



PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

GARY R. CHRISTENSEN, AICP, DIRECTOR

BILL DOWE, DEPUTY DIRECTOR

PATTI CHAMBERS
Administrative Coordinator

TIM DEVRIES, CBO
Building Official

MEMORANDUM

To: Skagit County Board of Commissioners
From: Carly Ruacho, Senior Planner
Date: February 8, 2011
Re: Proposed Code Amendments

The Department is completing work on the annual code amendments begun in 2010 and preparing to release a series of code amendments for public review and consideration by the Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners. Most amendments are minor in nature and can be classified as 'house-keeping'. The minor amendments address such things as typographical errors, inadvertent additions or omissions, as well as providing clarity or consistency.

The following list highlights some of the more substantive proposed changes:

- Addition of Net Metering Systems as a new use to allow small solar and wind energy production facilities.
- Addition of Recycling Drop Box Facility as a new use to allow small neighborhood-scale collection of certain recyclables with lesser permitting requirements.
- Addition of Manure Digesters as a new use.
- Inclusion of process and approval criteria for land division extension requests.
- Addition of new provision relating to expiration of applications including a process to bring outstanding, inactive land divisions to finalization.
- Amendments to school siting criteria in the Bayview Ridge UGA to allow schools buildings to exceed current size and height limits placed on other uses.
- New allowance for expansion of existing NRI zoned agricultural support businesses onto Ag-NRL land.
- Limitation of mining exemption for forest road construction/maintenance purposes for consistency with State law.

Attached is a list identifying all the proposed changes and a short description of the effect of each proposed change. The list is comprehensive but purposefully brief and meant to aid decision makers and the public in understanding the proposal at-a-glance. Draft code language is being discussed with various County advisory boards, departments, as well as legal counsel. With your concurrence, the Department will finalize the proposal and proceed through the public review process according to the schedule outlined below.

The processing schedule for the amendments is proposed as follows:

March 4th or 11th	Release Draft Regulations for Public Review
April 5th	Planning Commission Public Hearing
April 19th or May 2nd	Planning Commission Deliberations
May 10th	BoCC Review and Discussion
May 24th	BoCC Possible Adoption

Please feel free to contact me at extension 5582 with any questions you may have.

**Skagit County Code Amendment Concepts
2011 Update**

#	Code Section	Effect of Change	Language Complete	Staff
	14.04.020 Definitions			
1	Accessory use, residential	Add net metering systems	X	JD
2	Adult group care facility	Modify definition	X	JD
3	Agricultural accessory use	Add net metering systems	X	JD
4	Cluster	Clarify meaning of adjacent	X	CR
5	Cluster pod	Clarify meaning of adjacent	X	CR
6	Family	Add language consistent with Washington Fair Housing Policy Act	X	CR
7	Family member, individual	See Family	X	CR
8	Group care facility	Modify definition	X	JD
9	Institutional camps/retreats	Modify definition to combine with retreat	X	CR
10	Interpretive/Information center	Expand to include tourist information center	X	CR
11	Lot size	Exclude tidelands for purposes of calculating acreage	X	CR
12	Manure digester	Add definition for new use	X	JD
13	Meteorological tower	Add definition for new use	X	BD
14	Net metering system	Add definition for new use	X	JD
15	Recycling drop box facility	Add definition for new use	X	JD
16	Short term visitor accommodations	Modify definition to exclude vacation homes	X	CR
17	Solid waste handling facility	Add definition for new use	X	JD
18	Unclassified use	Modify definition for consistency	X	JD
19	Utility development	Modify definition for consistency	X	JD
	14.06 Permit Procedures			
20	.040(4)	Move Administrative Decision to 14.10 Variance		CR
21	.050(1)(a)	Specify both preliminary and final decisions on short plats.	X	JD
22	.080(2)	Clarification regarding pre-application meeting	X	CR
23	.100	Change to address requests for additional information and expiration of applications.	X	JD
24	.105 Expiration and renewal of applications	Add section that limits time to obtain land use or plat approval. Includes direction for processing old applications, process for renewal or extension.	X	JD
25	14.06.150(2)(b)(xiii)	Remove erroneous RCW 36.70B reference	X	CR
26	14.06.210(3)(b)	Clarify exceptions to time limit for final decision	X	JD
	14.08 Legislative			
27	.020(3)	Delete language regarding policy/designation changes for initial subarea plan adoptions	X	CR
28	.090(1)	Remove 'at public meeting set date/time' language	X	CR

