No buildings or structures are proposed to be located closer than 50’ to the ordinary high water mark nor over water.
   e. Building Height. No buildings or structures are proposed at this time.
   f. Building Design. No buildings are proposed at this time.
   g. Side yards. No buildings, and therefore no side yards, are proposed at this time.
   h. Front yards. No buildings, and therefore no front yards, are proposed at this time.
   i. Parking and Loading. No parking or loading is proposed at this time.
   j. Signs. No parking signs are proposed at this time.
   k. Restoration. The vegetation proposed in the restoration and mitigation plans is appropriate for the conservation areas. No vegetation, landscaping or screening has been proposed for the future development area. The proposal includes the removal of dilapidated buildings and structures, but does not detail how abandoned pilings will be dealt with. Maintenance of the construction site has not been detailed as part of the proposal.
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW: This project will comply with the SMP’s Master Program Elements upon satisfaction of conditions 10 through 12 below and the other conditions contained herein.

CONDITIONS:
10. **Prior to Completion of this Project** the proponent shall submit a landscaping and/or screening plan for the future development areas of this project. The plan shall comply with the Restoration regulations of the Shoreline Management Master Program.

11. **Prior to the Start of Construction** the proponent shall identify which pilings are abandoned and will be removed as part of this project. If pilings are to remain, the proponent shall identify them and indicate they will be removed as part of development within the future development areas.

12. **During the Duration of this Project** the proponent shall install temporary fencing/screening around the construction site to prevent public visual and physical access to the area. In order to explain the project and temporary blockages, the fencing may include signs on the landward sides of the project. Signs shall be temporary and shall not exceed 50 square feet.

**CRITERION SMP SHORELINE USE REGULATIONS** This section of the SMP details regulations applicable to 6 specific types of shoreline uses. Construction and Operations is the only use regulation detailed in this permit.

**FINDING(S):**
1. Inapplicable Use Regulations. The proposal does not include Renewable Resource uses, Scenic Vista and View Protection uses, Flood Plain Development uses, Surface Mining Uses, or Docks and Floating Structure uses, and the regulations related to those uses have not been reviewed.
2. Construction and Operations Regulations.
   a. Construction equipment may enter the Columbia River if authorized to do so in the state and/or federal permits regulating this project.
   b. Vegetation may be removed if authorized in the Critical Areas Permit issued for this project, City file CAP2014-01.
   c. The proposal includes measures to control land-borne and water-borne siltation and erosion and will also prevent waste materials and other foreign matter from entering the water.
   d. Fuel and chemicals are necessary to operate the equipment used in this proposal.
   e. The proposal includes measures to control land-borne and water-borne siltation and erosion.
   f. Drainage for the land being prepared for development is dealt with in the Critical Areas Permit issued for this project, City file CAP2014-01, and is adequate to prevent runoff from entering the waterbodies.
   g. Road building is not proposed at this time.
   h. Land clearing operations are not proposed at this time.
   i. Equipment, fuels and/or oil may be necessary to complete this proposal.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW: This project will comply with the SMP’s Master Program Elements upon satisfaction of conditions 13 through 14 below and the other conditions contained herein.

CONDITIONS:
13. **During the Duration of this Project** All fuel and chemicals shall be kept, stored, handled and used in a fashion which assures that there will be no opportunity for entry of such fuel and chemicals into the water.

14. **Prior to Project Completion** the proponent shall ensure that all construction debris such as fuel and oil containers and barrels and other miscellaneous litter are removed from the shoreline area. No equipment shall be abandoned within the shoreline area.

**SMC Ch. 18.13 CRITICAL AREAS AND NATURAL RESOURCE LANDS**
This chapter considers whether projects are located within or likely to impact Critical Areas (Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas, Fish & Wildlife Habitat Areas, Frequently Flooded Areas, Geologically Hazardous Areas, Wetlands), requiring mitigation if impacts are identified. The Chapter is subject to administrative review and approval.

**FINDING(S):**

1. The proponent has submitted a complete application for a Critical Areas Permit and is working with staff to finalize the permit requirements.
2. Mitigation measures for the proposal include on- and off-site mitigation and detail the performance, monitoring and contingency plans necessary to ensure impacts are avoided over the long-term.

**CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:** This project will comply with the Critical Areas Ordinance upon satisfaction of the conditions contained herein.

