



























**Chapter 6 Shorelines**  
2/2/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	
S-768 King County shall ensure that shoreline modifications individually and cumulatively do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological processes and functions. <del>((In order to))</del> To achieve this goal, King County shall give preference to those types of shoreline modifications that have a lesser impact on the shoreline and by requiring mitigation of identified impacts resulting from shoreline modifications.	Technical change	Grammar	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>
S-771 King County shall require shoreline stabilization to be consistent with Washington Administrative Code 173-26-221 <del>((5))</del> for vegetation retention and <del>((Washington Administrative Code 173-26-221(2) for))</del> protection of critical areas.	Clarification of existing policy intent	Raised RCW reference up a level for more timelessness to help ensure accuracy over the next 10 years, with edits for grammar and corrections	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>
S-773 King County may allow construction of new or replaced structural shoreline stabilization and flood control works to protect an existing structure if King County determines there is a documented need, including a geotechnical analysis that the structure is in danger from shoreline erosion caused by tidal action, currents, or waves.	Clarification of existing policy intent					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This policy could be consolidated into S-774, S-779, and S-780.</li> </ul>
S-774 Shoreline stabilization shall be allowed only when: a. Necessary to protect existing primary structures at imminent risk; b. No lower-impact alternative exists, including relocation or reconstruction of the structure; c. When impacts are mitigated to ensure no net loss of shoreline ecological processes and functions; and d. Stabilization measures are in conformance with Washington Administrative Code 173-26-231.	Clarification of existing policy intent	S-774 and S-744a consolidates S-626, S-627, S-752, S-775, and S-776 for clarity, to align with existing practice and consistency with other stabilization policies and state guidance	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This policy is intended to cover shoreline stabilization for new and existing development. However, sub a. states that protection of an existing primary structure is required. This policy could be revised to be clearer on which situation this policy applies to.</li> </ul>
S-774a King County shall require: a. <del>((#))</del> New shoreline development to be located and designed, as well as the creation of new subdivisions and short subdivisions, to avoid the need for future structural slope or shoreline stabilization <del>((to the maximum extent practicable)); and</del> b. New development to be set back from steep or eroding slopes so that structural slope or shoreline stabilization is not needed for the life of the development.	Clarification of existing policy intent	S-774 and S-744a consolidates S-626, S-627, S-752, S-775, and S-776 for clarity, to align with existing practice and consistency with other stabilization policies and state guidance	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This policy could be revised to include language from state law and the KCCP lead-in text, which discusses how new development should, on principle, avoid the construction of shoreline stabilization unless no other options are available.</li> </ul>
<del>((S-775 King County shall require that lots in new subdivisions and short subdivisions to be created so that shoreline stabilization will not be necessary in order for reasonable development to occur, using geotechnical analysis of the site and shoreline characteristics.))</del>	Clarification of existing policy intent	Consolidated in S-774 and S-774a	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>
S-776 King County shall require new development on steep slopes or bluffs to be set back sufficiently to ensure that shoreline stabilization is unlikely to be necessary during the life of the structure, as demonstrated by a geotechnical analysis.)	Clarification of existing policy intent	Consolidated in S-774 and S-774a	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>

Chapter 6 Shorelines  
2/2/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
<p><del>((S-778 King County should notify all prospective developers of new development along Vashon-Maury Island that their development may be impacted by sea level rise and should encourage all such new development to be set back a sufficient distance to avoid the need for shoreline protection during the expected life of the development.))</del></p>	<p>Clarification of existing policy intent</p>	<p>This policy is not needed. 1) it overlaps with policies and actions in the Vashon-Maury Island subarea plan. 2) it's mandated by code in K.C.C. 21A.25.170.M.</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>
<p>S-779 King County shall require the use of soft methods of shoreline stabilization to the maximum extent practicable. King County shall allow new <u>and replacement</u> hard structural stabilization measures only as follows:</p> <p>a. To protect existing nonwater-dependent development and structures, including single(<del>-family residences</del>) <u>detached homes</u>, if:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The erosion is not the result of upland conditions, such as the loss of vegetation and drainage;</li> <li>Nonstructural measures, such as locating the development further from the shoreline, planting vegetation, or installing on-site drainage improvements, are not feasible or not sufficient;</li> <li>The need to protect primary structures from <u>imminent risk of damage</u> due to erosion is demonstrated through a geotechnical report submitted by a qualified specialist. The damage must be caused by natural processes, such as tidal action, currents, and waves; and</li> <li>Mitigation is provided such that the erosion control structure will not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological processes and functions.</li> </ol> <p>b. To protect water-dependent development if:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The erosion is not the result of upland conditions, such as the loss of vegetation and drainage;</li> <li>Nonstructural measures, planting vegetation or installing on-site drainage improvements are not feasible or not sufficient;</li> <li>The need to protect primary structures from damage due to erosion is demonstrated through a geotechnical report submitted by a qualified specialist; and</li> <li>The erosion control structure will not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological processes and functions.</li> </ol> <p>c. To protect shoreline restoration projects or hazardous substance remediation projects pursuant to <u>Chapter 70A.305 Revised Code of Washington</u> (<del>(Chapter 70.105D)</del>) if:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nonstructural measures, planting vegetation or installing on-site drainage improvements are not feasible or not sufficient; and</li> <li>The erosion control structure will not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological processes and functions.</li> </ol>	<p>Clarification of existing policy intent</p>	<p>To align with state requirements/guidance and current practice.</p> <p>Added language in sub-a.3 to reflect current practice, clarifying that nonwater-dependent structures can only use structural shoreline stabilization to protect them from imminent risk, not any theoretical risk</p> <p>Other edits for current terminology, corrections, and grammar</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This policy covers three different instances where shoreline stabilization could be allowed. This policy could be broken into three policies addressing protection of existing structures, new nonwater-dependent development, water-dependent development, and restoration projects.</li> </ul>
<p>S-780 An existing shoreline stabilization structure may be replaced (<del>(with a similar structure if)</del>), <u>provided that the least impactful stabilization measure is used and</u> there is a demonstrated need to protect principal uses or structures from erosion caused by currents, tidal action, or waves.</p>	<p>Clarification of existing policy intent</p>	<p>To align with state requirements/guidance and current practice</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This policy could be revised to include more parameters such as where the replacement structure could be located, if the existing structure could be removed, and size limits of the new structure.</li> </ul>