**Skagit County Code Amendment Concepts
2011 Update**

#	Code Section	Effect of Change	Language Complete	Staff
29	.090 Review and decision by Board	Add language "If Planning Commission did not forward an official recommendation..."	X	CR
	14.10 Variances			
30		Add Administrative Decisions—Rename		CR
	14.16 Zoning			
31	Various	Amend height exemption for: Meteorological tower; Net metering system, wind;	X	ALL
32		Add new uses: Maintenance, Drainage; Manure digester; Net metering system, solar; Net metering system, wind; Recycling drop box facility ; Repair and maintenance of water lines with an inside diameter of 8 inches or less.	X	ALL
33	.100 RVC	Changes to allowed and special uses	X	CR
34		Add small scale production	X	CR
35		Business/professional offices	X	CR
36	.120 RFS	Changes to allowed and special uses	X	CR
37	.130 SRT	Changes to allowed and special uses	X	CR
38	.140 SSB	Include wholesale nurseries/greenhouses	X	CR
39		Combine (c) and (d) for consistency	X	CR
40	.155 BR-CC	Changes to allowed and special uses	X	CR
41	.155(4)(c)	Modify school siting criteria per BESD request	X	CR
42	.160 NRI	Remove 'farm management services'	X	CR
43		Add natural resource support services	X	CR
44		Business/professional offices	X	CR
45	.170 RMI	Correct typographical error (1)(b)	X	CR
46		Move cell tower use to Administrative permit level	X	CR
47		Delete 'and/or clubhouse facilities' from restaurants	X	CR
48	.175 H-I	Changes to allowed and special uses	X	CR
49	.180 BR-LI	Move cell tower use to Administrative permit level	X	CR
50		Correct outdoor storage uses	X	CR
51		Amend mini storage use for consistency	X	CR
52	.190 BR-HI	Move cell tower use to Administrative permit level	X	CR
53		Correct outdoor storage uses	X	CR
54	.195 URC-I	Business/professional offices	X	CR
55	.195(2)(r)	Correct retail use terminology for consistency	X	CR
56	.200 AVR	Correct outdoor storage uses	X	CR