**SUMMARY DETERMINATION OF COMPLIANCE**

The preceding discussion describes the City Council’s review of the relevant information available and evidence presented regarding the Port of Skamania’s Stevenson Shoreline Restoration & Enhancement Project (City file SHOR2017-01). The findings and conclusions of this document justify issuance of a Shoreline Substantial Development Permit under the Skamania County Shoreline Management Master Program. The Shoreline Substantial Development Permit for this proposal is being conditionally granted subject to the timeline established herein. For ease of readership, all conditions are repeated below and listed in temporal order.

Any person aggrieved by the granting of this permit by the Council may seek review from the Shorelines Hearings Board, pursuant to RCW 90.58.180.

1. **Prior to the Start of Construction** the proponent shall not begin work until 45 days from the date of filing of the final order of the Council with the Washington State Department of Ecology and Attorney General or until all review proceedings initiated within 45 days from the date of such filing have been terminated.

9. **Prior to the Start of Construction** the proponent shall consult with state or other public health officials to determine safety can be improved at the recreational facilities.

11. **Prior to the Start of Construction** the proponent shall identify which pilings are abandoned and will be removed as part of this project. If pilings are to remain, the proponent shall identify them and indicate they will be removed as part of development within the future development areas.

8. **Prior to the Deposit of Landfill** the proponent shall evaluate the source of the landfill to ensure it will not contribute toxics or other pollutants that reduce water quality.

4. **Prior to the Start of Construction of the Pedestrian Pathway** the proponent shall complete the landfill work and establish conservation areas for wildlife.

2. **During the Duration of this Project** the proponent shall comply with requirements from other federal, state and county permits, procedures and regulations.

3. **During the Duration of this Project** this permit shall be valid for 2 years from the date of approval by the Council. If the proposal is not completed within the 2-year period, the proponent may request City Council review and extension of the permit. Such request shall be submitted within the 2-year period of validity. Requests for extension are limited to 1 year at a time and subject to a maximum of 5 total years from the date of approval by the Council (2-year initial period of validity and 3 1-year extensions). Extensions will be granted by the Council only after finding that the proponent has made progress toward completion of the permit or that some other good cause exists for the extension.

5. **During the Duration of this Project** the proponent shall comply with all conditions of approval issued as part of the Critical Areas Permit for this project, City file CAP2014-01.
6. **During the Duration of this Project** the proponent shall comply with all construction windows and conditions of approval issued as part of the state and federal permits for this project.

7. **During the Duration of this Project** the proponent shall implement an Inadvertent Discovery Policy similar to that articulated by the Cowlitz Indian Tribe during the 2010 SEPA review of this proposal.

12. **During the Duration of this Project** the proponent shall install temporary fencing/screening around the construction site to prevent public visual and physical access to the area. In order to explain the project and temporary blockages, the fencing may include signs on the landward sides of the project. Signs shall be temporary and shall not exceed 50 square feet.

13. **During the Duration of this Project** All fuel and chemicals shall be kept, stored, handled and used in a fashion which assures that there will be no opportunity for entry of such fuel and chemicals into the water.

10. **Prior to Completion of this Project** the proponent shall submit a landscaping and/or screening plan for the future development areas of this project. The plan shall comply with the Restoration regulations of the Shoreline Management Master Program.

14. **Prior to Project Completion** the proponent shall ensure that all construction debris such as fuel and oil containers and barrels and other miscellaneous litter are removed from the shoreline area. No equipment shall be abandoned within the shoreline area.

DATED this _____ day of July, 2017

________________________________________

For the Council,
Frank Cox, Mayor
City of Stevenson
SHORELINES PERMIT APPLICATION
Substantial Development, Timber Cutting, Conditional Uses, Variances

PO Box 371 Stevenson, Washington 98648
Phone: (509)427-5970 Fax: (509)427-8202

Request:
☐ Substantial Development  ☐ Timber Cutting  ☐ Conditional Use  ☐ Variance

Applicant/Contact: Brian Bair
Mailing Address: 181 NE McEvoy Lane
Phone: 360-335-4307
Fax:__
E-Mail Address (Optional): brian@bairllc.com

Property Owner: Port of Skamania
Mailing Address: PO Box 1099 Stevenson, WA 98648
Phone: 509.427.5484 Fax: 509.427.7984

Subject Property Address (Or Nearest Intersection): See Attached
Tax Parcel Number: Multiple, See Attached
Zoning: Commercial and industrial
Name of Affected Waterbody: Columbia River
Shoreline Designation: Type "S" Fish Bearing
Current Use: Water Recreation
Proposed Use: Recreation
Brief Project Summary: The Port of Skamania is proposing to restore and enhance 1,250 feet of Columbia River shoreline. Please see attached for project details.

