

## 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
Anchor QEA and White Bluffs Consulting	Pend Oreille County Regional Partnership	December 2022

## 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.\*

**Commented [SN1]:** General comment: The consultant team will check and update all section cross references throughout this checklist following Planning Commission review.

Row	Summary of change	Review	Action
<b>2021</b>			
a.	The Legislature amended <b>floating on-water residences</b> provisions	No section in SMP.	House boats not permitted in Pend Oreille County; no amendments needed.
b.	The Legislature clarified the permit exemption for <b>fish passage projects</b>	xx.34.040(A) refers to exemptions, including exemptions for fish passage	Added reference to RCW 90.58.147 in xx.34.040(A). Also streamlined text regarding fish passage exemptions.
<b>2019</b>			
a.	OFM adjusted the <b>cost threshold for building freshwater docks</b>	xx.34.060 refers to freshwater docks cost threshold.	Updated xx.34.060 to include current OFM cost thresholds and Ecology recommended language for freshwater docks.
<b>2017</b>			
a.	OFM adjusted the <b>cost threshold for substantial development</b> to \$7,047.	xx.34.040 refers to substantial development cost thresholds.	Updated xx.34.040 with the new threshold of \$7,047.
b.	Ecology permit rules clarified the <b>definition of "development"</b> does not include dismantling or removing structures.	xx.10.020 includes a definition for "development."	Revised language in xx.10.020 to include Ecology-recommended definition of development.
c.	Ecology adopted rules clarifying <b>exceptions to local review under the SMA.</b>	The SMP does not specifically address exceptions.	Added a new subsection A to xx.34.020 to describe and list exceptions.
d.	Ecology amended rules clarifying <b>permit filing procedures</b> consistent with a 2011 statute.	xx.34.040 Shoreline Permits and Authorizations has some procedural text	<p>For planning commission consideration: The SMP doesn't include specific language about several procedural items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• public noticing requirements</li> <li>• duration of permits</li> <li>• initiation of development</li> </ul>

Row	Summary of change	Review	Action
		but does not address Ecology permit filing procedures specifically.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>review process</li> <li>appeals</li> <li>amendment of permits</li> <li>filing</li> </ul> <p>Other SMPs in the region have language that could be adapted, if the planning commission would like to consider adding it.</p>
e.	Ecology amended <b>forestry use regulations</b> to clarify that forest practices that only involves timber cutting are not SMA “developments” and do not require SDPs.	xx.34.060 includes development standards for commercial harvest of timber.	Added this text to xx.34.060: A forest practice that only involves timber cutting is not a development under the act and does not require a shoreline substantial development permit or a shoreline exemption. A forest practice that includes activities other than timber cutting may be a development under the act and may require a substantial development permit, as required by WAC 222-50-020.
f.	Ecology clarified the SMA does not apply to lands under <b>exclusive federal jurisdiction</b>	SMP does not address exclusive federal jurisdiction.	New xx.34.020(A) includes exceptions for uses on lands under exclusive federal jurisdiction.
g.	Ecology clarified “default” provisions for <b>nonconforming uses and development</b> .	xx.10.020 includes definition for “non-conformity”.	Replaced definition for “non-conformity” with Ecology’s recommended definitions for nonconforming use, development/structure, and lot.
<b>2016</b>			
a.	The Legislature created a new shoreline permit exemption for retrofitting existing structure to comply with the <b>Americans with Disabilities Act</b> .	xx.34.040 lists shoreline permit exemptions.	Added modifications to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act to the list of exemptions in xx.34.040.
b.	Ecology updated <b>wetlands critical areas guidance</b> including implementation guidance for the 2014 wetlands rating system.	xx.36.040 requires use of the current state wetland rating system.	Various sections of SMP Chapter 5 are being made to ensure consistency with the County’s current environmentally critical areas code (Chapter XX.36).

<sup>3</sup> See, for example, the SE Washington Coalition SMP: [Final Shoreline Master Program \(squarespace.com\)](https://www.squarespace.com)

Row	Summary of change	Review	Action
2015			
a.	The Legislature adopted a <b>90-day target</b> for local review of Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) projects.	WSDOT projects are not specifically addressed in the SMP.	WSDOT projects are included in the new exceptions text in xx.34.020(A).