**Skagit County Code Amendment Concepts
2011 Update**

#	Code Section	Effect of Change	Language Complete	Staff
57	.320 RRv	Remove wine tasting use	X	CR
58		Correct order of uses	X	CR
59		Correct outdoor storage uses	X	CR
60	.330 R	Add ASPU and HE uses	X	CR
61	.340(3)(a)	Correct day care use title for consistency	X	CR
62	.340(4)(f)	Amend school siting criteria for consistency w/.155	X	CR
63	.340(5)(c)	Amend accessory use setback from 15' to 5'	X	CR
64	.400 Ag-NRL	Clarify siting criteria regarding wells	X	CR
65	.400(3)	Correct erroneous reference	X	CR
66	.400(4)	Add new use for NRI business expansions	X	CR
67	.410 IF-NRL	Changes to allowed and special uses	X	CR
68		Move cell tower use to Administrative permit level	X	CR
69	.410(3)(d)	Language edits for consistency in all NRL zones	X	CR
70	.420 SF-NRL	Changes to allowed and special uses	X	CR
71	.420(2)(f)	Language edits for consistency in all NRL zones	X	CR
72	.430 RRc-NRL	Changes to allowed and special uses	X	CR
73	.430(2)(p)	Remove use – redundant with Ag processing Facility	X	CR
74	.430(2)(k) and (4)(d)	Language edits for consistency in all NRL zones	X	CR
75	.430(3)(e) and (k)	Edit reference from .400 to .430 and Ag to resource	X	CR
76	.440(30)(a)	Clarify language regarding mining exemptions	X	CR
77	.440(8)(b)	Correct 'hydrogeologist' terminology	X	CR
78	.450 URP-OS	Changes to allowed and special uses	X	CR
79	.500 OSRSI	Changes to allowed and special uses	X	CR
80	.600	Clarify unclassified use provisions	X	JD
81	.720(12)	Add AVR to the HE permit level	X	CR
82	.72X Renewable Energy	Add renewable energy section. Installment one is wind power as adopted by Whatcom County.		BD
83	.875?	Create noise title notice for all properties regarding Whidbey Naval Air Base		CR
84	.900(1)(b)(v)(E)	Clarify effects allowed on public health	X	CR
	14.18 Land Division			
85	.100	Add new section regarding plat approval expiration	X	JD
86	.310(8)(b)	Include exception for lands lying across County roads	X	CR
87	.320	Clarification regarding cluster requirements	X	CR
	14.20 Master Planned Resort			
88	.030(2)(e)	Correct Interpretive/Information center	X	CR
	14.24 Critical Areas Ordinance			
89	14.24.110	Revisions to for compliance with RCW 76.09.460 & .470	X	CR

**Skagit County Code Amendment Concepts
2011 Update**

#	Code Section	Effect of Change	Language Complete	Staff
	14.40 Open Space			
90	Delete Open Space	Move to Assessors code		RW
	14.42 Accepting Grants of Real Property			
91	Delete	Move to PW code		RW
92	14.42.030(2)	Correct RCW 64 reference	X	CR

Shoreline master programs: Making sense of tough issues

Introduction

To promote a healthy dialogue with the public and our local government partners, the Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology) has crafted this document to help answer an array of tough questions that have come up as we work together to manage Washington's shorelines for future generations. The state Shoreline Management Act, adopted by voters in 1972, ensures that all of us – the public, interest groups, local, state and tribal governments – work together to ensure our shorelines:

- Are kept safe and unpolluted.
- Are developed and managed fairly.
- Give our children and future generations that special “sense of place” we cherish in Washington.

The mechanism for putting new shoreline development regulations and policies in place is called a “shoreline master program.” Many people have questions and concerns about how changes to a local shoreline program might affect their homes, the environment, access to public waters and shorelines, and future development in their community.

With more than 30 updated shoreline master programs now in place, we have some on-the-ground experience regarding many issues people are concerned about – and how cities and counties have dealt with them including:

- Home repair and expansion within shoreline buffers and setbacks.
- The impacts of “no net loss of shoreline ecological functions” requirements.
- Shoreline erosion and potential impacts to property and the shoreline environment.
- Public access requirements and private property.
- Use of scientific information for shoreline master program regulations.

WHY IT MATTERS

Across Washington, about 260 local governments have or soon will be crafting new shoreline development policies and regulations that may affect you.

Many people have raised questions and concerns about how changes to their local “shoreline master program” might affect them, their homes, and future shoreline development in their community.

Ecology and local governments work together to update each shoreline program under an open public process. We want to help address some of the tough issues citizens have raised about shoreline master programs and the updating process.

Contact information

Curt Hart
Communications Manager
Shorelands and Environmental
Assistance Program
(360) 407-6990
curt.hart@ecy.wa.gov

Special accommodations

To ask about the availability of this document in a version for the visually impaired, call the Shorelands and Environmental Assistance Program at 360-407-6600.

Persons with hearing loss, call 711 for Washington Relay Service. Persons with a speech disability, call 877-833-6341.

Newly updated shoreline programs address these issues by recognizing and responding to local conditions and needs while fulfilling the statewide vision for shoreline development, protection, and uses set forth by the people of Washington.

