

WAC 173-26-090 Locally initiated review—Periodic review—Public involvement and approval procedures. (1) Locally initiated master program review.

Each local government should review its shoreline master program and make amendments deemed necessary to reflect changing local circumstances, new information or improved data. Local governments are encouraged to consult department guidance for applicable new information on emerging topics such as sea level rise.

(2) Periodic review requirements.

(a) Following the comprehensive updates required by RCW 90.58.080(2), each local government shall conduct a review of their master program at least once every eight years on a schedule established in the act. Following the review, local governments shall, if necessary, revise their master programs. This review and revision is referred to in this section as the periodic review.

(b) Deadlines for periodic review. Local governments must take action to review, and if necessary, revise their master programs according to the schedule established in RCW 90.58.080 (4)(b). Deadlines for completion of periodic review are as follows:

**Table WAC 173-26-090.1
Deadlines for Completion of Periodic Review**

Reviews must be completed on or before June 30th of:	Affected counties and the cities and towns within:
2019/2027*	King, Pierce, Snohomish.
2020/2028*	Clallam, Clark, Island, Jefferson, Kitsap, Mason, San Juan, Skagit, Thurston, Whatcom.
2021/2029*	Benton, Chelan, Cowlitz, Douglas, Kittitas, Lewis, Skamania, Spokane, Yakima.
2022/2030*	Adams, Asotin, Columbia, Ferry, Franklin, Garfield, Grant, Grays Harbor, Klickitat, Lincoln, Okanogan, Pacific, Pend Oreille, Stevens, Wahkiakum, Walla Walla, Whitman.

*And every eight years *thereafter*.

(c) Taking legislative action.

(i) The periodic review must be accomplished through legislative action. Legislative action means the adoption of a resolution, motion, or ordinance following notice and a public hearing including, at a minimum, findings that a review and evaluation has occurred and identifying the revisions made, or that a revision was not needed and the reasons therefore. Legislative findings that no revisions are needed are referred to in this section as "findings of adequacy."

(ii) Legislative action includes two components. It includes a review of the shoreline master program and it includes the adoption of either findings of adequacy or any amendments necessary to bring the program into compliance with the requirements of the act.

(iii) Legislative actions concluding the periodic review must be followed by department approval.

(d) The required minimum scope of review.

(i) The purpose and scope of the periodic review as established by the act is:

(A) To assure that the master program complies with applicable law and guidelines in effect at the time of the review; and

(B) To assure consistency of the master program with the local government's comprehensive plan and development regulations adopted under chapter 36.70A RCW, if applicable, and other local requirements.

(ii) The review process provides the method for bringing shoreline master programs into compliance with the requirements of the act that have been added or changed since the last review and for responding to changes in guidelines adopted by the department, together with a review for consistency with amended comprehensive plans and regulations. Local governments should also incorporate amendments to reflect changed circumstances, new information, or improved data. The review ensures that shoreline master programs do not fall out of compliance over time through inaction.

(iii) The periodic review is distinct from the comprehensive updates required by RCW 90.58.080(2). The presumption in the comprehensive update process was that all master programs needed to be revised to comply with the full suite of ecology guidelines. By contrast, the periodic review addresses changes in requirements of the act and guidelines requirements since the comprehensive update or the last periodic review, and changes for consistency with revised comprehensive plans and regulations, together with any changes deemed necessary to reflect changed circumstances, new information or improved data. There is no minimum requirement to comprehensively revise shoreline inventory and characterization reports or restoration plans.

(3) Procedures for conducting periodic reviews.

(a) Public participation program.

(i) In conducting the periodic review, the department and local governments, pursuant to RCW 90.58.130, shall make all reasonable efforts to inform, fully involve and encourage participation of all interested persons and private entities, tribes, and agencies of the federal, state or local government having interests and responsibilities relating to shorelines of the state and the local master program. Local governments may follow the public participation procedures under either the standard local process outlined in WAC 173-26-100, or the optional joint review process outlined in WAC 173-26-104.