\* 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	The County has updated its draft Comprehensive Plan; the SMP is also being updated and both will be consistent with each other.
	<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	The County has updated its development regulations but did not address SMP regulations; SMP regulations are being updated as part of the SMP periodic review.
	<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	Changes are being included in the SMP, which includes a separate critical areas section that governs CA protection in shorelines. Changes include updating wetlands and geo hazards provisions.
	<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 type="checkbox"/>	Yes	No – see response above.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	
Has any new shoreline area been annexed into your jurisdiction since your SMP was	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	

updated? If yes, were these areas pre-designated?			
Other	<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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Updating environment designations in two locations to address consistency with existing and planned development (Davis Lake) and based on refined reach designation (near Metaline Falls)
	<input type="checkbox"/> No	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	

Are there other changes to local circumstances, new information, or improved data that need to be addressed in your SMP?	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	Yes, USACE RGP 7 is no longer valid; updated dock provisions. Also made several organizational changes to improve clarity and reduce duplication. See below for additional detail.
--	--------------------------	----	--

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 date. 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
Various	Minor editorial revisions throughout text for consistency, grammar, and clarity and to correct typos.	Not applicable.	Recommendations of consultant team to improve SMP readability.
Various	Add references to city/town where appropriate to reflect that this is a regional SMP.	Not applicable.	Consultant recommendation.
Front matter	Revise acknowledgements (remove individual names).	Not applicable.	Revisions to bring acknowledgements up to date.
Front matter	Delete note about SMP revisions on page 1.	Not applicable.	Text revision to bring SMP up to date and remove unnecessary explanatory text.
Chapter 1, Part B	Streamline and update text describing SMP revision process.	Not applicable.	Text revision to bring SMP up to date and remove unnecessary explanatory text.
Chapter 1, Part C	Delete unnecessary text to streamline and focus on SMP implementation.	Not applicable.	Revisions to remove extraneous text.
Chapter 2, Part B	Delete text describing shoreline environment designations.	Not applicable.	Consultant team recommendation to keep this section focused on policies. Shoreline environment designations are described in XX.34.030. Buffers are listed in XX.
Chapter 2, Part B	Delete text regarding buffer widths and buffer reduction.	Not applicable.	Local staff and consultant team recommendation to limit this section to policies and avoid redundancy. Buffer widths are listed in XX.34.060, which also provides

SMP Section	Summary of proposed change	Citation to any applicable RCW or WAC	Rationale for how the amendment complies with SMA or Rules
			applicants the option to propose nonstandard buffers, apply common line buffers or buffer averaging, etc.
<b>Chapter 2, Part B</b>	Delete text regarding DNR guidelines for defensible space.	Not applicable.	Local staff and consultant team recommendation to reduce redundancy; this text is included in XX.34.060.
<b>Chapter 2, Part B</b>	Delete list of additional permits and approvals beyond SMA requirements.	Not applicable.	Local staff and consultant team recommendation to streamline text and remove unnecessary information.
<b>Chapter 2, Part B</b>	For County consideration: Delete the Water Access Management Plan requirement?		Confirm requirement with County.
<b>Chapter 2, Part B</b>	Delete statement regarding "natural capacity" of water body.	Not applicable.	This statement is unclear and duplicates the previous item regarding no net loss of ecological function.
<b>Chapter 2, Part B</b>	Revise text to note that Pend Oreille County SMP User Guide and local conservation district offices can provide plant lists.	Not applicable.	Text update to assist with plant list resources.
<b>Chapter 2, Part B</b>	Delete requirements for vegetation removal documentation.	Not applicable.	Duplicates regulations in Chapter 4, not needed in policies section.
<b>Chapter 2, Part B</b>	Move standards for shoreline stabilization to Chapter 4. Reference County Shoreline Stabilization Guide.	Not applicable.	Consultant recommendation to consolidate regulatory language in Chapter 4.
<b>Chapter 2, Part B</b>	Delete requirement to maintain a list of obstructions to fish passage (this is done by other agencies).	Not applicable.	Consultant recommendation to remove unneeded text.
<b>Chapter 2, Part B</b>	Move standards for dredging to Chapter 4.	Not applicable.	Consultant recommendation to consolidate regulatory language in Chapter 4.
<b>Chapter 2, Part B</b>	Delete standards for aquatic noxious weeds management.	Not applicable.	Standards are already covered in Chapter 4.