Updating local shoreline master programs

Voters adopted the state Shoreline Management Act (SMA) in 1972. More than 260 Washington towns, cities and counties have marine, lake, and stream shorelines that fall under SMA jurisdiction. The Act requires local governments to regularly review and revise their shoreline regulations and policies. However, most jurisdictions haven't done a thorough update of their shoreline master programs since the 1970s. Many changes have occurred along Washington's lakes, rivers, and marine waters in the last 40 years.

In the late 1990s, the Washington Legislature and Ecology recognized that most local shoreline plans, policies and regulations are a generation out-of-date. These old shoreline master programs need to be modernized, reviewed, and updated to:

- Address current shoreline conditions.
- Apply new scientific information about managing and protecting our shorelines.
- Accommodate future development while protecting the ecological functions of our shorelines.
- Align better with current environmental and land-use laws such as salmon recovery and watershed management plans, state Growth Management Act and critical areas ordinances, port development plans, park and trail systems, etc.

As the result of a 2003 negotiated settlement between Ecology and business interests, ports, environmental groups, shoreline user groups, and cities and counties, Ecology revised its legally-binding guidelines that outline the essential elements each local shoreline master programs must address (www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/sea/SMA/guidelines/index.html).

The 2003 Legislature set up a timetable for all 260 local governments to update their shoreline programs by December 2014. Each shoreline master program then must be reviewed every seven years to ensure it still complies with state law. To help local governments meet the 2014 goal, state lawmakers have provided about \$12 million to towns, cities, and counties to modernize their individual shoreline programs. When Ecology approves a local shoreline master program, it becomes part of the overall statewide shoreline master program.

Shoreline master programs benefits

Shoreline master programs contribute to local and statewide economic vitality by:

- Protecting lives and property by keeping development out of unstable or unsafe areas.
- Helping communities fulfill their vision for future waterfront development and uses in our shoreline areas.
- Providing more certainty to the development community through more consistent shoreline building ordinances and permitting requirements.

- Providing for public access and recreational opportunities in shoreline areas.
- Giving preference to water-dependent uses that rely on shorelines for economic viability.

Master programs also contribute to local and statewide environmental vitality by:

- Helping protect our marine waters, lakes, and stream systems from pollution.
- Protecting the overall health and functions of shorelines and public waters for both public and private use.
- Protecting critical fish and wildlife habitat.
- Restoring unhealthy shorelines and increasing the health of public waters.

Roles and responsibilities: Shoreline master programs

Under the comprehensive shoreline master program update process currently under way, local governments:

- Provide shoreline planning leadership within their jurisdictions and ensure all interests are brought to the table.
- Prepare, adopt, oversee, and enforce their locally-crafted shoreline master programs.
- Send minor and comprehensive shoreline master program updates to Ecology for approval.
- Periodically review and keep their shoreline master programs current.

Under the shoreline program update process, Ecology:

- Provides state guidelines outlining the essential elements that local shoreline master programs must address.
- Provides grants and technical assistance to local governments.
- Reviews and approves local shoreline master programs to confirm consistency with state law and rules.
- Once approved, individual local shoreline master programs become part of the overall state shoreline master program.

Shoreline master programs do not:

- Take away constitutional protections for private property rights.
- Require existing shoreline homes to be relocated.
- Try to return our shorelines to pre-settlement conditions.

Responding to public concerns

A number of issues have come up during efforts to update local shoreline master programs. Here are some responses we hope address these issues of public concern.

Issue 1: Updating a shoreline master program will impact existing homes

A number of shoreline property owners are concerned that updating local shoreline master programs will put their existing home in peril, because their home could be “out-of-compliance” or “non-conforming” under new shoreline regulations.

Important things to know about new shoreline master programs and your existing shoreline home:

- Updated shoreline master programs are not retroactive.
- Existing single-family homes are “grandfathered.” Expansions of existing single-family structures are reviewed on a case-by-case basis.
- Shoreline programs must be designed and put in place so they are consistent with constitutional protections of private property.

