

SHORELINE MASTER PROGRAM PERIODIC REVIEW

Periodic Review Checklist: 2021 version

This document is intended for use by counties, cities and towns subject to the Shoreline Management Act (SMA) to conduct the “periodic review” of their Shoreline Master Programs (SMPs). The review is required under the SMA at [RCW 90.58.080\(4\)](#). Ecology rules that define the procedures for conducting these reviews include a requirement to use this checklist to ensure a successful review ([WAC 173-26-090](#)). By filling out this checklist, the local government is demonstrating compliance with the minimum scope of review requirements of WAC 173-26-090(2)(d)(ii). The checklist is organized into two parts.

Part One is used to identify how the SMP complies with current state laws, rules and guidance. This checklist identifies amendments to state law, rules and applicable updated guidance adopted between 2007 and 2021 that may trigger the need for local SMP amendments.

Part Two is used to document local review to ensure the SMP is consistent with changes to the local comprehensive plans or development regulations, and to consider changes in local circumstances, new information or improved data. As part of this periodic review the local government should include consideration of whether or not the changes warrant an SMP amendment.

How to use this checklist

See the associated *Periodic Review Checklist Guidance* for a description of each item, relevant links, review considerations, and example language.

Use the **review column** to document review considerations and determine if local amendments are needed to maintain compliance. See WAC 173-26-090(3)(b). Ecology recommends reviewing all items on the checklist.

Use the **action column** as a final summary identifying your final action taken to address the identified change in state law, rule or guidance. See WAC 173-26-090(3)(d)(ii)(D), and WAC 173-26-110(9)(b). This will likely include one of the following:

- Amendment proposed (include code citation);
- No amendment needed; or
- Not applicable.

Example

Row	Summary of change	Review	Action
2017a	OFM adjusted the cost threshold for substantial development to \$7,047.	21A.25.290B refers to the statutory thresholds, as amended by OFM.	No amendments needed.

For more information

Coordinate with [Ecology regional planner](#) for more information on how to use this checklist and conduct the periodic review.

Prepared By	Jurisdiction	Date
John Kliem, CCS Inc.	City of Long Beach	09-27-21

Part One: State laws, rules and guidance review

Part One is used to demonstrate compliance with WAC 173-26-090(2)(d)(i)(A). This checklist identifies amendments to state law, rules and applicable updated guidance adopted between 2007 and 2021 that may trigger the need for local SMP amendments during periodic reviews.*

Row	Summary of change	Review	Action
2021			
a.	The Legislature amended floating on-water residences provisions	There are no floating on-water residences in shoreline jurisdiction.	No amendment needed.
b.	The Legislature clarified the permit exemption for fish passage projects	Amendment to list of Statutory Exemptions, Section 6.1.1.19	
2019			
a.	OFM adjusted the cost threshold for building freshwater docks	There are no freshwater waterbodies within shoreline jurisdiction to site a dock.	No amendment needed.
2017			
a.	OFM adjusted the cost threshold for substantial development to \$7,047.	Amendments to definition of "substantial development," Section 8 and Section 6.1.1, Statutory Exemptions.	
b.	Ecology permit rules clarified the definition of "development" does not include dismantling or removing structures.	Amendments to definition of "substantial development," Section 8	
c.	Ecology adopted rules clarifying exceptions to local review under the SMA.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Remedial actions already included under 6.1.1.13 2. Boating facilities are prohibited uses in the city (Table 5-1) 3. Environmental excellence exemption added under 6.1.1.17 4. Energy Facility Site Evaluation exemption added under 6.1.1.18 5. WSDOT exemption added under 6.1.1.16 	

Row	Summary of change	Review	Action
d.	Ecology amended rules clarifying permit filing procedures consistent with a 2011 statute.	Add reference to WAC 173-27-130 under 6.1.3, Transmittal to Ecology	
e.	Ecology amended forestry use regulations to clarify that forest practices that only involves timber cutting are not SMA “developments” and do not require SDPs.	Current SMP does not include provisions for forestry - no forestlands exist within city shoreline jurisdiction.	No amendment needed.
f.	Ecology clarified the SMA does not apply to lands under exclusive federal jurisdiction	Covered under Section 2.4.2, To Whom this SMP Applies.	No amendment needed.
g.	Ecology clarified “default” provisions for nonconforming uses and development .	Covered under Section 7, Nonconforming Uses, Structures, & Lots	No amendment needed.
2016			
a.	The Legislature created a new shoreline permit exemption for retrofitting existing structure to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act .	Section 6.1.1.14 under Statutory Exemptions, Item covers this requirement.	No amendment needed.
b.	Ecology updated wetlands critical areas guidance including implementation guidance for the 2014 wetlands rating system.	See CAO, Ordinance 985, Section 13-4-2	No amendment needed.
2015			
a.	The Legislature adopted a 90-day target for local review of Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) projects.	The SMP does not include this optional language.	No amendment needed.
2012			
a.	The Legislature amended the SMA to clarify SMP appeal procedures .	Section 6.3, Amendments or Updates to this SMP, does not address SMP appeals procedures.	No amendment needed.
2011			
a.	Ecology adopted a rule requiring that wetlands be delineated in accordance with the approved federal wetland delineation manual .	See CAO, Ordinance 985, Section 13-4-3.	No amendment needed.