SMP Section	Summary of proposed change	Citation to any applicable RCW or WAC	Rationale for how the amendment complies with SMA or Rules
Chapter 2, Part B	Move standards for aquaculture to Chapter 4.	Not applicable.	Consultant recommendation to consolidate regulatory language in Chapter 4.
Chapter 2, Part B	Move standards for agriculture to Chapter 4.	Not applicable.	Consultant recommendation to consolidate regulatory language in Chapter 4.
Chapter 2, Part B	Delete standards for commercial logging.	Not applicable.	Standards are already covered in Chapter 4.
Chapter 2, Part B	Move standards for mining to Chapter 4.	Not applicable.	Consultant recommendation to consolidate regulatory language in Chapter 4.
Chapter 2, Part B	Delete road standards; add road/transportation regulations to Chapter 4.	Not applicable.	Consultant recommendation to consolidate regulatory language in Chapter 4.
Chapter 2, Part B	Delete standards for utilities.	Not applicable.	Standards are already covered in Chapter 4.
Chapter 2, Part B	Move standards for marinas to Chapter 4.	Not applicable.	Most of these standards are already covered in Chapter 4; consolidate those that aren't already included in the Boating Facilities section.
Chapter 2, Part B	Delete specific dock standards, which are in Chapter 4.	Not applicable.	Standards are already covered in Chapter 4.
Chapter 2, Part B	Delete sign standards.	Not applicable.	Standards are already covered in Chapter 4.
Chapter 2, Part B	Remove specific reference to Tri County Health District.	Not applicable.	Planning staff recommendation (County does not have jurisdiction over Health District standards).
Chapter 2, Part B	Confirm with County whether the Pend Oreille River Water Trails Project, West Branch Little Spokane Wildlife Area restoration, dam license settlement agreements are still current or should be removed.		Confirm with County. County staff indicated the Tribe and/or Parks may have taken on the water trail and that WDFW has been doing some work in the WBLSR as well as the POCD; the county works with them when permitting is required. The dams and agreements are done through those entities, BOCC and legal; County staff believes these are current. He indicated the water rights and adjudication is a direct function of Ecology and the county has participated in WRIA 55 regarding legal and available water, but the water rights and



SMP Section	Summary of proposed change	Citation to any applicable RCW or WAC	Rationale for how the amendment complies with SMA or Rules
			adjudication is something the county would guide applicants to Ecology to address.
<b>Chapter 2, Part B</b>	Move implementation actions (permit and monitoring review) to a new chapter.	Not applicable.	Consultant recommendation; these are not shoreline policies.
<b>Chapter 2, Part B</b>	Add new policy regarding adaptive use of state historical buildings.	Not applicable.	Text revisions are from 2015 Limited Amendment.
<b>XX.10.020</b>	Delete confusing reference to ordinance section in definition of "lowest floor."	Not applicable.	Consultant recommendation for clarity.
<b>XX.10.020 and others</b>	Change references to "Community Development Director" to "Shoreline Administrator" throughout the SMP to reflect SMP administration by other jurisdictions in the regional partnership. Add definition of Shoreline Administrator in XX.10.020.	Not applicable.	Consultant recommendation for clarify and consistency.
<b>XX.10.020</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add definition for "Utility" for clarity.</li> <li>• Delete definition for "Clean Clear Aliquot Legal Description" which is not used in the SMP.</li> <li>• Delete language regarding insurance premium rates in "elevation certificate" definition (this detail is worked out as part of the certificate).</li> <li>• Revise "nonconforming lot" to "legal nonconforming lot."</li> <li>• Revise "Park model trailer" to clarify these are not travel trailers.</li> </ul>	Not applicable.	Consultant and planning staff recommendations.

SMP Section	Summary of proposed change	Citation to any applicable RCW or WAC	Rationale for how the amendment complies with SMA or Rules
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revise “recreational vehicle” definition for clarity.</li> <li>Add definition for “regional partnership.”</li> </ul>		
XX.34.020	Delete reference to Sullivan Creek FERC license process (completed).	Not applicable.	Planning staff recommendation.
XX.34.040	<p>For planning commission review: Confirm permit classifications for shoreline permits (Class 1, 2, 3, or 4). The SMP class designations are not all consistent with County development code XX.14.010-070.</p> <p>Also, please consider use of the SMP by city and town members of the regional partnership when considering text revisions.</p>	Not applicable.	County could consider adding a permit class table to the SMP (similar to the table in the development code but for shoreline permits only) and/or cross reference the applicable development code sections.
XX.34.040(A)	Delete reference to RCW 90.58.550; this covers marine waters and is not applicable.	Not applicable.	Planning staff recommendation.
XX.34.040(A)	Replace reference to RCW 17.26.020 with RCW 17.10.010 which defines “aquatic noxious weeds.”	Not applicable.	Planning staff recommendation.
XX.34.040(B)	Add reference to RCW 90.58.140 (additional state shoreline permitting requirements).	Not applicable.	Planning staff recommendation.
XX.34.040(C)	Delete reference to WAC 173-27-060; this is the Coastal Zone Management Act, not necessary to include.	Not applicable.	Consultant recommendation.
XX.34.040(E)	Revise item E(1)(b) to clarify the determination is whether a shoreline	Not applicable.	Planning staff recommendation.