**Chapter 6 Shorelines**  
2/2/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
S-781 King County shall require replaced shoreline protection structures to be designed, located, sized, and constructed to assure no net loss of shoreline ecological processes and functions.	Policy staff flag					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This policy could be combined with Policy S-781.</li> </ul>
S-784 King County shall <del>((encourage))</del> require the use soft shoreline stabilization measures that use placement or growth of natural materials that closely resemble natural scales and configurations, <u>or other soft stabilization measures where appropriate,</u> and that provide restoration of shoreline ecological processes and functions waterward of the ordinary high-water mark.	Clarification of existing policy intent	To align with state requirements/guidance and current practice	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Planned implementation of proposal:</u> n/a</li> <li><u>Description of proposed regulations:</u> n/a</li> <li><u>Anticipated resource need:</u> n/a</li> <li><u>Anticipated timeline:</u> n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>
<del>S-786 ((When shoreline stabilization is proposed, King County shall require a geotechnical report to address the need to prevent potential damage to a primary structure. The report shall estimate time frames and rates of erosion and the urgency associated with the specific situation. King County should not allow hard armoring solutions, unless a geotechnical report confirms that there is a significant possibility that the structure will be damaged within three years as a result of shoreline erosion in the absence of such hard armoring measures, or where waiting until the need is immediate would foreclose the opportunity to use measures that avoid impacts on shoreline ecological processes and functions. If the geotechnical report confirms a need to prevent potential damage to a primary structure, but the need is not as immediate as the three years, the report may still be used to justify more immediate authorization to protect against erosion using soft measures.))</del> <u>When shoreline stabilization is proposed, King County shall ensure that the stabilization method used is the least ecologically impactful, technically feasible option.</u>	Clarification of existing policy intent	To reflect existing practice.	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Planned implementation of proposal:</u> n/a</li> <li><u>Description of proposed regulations:</u> n/a</li> <li><u>Anticipated resource need:</u> n/a</li> <li><u>Anticipated timeline:</u> n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This revised policy language could be consolidated with S-788, as this policy also covers what must be demonstrated in order to allow shoreline stabilization.</li> </ul>
S-788 If structural shoreline stabilization measures are demonstrated to be necessary, King County shall: <del>((1-))</del> a. Limit the size of stabilization measures to the minimum necessary; <del>((2-))</del> b. Require the use of measures designed to assure no net loss of shoreline ecological processes and functions; <u>and</u> <del>((3-))</del> c. Require the use of soft approaches, unless they are demonstrated not to be sufficient to protect primary structures, dwellings, and businesses.	Technical change	Updated to standard Comprehensive Plan numbering	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Planned implementation of proposal:</u> n/a</li> <li><u>Description of proposed regulations:</u> n/a</li> <li><u>Anticipated resource need:</u> n/a</li> <li><u>Anticipated timeline:</u> n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This revised policy language in S-786 could be consolidated with this policy, as this policy also covers what must be demonstrated in order to allow shoreline stabilization..</li> </ul>
S-793 King County shall allow new piers and docks only for water-dependent uses or public access. If it is designed and intended as a facility for access to watercraft, a dock associated with a single <del>((family residence))</del> <u>detached home</u> is considered a water-dependent use. As an alternative to individual private moorage for residential development: mooring buoys are preferred over floats or docks and shared moorage facilities are preferred over single use moorage, where feasible or where water use conflicts exist or are predictable.	Technical change	Current terminology	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Planned implementation of proposal:</u> n/a</li> <li><u>Description of proposed regulations:</u> n/a</li> <li><u>Anticipated resource need:</u> n/a</li> <li><u>Anticipated timeline:</u> n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policies S-793 and S-796 concerns new piers and docks. These policies could be consolidated and clarified to distinguish between single-family development and non-single-family development.</li> </ul>
S-796 King County shall allow new pier or dock construction, excluding docks accessory to single <del>((family residences))</del> <u>single detached homes,</u> only when the applicant has demonstrated that a specific need exists to support the intended water-dependent uses.	Technical change	Current terminology	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Planned implementation of proposal:</u> n/a</li> <li><u>Description of proposed regulations:</u> n/a</li> <li><u>Anticipated resource need:</u> n/a</li> <li><u>Anticipated timeline:</u> n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policies S-793 and S-796 concerns new piers and docks. These policies could be consolidated and clarified to distinguish between single-family development and non-single-family development.</li> </ul>