Similar to most land-use laws, provisions of new shoreline master programs are not “retroactive.” This means existing homes are not “out of compliance” with new shoreline master program regulations. New regulations only apply to new development and uses. In Washington, residential lots created and homes built under older land use laws are “grandfathered in” under those laws so that new standards do not apply retroactively – if no new development is proposed.

Shoreline homeowners can make improvements, and can enlarge or expand their current homes under most conditions. For instance, Whatcom County updated their shoreline master program in 2008 using Ecology’s new shoreline guidelines. Since then, the county has received more than 20 applications to make improvements to existing homes, including making additions and building garages. Every homeowner’s permit request was approved and issued in a timely manner.

Issue 2: Protecting a house from erosion by armoring the shoreline is no longer allowed

In the past, shoreline erosion threatening a home or business was fought by armoring the shoreline with concrete bulkheads and seawalls, riprap and “revetments” such as sandbags or cement, and other structures designed to harden a shoreline. We now know that hardening a shoreline can endanger neighboring properties and threaten valuable resources, such as salmon, and is best used as a last resort.

The best way to safeguard homes and businesses is to leave enough room between the shoreline and new structures. That way if erosion occurs, it doesn’t threaten those structures. During the past 40 years, we’ve learned that shoreline erosion is much more a process of nature we need to learn to live with. Eroding marine bluffs feed the growth of beaches that protect existing homes. When we try to stop erosion in these places, it robs existing homes of their natural protection. In some cases, armoring pushes the force of waves and water to nearby properties, hastening erosion there. Our approach to managing shoreline erosion needs to be done thoughtfully and carefully.

Important things to know about shoreline armoring and new shoreline master programs:

- Armoring is expensive and may only provide a short-term solution. We need to have a better set of policies and regulations that don't put properties and homes in harm's way.
- Updated shoreline programs are designed to reduce the need for armoring.
- Private property owners can protect their houses or business structures but are asked to use approaches that respect other people's properties and the natural shoreline.

Issue 3: What “no-net-loss of ecological functions” means to homeowners

It's clear that development along our beaches and shorelines can affect their long-term health and prevent people from using and enjoying them. To insure this doesn't happen in the future, new shoreline policies and regulations must meet a standard of “no net loss of ecological functions.”

This means existing shoreline functions should be protected and maintained over time while properly sited shoreline development goes on. This is accomplished by modifying development designs to avoid the loss, or making up for – or “mitigating” – adverse impacts.

The no-net-loss standard doesn't mean that your house needs to be removed. You can continue to live in, maintain and repair your house. The no-net-loss of ecological functions goal helps ensure one person's shoreline development doesn't decrease the overall benefits of our shorelines for everyone – while still allowing development to move forward.

Important things to know about no-net-loss:

- It ensures that the economic and environmental benefits of healthy shorelines are preserved for future generations. The first step is good planning for future land use and development. It does not stop shoreline development. Local governments must review proposed projects during the permitting process to see if they interfere with shoreline ecological functions.
- It does not mean returning to a pre-settlement environment. Today is the starting point for measuring no-net-loss. It is defined by a shoreline inventory and characterization prepared by the town, city, or county updating their shoreline master program – a critical part of any shoreline program update.

Issue 4: Public access to shoreline areas

Some shoreline homeowners are concerned that public access means allowing strangers to cross their property to get to the beach, river or lake. That's not the case. The Shoreline Management Act and Ecology's shoreline guidelines focus on access to public waters from publicly-owned property. Public access may also be required at large private shoreline developments such as hotels, marinas, and mixed-use projects as part of the original design.

Unlike Oregon and some other coastal states, Washington's tidelands and beaches are not all in public ownership. From 1889 statehood until the 1972 Shoreline Management Act was adopted, the state sold off many of its tidelands and beaches. It's estimated that 60-70 percent of our tidelands are privately owned. According to data from Ecology's Marine Shoreline Public Access Project, only 37 percent of all of Washington's marine shorelines – including those in Puget Sound and our coastal shores – are publicly accessible. This doesn't include information about public access to any freshwater water bodies such as lakes and streams.