Water Supply Source: Columbia River
Sewage Disposal Method: NA

As the property owners of the real property described in this proposal, our signatures indicate our approval of this proposal, with the understanding that the proposal is subject to review, approval, and/or denial under SMC 18.04.

I/we hereby provide written authorization for the City to reasonably access to the subject property to examine the proposal and carry out the administrative duties of the Stevenson Municipal Code.

I/we hereby certify any/our awareness that application fees are non-refundable, there is no guarantee that a permit will be issued

Incomplete applications will not be accepted. ● Please ensure that all submittals are included

Signature of Applicant: Brian Bair
Date: 4/25/17

Signature of Property Owner: Director, Port of Skamania
Date: 4/27/17

ShorelinesApplication2C11.docx Page 1 of 3
Shorelines Permit
Submittal Requirements

The following information is required for all Shoreline Permit Applications. Applications without the required information will not be accepted. Site plans are to be submitted on 8½"x11" or 11"x17" paper, and drawn to a standard engineering scale (e.g. 1"=10', 1"=20', 1/4"=1', etc.).

☐ Application Fee (Amount:___________ Date:___________ Receipt #:___________)

☐ Completed and Signed Shorelines Permit Application

☐ Any Associated Land Use and Building Permit Applications

☐ Two (2) Complete Site Plan Proposals—Drawn to scale, showing the proposal site and all adjoining areas within 100 feet, and including the following:
  □ A Vicinity Map
  □ A North Arrow
  □ All property boundary lines and dimensions
  □ The location and width of all public and private roads
  □ The location and size of all existing structures, utility lines, easements, septic tanks and drainfields, wells, and other improvements
  □ The location and extent of all proposed structures and/or uses
  □ The location, species, and diameter of all significant trees
  □ The location and description of all critical areas and buffers

The following information is required for Timber Cutting Permits. Timber cutting permits are related to selective commercial timber cutting where no more than thirty (30) percent of the merchantable timber is harvested, or clear-cutting necessary for the preparation of land for another use.

☐ Timber Cutting Permits
  □ A Report Prepared by a Professional Forester Documenting the Full Amount of Merchantable Timber Existing at the Time of Application, and the Amount of Timber Proposed for Cutting
  □ A Description of Any Topography, Soil Conditions, or Silviculture Practices Necessary for Regeneration that May Render Selective Logging Ecologically Detrimental

The following information is required for Shoreline Conditional Use Permits. Conditional uses are those uses which either do not need a shoreline location or are considered unsuitable for siting within a particular shoreline environment. Such uses must:
- Cause no unreasonable adverse effects on the environment or other uses within the area;
- Not interfere with the public use of public shorelines;
- Have a design that is compatible with the shorelines environment in which it will be located; and
- Not be contrary to the goals, policy statements or general intent of the shoreline environments.

☐ Shoreline Conditional Use Permits
  □ A Narrative Explaining How the Proposal Meets the Four Criteria Above
Shorelines Permit
Submittal Requirements, Continued

The following information is required for Shoreline Variances. Variances deal with specific requirements of the Shoreline Management Master Program and their objective is to grant relief when there are practical difficulties or unnecessary hardship in the way of carrying out the strict letter of the Shoreline Management Master Program. The property owner must show that if forced to comply with the provisions then no reasonable use of the property can be made. The fact that the property owner might make a greater profit by using the property in a manner contrary to the intent of the Shoreline Management Master Program is not a sufficient reason for variance. A variance will be granted only after the applicant can demonstrate the following:

- The hardship which serves as a basis for granting of variance is specifically related to the property of the applicant;
- The hardship results from the application of the requirements of the Act and the Shoreline Management Master Program and not from for example, deed restrictions or the applicant's own actions;
- The variance granted will be in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the Shoreline Management Master Program.
- Public welfare and interest will be preserved. If more harm will be done to the area by granting the variance that would be done to the applicant by denying it, the variance will be denied.