(ii) Counties and cities shall establish and broadly disseminate to the public a public participation program identifying procedures whereby review of the shoreline master program will be considered by the local governing body consistent with RCW 36.70A.140. Such procedures shall provide for early and continuous public participation through broad dissemination of informative materials, proposals and alternatives, opportunity for written comments, public meetings after effective notice, provision for open discussion, and consideration of and response to public comments.

The public participation program should include a schedule for the periodic review and identify when legislative action on the review and update component are proposed to occur. The public participation program should also inform the public of when to comment on the scope of the review and proposed changes to the master program. Counties and cities may adjust the public participation program to best meet the intent of the participation requirement.

(b) Review and analysis to determine need for revisions.

(i) Review amendments to the act and shoreline master program guidelines.

Local governments must review amendments to chapter 90.58 RCW and department guidelines that have occurred since the master program was last amended, and determine if local amendments are needed to maintain compliance. The department will maintain a checklist of legislative and rule amendments to assist local governments with this review. The department will provide technical assistance to ensure local governments address applicable changes to the act and master program guidelines.

(ii) Review relevant comprehensive plans and regulations.

Local governments must review changes to the comprehensive plan and development regulations to determine if the shoreline master program policies and regulations remain consistent with them.

WAC 173-26-191 (1)(e) and 173-26-211(3) provide guidance on determining internal consistency. It is the responsibility of the local government to assure consistency between the master program and other elements of the comprehensive plan and development regulations. Local governments should document the consistency analysis to support proposed changes.

(iii) Additional review and analysis. Local governments should consider during their periodic review whether to incorporate any amendments needed to reflect changed circumstances, new information or improved data as described under subsection (1) of this section. Local governments should consider whether the significance of the changed circumstances, new information or improved data warrants amendments.

(c) Take legislative action.

(i) At the end of the review process, counties and cities must take legislative action declaring the review process complete.

(ii) The notice of hearing for legislative actions that are intended to address the periodic review process must state that the actions to be considered are part of the periodic review process under RCW 90.58.080(4).

(iii) The findings for any legislative action on the periodic review process must state that the action is intended to satisfy the requirements of RCW 90.58.080(4).

(iv) A local government that determines after review that amendments are not needed shall adopt a resolution, motion, or ordinance declaring findings of adequacy. Findings of adequacy are a local written determination that no revisions to a shoreline master program are needed to comply with the requirements of RCW 90.58.080(4).

(d) Submittal to the department.

(i) A local government that determines amendments are needed shall submit the amendments to the department consistent with WAC 173-26-110.

(ii) A local government that determines amendments are not needed shall submit the following in lieu of the requirements of WAC 173-26-110:

(A) A resolution or ordinance declaring findings of adequacy.

(B) Evidence of compliance with applicable public notice and consultation requirements.

(C) Copies of all public, agency and tribal comments received during any applicable public comment periods, or where no comments have been received, a statement to that effect.

(D) A completed checklist demonstrating review elements have been considered, and are either inapplicable or have already been addressed through previous locally initiated amendments prior to the scheduled periodic review.

(e) State process for approving periodic reviews.

(i) The department must issue a formal approval of any amendment or findings of adequacy. Department approval is necessary to affirmatively conclude the periodic review process, to confirm that state review of local action has occurred, and to establish a definitive appeal window consistent with RCW 90.58.190.

(ii) Where the local government final action includes master program amendments, local governments and the department shall follow applicable adoption procedures described in WAC 173-26-120.

(iii) Where the local government final action is to adopt findings of adequacy, the department shall follow applicable adoption procedures described in WAC 173-26-120. The department shall review the findings of adequacy solely for consistency with RCW 90.58.080(4) and this section.

[Statutory Authority: Chapter 90.58 RCW. WSR 17-17-016 (Order 15-06), § 173-26-090, filed 8/7/17, effective 9/7/17. Statutory Authority: RCW 90.58.140(3) and [90.58].200. WSR 96-20-075 (Order 95-17), § 173-26-090, filed 9/30/96, effective 10/31/96.]