Important things you should know about public access to public waters and shorelines:

- State waters – Washington's lakes, streams, rivers, Puget Sound, Pacific Ocean – belong to us all. We have a right to boat, swim, and fish in these waters and enjoy their associated public shorelines.
- The people of Washington want to see, touch and enjoy the shorelines of the state. They embodied this desire in the 1972 voter-approved Shoreline Management Act (SMA).
- One of the primary goals of the SMA is to protect the public's right to access public waters and shorelines.
- They help ensure that both the public's right to access and private property rights are respected. Local shoreline programs help communities plan the best locations for public access to public waters and shorelines.

Issue 5: What shoreline buffers and setbacks mean to homeowners

Shoreline property owners have voiced concern about new buffer and setback standards under updated shoreline master programs. Some worry they will have to tear out existing landscaping or their garden, or lose waterfront views because they'll be forbidden from pruning their trees and shrubs. Ecology has adopted more than 30 shoreline programs under the 2003 guidelines. All have included allowances for tree trimming and maintaining natural views, as well as provisions for accessing the water. New shoreline master programs do not require homeowners to remove their existing landscaping.

Buffers are intended to protect homes from erosion, filter polluted run-off, provide shade, and protect other ecological functions. They protect our water quality by helping filter out toxic and other pollutants in stormwater runoff, help stabilize slopes, and provide organic material to both the land and water food webs. Buffers also provide shade and habitat for critical fish and wildlife species.

Shoreline setbacks are the minimum distance between a structure and the shoreline, or the structure and the buffer. They are not retroactive so they won't affect existing homes. Setbacks keep new homes and developments out of harm's way and prevent the future need for shoreline armoring. Setting a new home back from the shoreline in a low bank area can reduce the need for armoring when sea levels rise over time or unusual floods come. Setbacks also keep homes from being built too close to the water's edge, making our residences safer and less expensive to maintain.

Important things you should know about shoreline buffers and setbacks:

- Shoreline master programs do not necessarily set rigid “one-size-fits-all” standards. Buffer and setback sizes can be tailored based on environmental conditions, current development patterns, and future planned development.
- Buffers and setbacks help protect environmental and economically important shoreline resources.
- Shoreline buffers and setbacks offer opportunities for unique landscaping, screen nearby developments from view, and block noise and glare from adjacent properties and water-based activities.

Issue 6: Science and shoreline master program updates

It’s important to remember that at the core, shoreline master programs are a planning process informed by community input, science and many other factors. It is not a process driven solely by science.

In some areas, shoreline homeowners have questioned whether Ecology uses credible science to help local jurisdictions update their shoreline master programs. On the surface, it may be difficult to assess the quality of the methods and statistics reported in a document. Technical documents that Ecology uses include a clear description of the methods used and undergo a rigorous review by reputable experts in the field. This ensures that proper scientific methods, research procedures, and review protocols were used.

Local experience and anecdotal evidence provided by interested parties also may offer valuable information to supplement scientific information. However, nonscientific information can’t substitute for valid, available scientific information. Local governments should carefully and objectively review the relative merits of all information.

Ecology’s 2003 shoreline master program guidelines require local governments to “make use of and, where applicable, incorporate all available scientific information.” This includes reports, documents and materials such as inventory, monitoring, research and survey data, technical assistance materials, mathematical and computer modeling, manuals and services from reliable scientific sources, and aerial photography.

Important things you should know about scientific information:

- Local governments and Ecology use science to inform the policies and regulations that protect and restore shorelines. Scientific information based on reputable methods and reviewed by scientists from the same fields of study, logical conclusions and reasonable deductions, context, and references is considered the most credible.
- Ecology and local governments also consider residents’ knowledge about our shorelines to be valuable.