Shoreline Variances

☐ A Narrative Explaining How the Proposal Meets the Four Criteria Above
☐ A Financial Analysis Showing that No Reasonable Use of the Property Can be Made
Stevenson Shoreline Restoration and Enhancement Project

Shoreline Substantial Development Permit Application

By
BAIR L.L.C. and Associates

For
The Port of Skamania

4/25/2017
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Introduction
Washington State's Shoreline Management Act requires local governments to administer permits for substantial developments along shorelines (WAC 173-27-180). The City of Stevenson administers these permits for Skamania County. The Port of Skamania proposes to restore and enhance 1,250 feet of Columbia River shoreline (Attachment A Project Plans, Figure 1). The following report provides the documentation required for the Shoreline Substantial Development Permit Application for the Port of Skamania's Stevenson Shoreline Restoration and Enhancement Project.

Applicant and Property Owner
Port of Skamania County
Pat Albaugh, Executive Director
pat@portofskamania.org
(509) 427-5484

Project Location
The project area is located between points 45.6195 N, 121.8817 W and 45.6930 N, 121.8779 W within the city limits Section 31, T.3N., R.8E. The parcels, ownership and areas bounded within the project area total 17.9 acres and are as follows: Parcel 02070111610000, City of Stevenson, 0.11 Acres and Port of Skamania property parcels 02070111580000, 02070111570000, 02070111560000, 02070111630100, 02070111630000, 0270111620000 02070111540000, 02070110370000, 02750622010000, 02750622050000, 02750622060000 (Figure 2).

The project area is zoned for commercial and industrial. The waterbody associated with the project is the Columbia River, a Type S fish bearing system.

Project Description
The Stevenson Shoreline Restoration and Enhancement Project proposes to arrest 450 feet of severe bank erosion, restore aquatic habitat along 1,250 feet of Columbia River bank and extend the shoreline on average 78 feet to the south. An estimated 35,000 cubic yards of rock and soil would be placed to restore the shoreline and enhance aquatic and riparian habitats. The proposed project restores the footprint of the historic river bank, which expands the riparian area by 2.15 acres (53%).

Existing Vegetation
Vegetation within the project is a mix of native and non-native plant species. Significant trees within the HCA were surveyed, mapped and identified on October 14, 2013 (Figure 3). The native tree species
within the project area are: (Thuja plicata) western red cedar, (Acer macrophyllum) big leaf maple, 
(Pseudotsuga menziesii) Douglas fir, (Populus trichocarpa) black cottonwood (Alnus rubra) red alder, 
(Acer circinatum) vine maple. Non-native tree species within the project area HCA are: (Populus sp.) 
poplar, (Prunus sp.) cherry and (Acer sp.) maple. Poplar was planted for aesthetic improvements and 
quick growing characteristics for the park and hiking trail. Cherry and Maple within the area were likely 
planted by historic residents for aesthetic values. Canopy cover within the project area is currently 0.46 
acres or 11% canopy cover (See Figure 3).

Existing Infrastructure and Developments
Buildings within the project area include a section of a multipurpose industrial building, a restaurant, a 
maintenance building and a residence. The total area of buildings within the project area is 0.35 acres. 
Paved parking area associated with the existing buildings within the project area totals 1.34 acres. In 
addition to the buildings and paved parking areas, a paved accessible recreation trail parallels 829.5 feet 
of the shoreline covering an area of 0.25 acres. Leavens Street, which extends from Cascade Avenue 
south to the shoreline, covers an additional 0.07 acres. Total area and percent area covered by buildings 
and paving within the project are 1.87 acres and 46%, respectively. The remaining 2.19 acres, 54% of 
the project area, are dedicated to water dependent public recreation: The Russell Street Development 
Lot, East Point Kite Board Beach and Leavens Point Park (Figure 4).

Adjacent Land Uses
Land use surrounding the project area includes the following water dependent recreation facilities: the 
Cascade Avenue Small Craft Boat launch (to the east) and the Stevenson Landing large vessel pier at 
Russell Street (to the west). Activities at these facilities include boating, fishing, swimming, windsurfing, 
kiteboarding, hiking, wildlife viewing, historic interpretation and picnicking. Additional adjacent uses 
include a lodge, private residences and a significant railway transportation corridor.

Site Development Plan
For the following discussion please refer to the engineering designs Rock Creek Dredge Mitigation, 
Stevenson Shoreline Enhancement, Port of Skamania, June 2008 (Attachment A).

