

# Tracking Shoreline Development and the 8-Year SMP Review Cycle

*RCW 90.58.080(4)(a)*

- *Following comprehensive update, local governments shall conduct a review of their master programs at least once every eight years and if necessary, revise their master programs... to assure:*
  - *that the master program complies with applicable law and guidelines in effect at the time of the review, and*
  - *Consistency with the local government's comprehensive plan and development regulations adopted under the GMA, and other local requirements.*

# 8-Year SMP reviews - When due?

RCW 90.58.080(4)(b)

For counties and cities within, reviews are to be completed, by:

- *June 30, 2019: King, Pierce, and Snohomish*
- *June 30, 2020: Clallam, Clark, Island, Jefferson, Kitsap, Mason, San Juan, Skagit, Thurston, and Whatcom*
- *June 30, 2021: Benton, Chelan, Cowlitz, Douglas, Grant, Kittitas, Lewis, Skamania, Spokane, and Yakima*
- *June 30 2022: Adams, Asotin, Columbia, Ferry, Franklin, Garfield, Grays Harbor, Klickitat, Lincoln, Okanogan, Pacific, Pend Oreille, Stevens, Wahkiakum, Walla Walla, and Whitman*
- *“...and every eight years thereafter.”*

# Documenting local project review actions and changing conditions

WAC 173-26-201(2)(b)

- *Effective shoreline management requires the evaluation of changing conditions and the modification of policies and regulations to address identified trends and new information*
- *Local governments should monitor actions taken to implement master programs and shoreline conditions and update SMP provisions to improve shoreline management over time*

# Documenting local actions (Continued)

WAC 173-26-191(2)(a)(iii)(D)

- *SMPs shall include a mechanism for documenting all project review actions in shoreline areas and identify a process for periodically evaluating the cumulative effects of authorized development on shoreline conditions.*
- *This process could involve a joint effort by local governments, state resource agencies, affected Indian tribes, and other parties.*

# Issaquah SMP example...

## *Cumulative Effects of Shoreline Development*

- A. The city will periodically evaluate the effectiveness of the Shoreline Master Program update at achieving no net loss of shoreline ecological functions with respect to shoreline permitting and exemptions. An existing database shall be used to track shoreline development*
- B. The Shoreline Administrator will...coordinate with other city departments or restoration partners, as well as adjacent jurisdictions, to assess cumulative effects of shoreline development*
- C. The City shall use shoreline development tracking information to prepare a SMP effectiveness evaluation report every eight years to comply with SMA requirements*

# Spokane County SMP example:

## 9.1 Shoreline Management Program Periodic Review and Revision

*The Spokane County SMP shall be considered a continuing program subject to periodic review and revision...*

## 9.2 Program Monitoring - Review of Permits and Annual Reports

*...the Director shall prepare a report of shoreline development permits, conditional permits and variances including exempt activity...in a statistical and geographical summary...*

*The report will include recommendations to improve policies and procedures for shoreline protection and restoration... and consider...*

*monitoring reports, on-site analysis of selected sites and review of administrative techniques.... Site characteristics to be reviewed include habitat complexity, canopy coverage, water temperature, habitat diversity, properly functioning condition, shoreline stability, vegetation species and extent of coverage*

# When the time comes, how will 8-year SMP reviews be conducted?

- Shoreline management is a “partnership”. Local governments and Ecology are in this together.
- What can each partner bring to the table?
  - What shoreline development data is locally collected?
  - How will impacts of authorized development be assessed?
- Upon review, what if the conclusions of local government and Ecology differ?

# 8 Year SMP Reviews – No specific guidance currently exists...

- How should SMP updates currently underway be prepared to better track local project review actions?
- How will one know when SMP revisions are necessary?
- What form will local “reviews” take?
  - a locally prepared analysis and report, or
  - a review checklist prepared by Ecology and completed by local government

# How should we proceed?

- Survey local governments?
- Create a “working group” to refine what’s expected of both locals and the state?
  - Who should be included?
- Ecology drafts guidance for review and comment.
- Seek funding?
- Other suggestions?