Focus on Shorelines

- A document that contains a lot of numbers and statistics is not always based on credible science. Technical documents should always include a clear description of the methods used and undergo a rigorous review by other experts in the field. This ensures proper scientific methods, research procedures, and review protocols were used.

For more information

Shoreline Master Programs

<http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/sea/shorelines/smp/index.html>

Citizen Guide to Shoreline Master Programs

<http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/sea/shorelines/smp/citizen.html>

Shoreline Management Data and Information

<http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/sea/sma/data/index.html>



PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

GARY R. CHRISTENSEN, AICP, DIRECTOR

BILL DOWE, DEPUTY DIRECTOR

PATTI CHAMBERS
Administrative Coordinator

TIM DEVRIES, CBO
Building Official

Memorandum

To: Skagit County Planning Commission Members

From: Betsy Stevenson, AICP, Team Supervisor *BDS*

Date: February 22, 2011

Re: Skagit County Shoreline Management Master Program Update

Please find included in your packet for the March 1, 2011 meeting some background information on the SMP Update:

- Ecology Focus Sheet
- SMP Update Planning Process
- SMP Update Planning Process Chart

Now that we have our grant signed, we have started work on the update. Although it will take several years to complete the process and have a draft document for your review, it is important that you be kept informed and also that we receive your feedback and thoughts throughout the process.

There will also be a Power Point presentation, which I can provide to you at the meeting. This is the first of many discussions to brief you on our progress and accept your comments. I look forward to working closely with you throughout the process.

If you have any questions or comments, please feel free to contact me at (360) 336-9410 ext 5879 or betsyds@co.skagit.wa.us.

Planning Process

The following phases and tasks are aligned with the [shoreline master program planning process chart](#) provided to you with your [grant](#). Each task page contains information to help guide you through your grant phases, such as rule and law citations, handbook chapters, technical documents, and local examples.

- **Phase 1:** Preliminary Shoreline Jurisdiction and Public Participation Plan
 - Task 1.1: [Identify preliminary shoreline jurisdiction](#)
 - Task 1.2: [Develop public participation plan](#)
 - Task 1.3: [Demonstrate how Phase 1 complies with Guidelines](#)
- **Phase 2:** Shoreline Inventory, Analysis and Characterization
 - Task 2.1: [Complete shoreline inventory](#)
 - Task 2.2: [Conduct shoreline analysis](#)
 - Task 2.2.1: [Characterize ecosystem-wide processes](#)
 - Task 2.2.2: [Characterize shoreline functions](#)
 - Task 2.2.3: [Conduct shoreline use analysis and identify public access opportunities](#)
 - Task 2.3: [Prepare inventory and characterization report](#)
 - Task 2.4: [Demonstrate how Phase 2 complies with Guidelines](#)
- **Phase 3:** Environment Designation, Policy and Regulation Development, Cumulative Impacts Analysis
 - Task 3.1: [Conduct community visioning process](#)
 - Task 3.2: [General goals, policies, and regulations](#)
 - Task 3.3: [Develop environment designations](#)
 - Task 3.4: [Develop policies, regulations and standards for shoreline uses and modifications](#)
 - Task 3.5: [Develop administrative provisions](#)
 - Task 3.6: [Prepare cumulative impact analysis](#)
 - Task 3.7: [Demonstrate how Phase 3 complies with Guidelines](#)
- **Phase 4:** Restoration Plan, Revisit Phase 3 products
 - Task 4.1: [Prepare restoration plan](#)
 - Task 4.2: [Revisit draft environment designations, policies, and regulations and finalize maps](#)
 - Task 4.3: [Demonstate how no net loss \(NNL\) is achieved](#)
 - Task 4.4: [Demonstrate how Phase 4 complies with Guidelines](#)
- **Phase 5:** [Local Approval](#)
- **Phase 6:** [State Approval](#)