Access Routes, Borrow, Stockpile and Staging Areas
Construction of access routes and stockpile areas will disturb the minimum amount of vegetation 
practicable. Project access roads on unpaved areas total 412 feet with average widths of 14 feet (5,768 
square feet). To construct the access route approaches four non-native cherry trees will be removed, 
stockpiled and then incorporated into the restoration project. Two Port of Skamania buildings within the 
stockpile areas will be demolished to maximize the stockpile area for the project. These structures may 
be rebuilt in the future. The limits of stockpile areas will be flagged and located on areas occupied by 
grass. Potential stockpile sites will occupy a total area of 0.42 acres. The staging area will be located 
east of Leavens Street on 0.17 acres of the paved parking lot (see Figure 5).
Approximately 35,000 cubic yards of river rock and soil will be needed to restore the shoreline within the project area. Boulders, cobbles, gravel and sand will be imported from the Rock Creek and North Bonneville borrow areas (Figure 6). The Rock Creek borrow areas are located on gravel bars within the active stream channel. Gravel bars will be scalped meaning that the top pavement layer will be excavated, sorted and then hauled to the shoreline restoration project area. The precise quantities of rock salvaged from the gravel bars cannot be determined due to two primary factors:

1) the Rock Creek landslide is an active slide purported to contain over 2,000,000 yards of soil and rock. It is uncertain from year to year and or from rain event to rain event how much material will be delivered downstream to the borrow area sites. In addition, the gravel bar elevations, size and substrate composition varies dramatically due to the magnitude of individual storms and the activity of the slide.

2) The composition of the gravel bars varies from large boulders, cobbles, gravel, sand and clay conglomerates. This composition also varies with precipitation and landslide activity intensity. Because of these factors reasonable rock quantity estimates cannot be made. However the location of the material to the project area will be the most cost efficient haul and is therefore the priority material for shoreline restoration.

East bank access points for the Rock Creek borrow areas are located on North and Southeast sides of the fairground pedestrian bridge. West bank access sites are located on the southern extent of the fairgrounds road/pedestrian path and upstream of the Rock Creek Drive bridge and medical clinic. All access points will be rehabilitated and revegetated with native riparian vegetation.

Material within the Rock Creek borrow areas will be sorted on site with a Grizzly substrate sorter or power screen. Erosion control best management practices will be employed to prevent fine sediment from entering running water. Existing riparian vegetation will be preserved to the maximum extent practicable. Large woody debris with rootwads will be salvaged from the Rock Creek borrow area and used in the boulder-rootwad structures. All disturbed areas will be rehabilitated and contoured to promote natural deposition within Rock Creek. Finished ground elevations will be approximately one foot above the base flow elevation.

The North Bonneville borrow area will be used to supply the remaining material. The North Bonneville borrow area will be excavated in a manner to level the site for future use. Material from North Bonneville borrow will also be sorted on site. Best management erosion control practices will be employed to prevent transport of fine sediment into flowing waters. The site will be mulched and seeded at the completion of the project.

**Construction Sequencing**

Construction will begin by preparing the staging area and pioneering access routes. Sediment curtains will be installed in the Columbia River in 200-foot sections to isolate the work areas, contain fine sediment and turbidity. Boulder cobble fill will initially be imported and placed parallel to the shoreline at an elevation of at least one foot above the existing water level elevation forming the base layer. The base layer boulder and cobble fill will continue in vertical and horizontal lifts until the project fill limit to
the South is achieved. Rootwad - boulder structures will be constructed and incorporated into the base layer. Gravel and fines will then be imported in lifts to fill the interstitial spaces of the boulders and cobble layer. The gravel-fine lifts will continue, sloping north to the upper limits of the project area (top of bank elevation). Gravel will be imported and placed along the toe of the project limits (southern edge) to create a gradual sloping gravel beach. Top soil will then be imported and spread throughout the planting area. Top soil will be applied in lifts with minimum depths of six inches. Top soil will be covered with coir fabric and then planted. Tree survival will be assessed every year for ten years. Dead trees/shrubs will be replaced species specifically. Access routes will be rehabilitated immediately following restoration and then de-compacted, mulched and seeded. Silt fence would be left in place and maintained until green-up the following spring.

Detailed site diagrams, grading and excavation details are provided in Attachment A Project Plans. The contractor will provide an erosion control and spill prevention plan before mobilization to the site.