Row	Summary of change	Review	Action
b.	Ecology adopted rules for new commercial geoduck aquaculture .	The Aquatic SED designation does not support geoduck aquaculture. The definition for "Aquaculture" includes the exclusion for the harvest of wild geoduck.	No amendment needed.
c.	The Legislature created a new definition and policy for floating homes permitted or legally established prior to January 1, 2011.	There are no floating on-water residences in the Aquatic SED.	No amendment needed.
d.	The Legislature authorizing a new option to classify existing structures as conforming .	Section 7.0 contains polities and regulations for Nonconforming Uses, Structures, and Lots	No amendment needed.
2010			
a.	The Legislature adopted Growth Management Act – Shoreline Management Act clarifications .	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Section 2.5.4 amended to reflect update in CAO ordinance citation Section 2.5.4 amended to reflect effective date of SMP amendments. 	1.
2009			
a.	The Legislature created new "relief" procedures for instances in which a shoreline restoration project within a UGA creates a shift in Ordinary High Water Mark.	SMP does not incorporate these optional procedures.	No amendment needed.
b.	Ecology adopted a rule for certifying wetland mitigation banks .	CAO Ordinance 985, Chapter 4, Section 13-4-9 addresses Wetland Mitigation Banking.	No amendment needed.
c.	The Legislature added moratoria authority and procedures to the SMA.	SMP does not address moratoria authority.	No amendment needed.
2007			
a.	The Legislature clarified options for defining "floodway" as either the area that has been established in FEMA maps, or the floodway criteria set in the SMA.	There are no FEMA designated floodways in the city.	No amendment needed.

Row	Summary of change	Review	Action
b.	Ecology amended rules to clarify that comprehensively updated SMPs shall include a list and map of streams and lakes that are in shoreline jurisdiction.	Appendix A includes Shoreline Jurisdiction Map. There are no streams or lakes within the city's Shoreline jurisdiction.	No amendment needed.

* See additional considerations for Ocean Management within Ecology's Ocean Management Checklist and associated guidance for using the Ocean Management Checklist. This checklist and guidance summarizes state law, rules and applicable updated information related to Ocean Resources Management Act (ORMA) and the Washington State Marine Spatial Plan (MSP). All jurisdictions with coastal waters must implement ORMA and the MSP applies to all jurisdictions that overlap with the MSP Study Area. Clallam County, Jefferson County, Grays Harbor County, Pacific County, Ilwaco, Long Beach, Raymond, South Bend, Cosmopolis, Ocean Shores, Hoquiam, Aberdeen, Westport need to plan for ocean uses consistent with ORMA and the MSP and should be using the Ocean Management Checklist in addition to this Periodic Review Checklist.

Part Two: Local review amendments

Part Two is used to demonstrate compliance with WAC 173-26-090(2)(d)(ii). This checklist identifies changes to the local comprehensive plans or development regulations, changes in local circumstances, new information or improved data that may warrant an SMP amendment during periodic reviews.

Changes to Comprehensive Plan and Development regulations

Question	Answer		Discussion
Have you had Comprehensive Plan amendments since the SMP comprehensive update that may trigger need for an SMP amendment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	
Have your had Development Regulations amendments since the SMP comprehensive update that may trigger need for an SMP amendment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	
Has your Critical Areas Ordinance (CAO) been updated since the SMP comprehensive update? If yes, are there changes that trigger need for an SMP amendment?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	No changes required
	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	
Are CAO provisions incorporated by reference (with ordinance # and date) into your SMP? If yes, is it the current CAO or a previous version?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	Current ordinance number and date of adoption added to SMP (the city's codifier has yet to replace Title 13 on its code website)
	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	
Has any new shoreline area been annexed into your jurisdiction since your SMP was updated? If yes, were these areas pre-designated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	

If your review and evaluation resulted in proposed SMP text or map amendments, please create a table that identifies changes to the SMP for consistency with amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and Development regulations. Example format:

SMP Section	Summary of proposed change	Citation to any applicable RCW or WAC	Rationale for how the amendment complies with SMA or Rules

Changes to local circumstance, new information, or improved data

Question	Answer		Discussion
Has your jurisdiction experienced any significant events, such as channel migration, major floods or landslides that impacted your shoreline and could trigger a need for an SMP amendment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	
Have FEMA floodplain or floodway maps been recently updated for your jurisdiction? If your SMP extends shoreline jurisdiction to the entire 100-year floodplain, has FEMA updated maps that trigger a need for an SMP amendment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	
Have you issued any formal SMP Administrative Interpretations that could lead to improvements in the SMP?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	
Are there any Moratoria in place affecting development in the Shoreline?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	
Have staff identified the need for clarification based on implementation or other changes? e.g., modifications to environment designations, mapping errors, inaccurate internal references.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	
Are there other changes to local circumstances, new information, or improved data that need to be addressed in your SMP?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	

If your review and evaluation resulted in proposed SMP text or map amendments, please create a table that identifies changes to the SMP to address changes to local circumstances, new information, or improved data. Example format:

SMP Section	Summary of proposed change	Citation to any applicable RCW or WAC	Rationale for how the amendment complies with SMA or Rules