FIGURE 1: SHORELINE MASTER PROGRAM PLANNING PROCESS

7/13/09

SMP UPDATE PROCESS	SPECIFIC PLANNING TASKS	PRODUCTS
Phase 1: Preliminary Shoreline Jurisdiction and Public Participation Plan	Task 1.1: Identify preliminary shoreline jurisdiction - shorelines & shorelands Task 1.2: Develop public participation plan (citizen, technical, Ecology, other stakeholders) Task 1.3 Demonstrate how Phase 1 complies with Guidelines	Product 1.1: Preliminary map of local shorelines & shorelands subject to the SMP Product 1.2: Public participation plan Product 1.3 Documentation in SMP submittal checklist
Phase 2: Shoreline Inventory & Shoreline Analysis & Characterization	Task 2.1: Complete shoreline inventory Task 2.2 Conduct shoreline analysis Task 2.2.1: Characterize ecosystem-wide processes Task 2.2.2: Characterize shoreline functions Task 2.2.3: Conduct shoreline use analysis, analyze public access opportunities Task 2.3: Prepare shoreline inventory and characterization report Task 2.4: Demonstrate how Phase 2 complies with Guidelines	Product 2.1: Draft list of inventory data sources, digital maps of inventory information Product 2.3: Shoreline inventory and characterization report with, map portfolio & GIS data, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Characterization of ecosystem-wide processes • Characterization of shoreline functions • Identification of potential protection and restoration areas • Shoreline use & public access analyses • Shoreline management recommendations Product 2.4: Documentation in SMP submittal checklist
Phase 3: Shoreline Environment Designation, Policy & Regulation Development; Cumulative Impacts Analysis	Task 3.1: Conduct community visioning process Task 3.2: Develop general goals, policies & regulations Task 3.3: Develop environment designations Task 3.4: Develop shoreline use & modifications policies, regulations & standards Task 3.5: Develop administrative provisions Task 3.6: Prepare preliminary cumulative impacts analysis Task 3.7: Demonstrate how Phase 3 complies with the Guidelines	Product 3.1: Shoreline management strategy Product 3.2-3.5: Complete Draft SMP, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft general goals, policies & regulations • Draft environment designations • Draft shoreline use & modifications policies, regulations & standards • Draft administrative provisions Product 3.6: Preliminary cumulative impacts analysis Product 3.7: Documentation in SMP submittal checklist
Phase 4: Restoration Plan; Revisiting Phase 3 Products as Necessary	Task 4.1: Prepare restoration plan Task 4.2: Revisit environment designations, policies and regulations; finalize jurisdiction maps Task 4.3: Demonstrate how NNL is achieved Task 4.4: Demonstrate how Phase 4 complies with Guidelines	Product 4.1: Restoration plan Product 4.2 Revised SMP, cumulative impacts analysis & jurisdiction maps Product 4.3 No net loss report Product 4.4: Documentation in SMP submittal checklist
Phase 5: Local Approval	Task 5.1: Assemble complete draft SMP and submit to Ecology for informal review Task 5.2: Complete SEPA review, documentation Task 5.3: Provide GMA 60-day notice of intent to adopt Task 5.4: Hold public hearing Task 5.5: Prepare responsiveness summary and respond to public comments Task 5.6: Adopt SMP and submit to Ecology Task 5.7: Demonstrate how Phase 5 complies with Guidelines	Product 5.1: Final draft SMP Product 5.2: SEPA products (checklist, MDNS/EIS; SEPA notice) Product 5.3: Evidence of compliance with GMA notice requirements Product 5.4: Public hearing record Product 5.5: Responsiveness summary Product 5.6: Complete SMP submittal package Product 5.7: Documentation in SMP submittal checklist
Phase 6: State Approval	Task 6.1: Provide public notice & opportunity for comment; respond to comments received Task 6.2: Prepare decision packet including findings & conclusions, transmittal letter, conditions of approval (if any), & responsiveness summary Task 6.3: Work with local government to finalize local adoption	Product 6.1: Responsiveness summary Product 6.2: Decision package submitted to local government Product 6.3: Final SMP adoption incorporating any Ecology conditions of approval; SMP takes effect