

SENATE BILL REPORT

SB 5671

AS REPORTED BY COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES, FEBRUARY 24, 1993

Brief Description: Modifying the definition of a substantial development for the purposes of the shoreline management act.

SPONSORS: Senators Owen, Sutherland, Amondson, Erwin, Hargrove, Oke, L. Smith and Fraser

SENATE COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES

Majority Report: That Substitute Senate Bill No. 5671 be substituted therefor, and the substitute bill do pass.

Signed by Senators Owen, Chairman; Hargrove, Vice Chairman; Amondson, Erwin, Franklin, Haugen, Oke, Snyder, and Spanel.

Staff: Erika Lim (786-7488)

Hearing Dates: February 17, 1993; February 24, 1993

BACKGROUND:

The Shoreline Management Act was passed in 1971. It requires a development permit be obtained for projects which are substantial developments along the shorelines of the state. In 1971 a "substantial development" was defined as having total cost or fair market value exceeding \$1000. This amount was changed to \$2500 in 1986.

SUMMARY:

The value of a "substantial development" which requires a development permit under the Shoreline Management Act is raised to \$8500. The Department of Ecology will periodically review this amount for possible adjustments for inflation.

Grammatical changes in definitions in the Shoreline Management Act are made.

EFFECT OF PROPOSED SUBSTITUTE:

The conditions under which a hydraulic permit must be obtained are also changed. If a project was previously granted a hydraulic permit, routine repair and maintenance work on that project does not require a new hydraulic permit. The conditions of the previously granted hydraulic permit are still applicable and must be met. If a project was never granted a hydraulic permit, a permit must be obtained.

Appropriation: none

Revenue: none

Fiscal Note: available

TESTIMONY FOR:

The current \$2500 exemption is too low. For small dollar amount projects, more time is spent seeking a permit than working on the project itself.

TESTIMONY AGAINST:

Environmental impacts of a project cannot be accurately gauged solely using a dollar amount. There can be expensive projects with little environmental effect or there can be inexpensive projects with profound environmental effect.

The cumulative impacts of small, exempt projects can be significant. The permitting process allows neighboring property owners and affected agencies to comment and to suggest mitigating measures. This is not possible for exempt projects.

TESTIFIED: Hugh Middleton; Robert N. Boehm; Eric Berger, County Road Administration Board; Rod Mack, Dept. of Ecology; Bernie Chaplin, Dept. of Transportation; Jeff Parsons, National Audubon Society