Chapter 6 Shorelines

2/2/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
S-798 King County shall require piers and docks, including those accessory to single( <del>family residences</del> ) detached homes, to be designed and constructed to avoid and then minimize and mitigate the impacts to shoreline ecological processes and functions. King County shall ( <del>require piers and docks to be constructed of non-toxic materials. Where toxic materials, such as treated wood, are proposed, the proponent must show that no non-toxic alternative exists</del> ) prohibit the use of creosote or pentachlorophenol pilings.	Clarification of existing policy intent	To align with state law requirements, in response to comments from Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife and consistent with existing King County Code  Other changes to reflect current terminology	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>"Single detached" is not the terminology used in the Shoreline Management Act. References to "single detached residential uses" could be changed back to "single-family residential uses" or clarified elsewhere in this chapter.</li> </ul>
S-800 King County shall allow fill waterward of the ordinary high-water mark only when necessary to support: <del>((1-))</del> a. Water-dependent use; <del>((2-))</del> b. Public access; <del>((3-))</del> c. Cleanup and disposal of contaminated sediments as part of an interagency environmental clean-up plan; <del>((4-))</del> d. Disposal of dredged material considered suitable under, and conducted in accordance with, the dredged material management program of the Washington Department of Natural Resources; <del>((5-))</del> e. Expansion or alteration of transportation facilities of statewide significance currently located on the shoreline and then only upon a demonstration that alternatives to fill are not feasible; <del>((6-))</del> f. Mitigation actions, environmental restoration, beach nourishment, enhancement projects; or <del>((7-))</del> g. Flood risk reduction projects implemented consistent with the goals, policies and objectives of the King County Flood Hazard Management Plan where no reasonable alternative exists.	Technical change	Updated to standard Comprehensive Plan numbering and grammar	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>
S-805 Breakwaters, jetties, groins, and weirs shall be designed to protect critical areas and shall provide for mitigation according to the sequence in policy S-616 and defined in Washington Administrative Code 173-26-201 ( <del>((2)(e))</del> ).	Clarification of existing policy intent	Raised RCW reference up a level for more timelessness to help ensure accuracy over the next 10 years, with edits for grammar and corrections	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>
S-809 King County shall not allow disposal of dredge material on shorelands and in side channels within a river's channel migration zone. King County shall not allow disposal of dredge material in wetlands located within the shoreline jurisdiction. In the limited instances where it is allowed, such disposal shall require a shoreline conditional use permit.	Policy staff flag					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This policy internally conflicts. The language could be changed to reflect that disposal of dredge material is allowed only through a shoreline conditional use permit.</li> </ul>
S-810 King County shall require dredging to be conducted consistent with Policy RCM-3 of the <del>((2006))</del> King County Flood Hazard Management Plan, or successor policies or plans.	Clarification of existing policy intent	Updates for more timelessness to help ensure accuracy over the next 10 years	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>
S-901 <del>If the Department of Ecology recommends changes to any elements of the King County Shoreline Master Program, King County reserves the right to submit an alternate proposal to the Department for its review and approval.</del>	Clarification of existing policy intent	Redundant to state law; not necessary for Comprehensive Plan to state.	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>

**Chapter 6 Shorelines**

2/2/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
<p><del>S-902— If the Department of Ecology rejects part or all of King County's Shoreline Master Program, or if the Department of Ecology recommends changes that are unacceptable to King County, King County reserves the right to appeal the Department's decision to the Shoreline Management Hearings Board.</del></p>	<p>Clarification of existing policy intent</p>	<p>Redundant to state law; not necessary for Comprehensive Plan to state.</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>
<p><del>S-903— Upon receipt of the letter from the Department of Ecology approving the King County Shoreline Master Program or any amendments to the Shoreline Master Program, King County will promptly post on its web site a notice that the Department of Ecology has taken final action and approved the Shoreline Master Program or SMP amendments. The notice will indicate the effective date.</del></p>	<p>Clarification of existing policy intent</p>	<p>Redundant to state law; not necessary for Comprehensive Plan to state.</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>
<p>S-904 Nothing in the King County Shoreline Master Program nor in any action taken under the Shoreline Master Program shall be construed to affect any <u>Indian</u> treaty right to which the United States is a party.</p>	<p>Technical change</p>	<p>Current terminology</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>