The specific efforts to avoid and minimize impacts to priority habitats and their buffers will include minimizing buffer area and significant tree disturbance to the maximum extent practicable. All significant trees will be left in place and protected with the exception of four non-native cherry trees within the access corridor. The only foreseeable exception would be in the advent of hazard trees and potential compromise of worker safety (per OSHA).
Habitat Mitigation Plan

The Stevenson Shoreline Restoration and Enhancement Project propose to arrest 450 feet of severe bank erosion and restore aquatic habitat along 1,250 feet of Columbia River bank. The project entails extending the shoreline on average 78 feet to the south. An estimated 18,730 cubic yards of rock and soil would be placed to restore the shoreline and enhance aquatic and riparian habitats. The proposed project restores the footprint of the historic river bank, which expands the riparian area by 2.15 acres (53%).

SMC 18.13.095.E requires riparian buffer widths of 150 feet on the Columbia River a Type S fish bearing system. Base riparian habitat buffers can be reduced by 30% (reduced to 105 feet) through enhancement of degraded buffers. Buffer widths can be further reduced with off-site mitigation. This project proposes to expand the buffer by 2.15 acres by restoration of the shoreline and degraded areas. In addition 2.02 acres of off-site mitigation, vegetation rehabilitation on Slaughter House Point will also be accomplished. Therefore HCA buffer width would be reduced to 50 feet from the North edge of the shoreline restoration project area extending south. The restored shoreline within the buffer will be re-vegetated with native shrubs and grasses at densities of twenty shrubs per 1,000 ft² within the HCA (see Figure).

The HCA buffer and transition zone is near shore riparian and, therefore, replanted with the following native species:

(Salix lucida) Pacific Willow
(Salix scouleriana) Scouler Willow
(Salix fluviatilis) Columbia River Willow
(Cornus sericea) Red csier dogwood
(Rosa pisocarpa) Cluster or Swamp Rose

The restored shoreline above the ordinary pool elevation to the vegetated HCA buffer will be planted with native shrubs and forbs to reduce beach erosion from waves in a manner consistent with water related recreation use. The lower planting limit or stream bank toe upslope to the HCA Buffer will be planted with seasonally submerged hydrophilic shrubs and forbs.

420 (Salix fluviatilis Nutt.) Multnomah Columbia River Willow
Habitat Conservation Area Delineation

The Habitat Conservation stream buffer will have a permanent physical demarcation of logs, a tree or hedgerow, wood or wood-like fencing, which will be approved by the City of Stevenson Planning Department. In addition, a sign (minimum size 1 foot x 1 foot and posted 3.5 feet above grade) worded “WILDLIFE HABITAT BUFFER – PLEASE RETAIN IN A NATURAL STATE” will be posted along the outer perimeter of the habitat buffer.

Off-Site Mitigation - Slaughter House Point

Slaughter House point would be rehabilitated by removal and treatment of invasive plant species. Himalayan black berries will be spot treated, cutting back the above-ground blackberry bramble as close to the ground as possible and then applying glyphosate-based herbicide directly to freshly cut canes. Due to the proximity of the Columbia River, only herbicides containing glyphosate such as Rodeo (Dow) or Aquamaster (Monsanto) with LI-700 surfactant will be used. Herbicide will not be applied within ten feet of the ordinary high water mark; all black berries within ten feet of the stream will be manually extracted, no herbicide will be applied. Black berry eradication will occur at least once a year for five years.

In summary the riparian area will be significantly improved due to the increase in area (2.15 acres, a 53% increase in HCA), increase in riparian canopy cover (1.5 additional acres and a 25% increase), increase in bank stability (450 feet stabilized), removal of 120 feet of sheet pile and rehabilitation of 680 feet of rip-rap river bank. In addition, the three rootwad structures would provide additional aquatic habitat for aquatic organisms.
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Applicant Agent Qualifications

This document was completed by Brian Bair Owner and Projects Director of BAIR L.L.C.

Education

Bachelor of Science, Biology, Montana State University

Certifications

USDA National Construction Certification for engineering related activities in watershed restoration and construction management.

Experience

Brian has worked throughout the Continental United States, Alaska, and Canada on large-scale watershed restoration and rehabilitation projects. Brian’s primary responsibilities for the past 22 years have been to assess, design, and implement watershed and stream corridor rehabilitation projects. Brian has an extensive heavy equipment and project management background.