SMP Section	Summary of proposed change	Citation to any applicable RCW or WAC	Rationale for how the amendment complies with SMA or Rules
	permit is required (not a complete exemption from permitting).		
XX.34.040(E)	Delete item E(1)(c). Activities not listed in the Table of Permitted Uses and Activities require a CUP per item E(2).	Not applicable.	Consultant recommendation.
XX.34.040(E)	Delete reasonable use exception language.	Not applicable.	Reasonable use exceptions do not apply within shoreline jurisdiction.
XX.34.050	Add a reference to list of exemptions, which includes projects below the state cost threshold. Delete references to cost thresholds for SSDP and SCUP.	Not applicable.	Consultant recommendation for clarity.
XX.34.050 Table B	Delete repeated notes to improve table readability.	Not applicable.	Consultant recommendation.
XX.34.050 Table B	<p>Planning commission, consider deleting non-water-dependent commercial development row and footnote 6 and adding water-oriented and water-related uses to the following row. Make it clear that commercial use needs to have some connection to water to be allowed.</p> <p>Consultant will update footnote numbering if the County wants to implement this revision.</p>	Not applicable.	For consideration by the planning commission. County staff noted if we delete footnote 6 that doesn't leave much flexibility for the rare challenging lot; size, shape, roads, highways, etc.
XX.34.050 Table B	Revise note 8 regarding docks for clarity.	Not applicable.	Consultant recommendation.
XX.34.060(E)	Replace part E with updated text that incorporates relevant provisions of RGP 7 and other currently accepted dock standards.	Not applicable.	Consultant recommendation.

SMP Section	Summary of proposed change	Citation to any applicable RCW or WAC	Rationale for how the amendment complies with SMA or Rules
	Additional requirements for Bead and Sullivan Lakes have been added per discussion with WDFW.		
XX.34.060(E)	<p>County could consider adding language for floats, such as the following from another SMP:</p> <p>1. Floats. The following standards apply to all new, replaced, and repaired floats.</p> <p>a. Float components shall not exceed the dimensions of 8 by 20 feet, or an aggregate total of 160 square feet, for all float components.</p> <p>(1) Private swim floats should be no longer than 8 feet and no wider than 8 feet.</p> <p>b. Only one swim float may be approved per contiguous waterfront ownership.</p>		
XX.34.060(E)	For County consideration: County staff suggested stating that moorage is for the sole use of the parcel owner and may not be rented to a non-owner.		
XX.34.060(E)	County staff noted that WDFW may apply a lower threshold (33%) for replacement of dock support piles.		Consultant team will follow up with WDFW.
XX.34.060(E)	Note for planning commission discussion: The consultant team has proposed the following language for the Pend Oreille River and Bead and Sullivan lakes: "The width		

SMP Section	Summary of proposed change	Citation to any applicable RCW or WAC	Rationale for how the amendment complies with SMA or Rules
	<p>of any individual section of deck shall not exceed 8 feet for piers and floats and 4 feet for ramps." County staff asks whether this is likely to lead for the need for additional shoreline variances. More stringent requirements are proposed for these waterbodies to protect bull trout.</p>		
<b>XX.34.060(F)</b>	<p>Clarify requirements to locate boating facilities where they will not affect ecological processes near tributaries or priority habitat areas. Add new item that boating facilities must not conflict with federal hydro facilities. Clarify that boating facilities are subject to review by local, state, tribal, and federal agencies.</p>	Not applicable.	Consultant and County staff recommendation.
<b>XX.34.060(J)</b>	<p>Clarified that the current version of the Eastern Washington Storm Water Manual applies.</p>	Not applicable.	Planning staff recommendation.
<b>XX.34.060(K)</b>	<p>Consolidated text from Chapter 2 into this section. Updated text referencing the expired Regional General Permit.</p>	Not applicable.	Consultant recommendation.
<b>XX.34.060(M)</b>	<p>Text regarding mining moved from Chapter 2 into this section.</p>	Not applicable.	Consultant recommendation.
<b>XX.34.060(N)</b>	<p>Delete reference to "approved real estate signs" (unclear).</p>	Not applicable.	Planning staff recommendation.
<b>XX.34.060(R)</b>	<p>Text regarding agriculture moved from Chapter 2 into this section.</p>	Not applicable.	Consultant recommendation.

SMP Section	Summary of proposed change	Citation to any applicable RCW or WAC	Rationale for how the amendment complies with SMA or Rules
XX.34.060(W)	Text regarding dredging moved from Chapter 2 into this section.	Not applicable.	Consultant recommendation.
XX.34.060(X)	Text regarding aquaculture moved from Chapter 2 into this section.	Not applicable.	Consultant recommendation.
XX.34.060(Y)	Added new section for trail, road, and parking standards.	Not applicable.	Consultant recommendation.
XX.34.060	County consider moving/consolidating this text into Chapter 7 (Nonconforming Uses) so all of this related text is in one place.	Not applicable.	Consultant recommendation.
XX.34.070	Delete violations and enforcement subsection; not needed because this is covered in Chapter 8.	Not applicable.	Consultant recommendation to streamline text.
XX.34.080	Delete Shoreline Mitigation and Restoration Fund section (fund does not exist and is not required).	Not applicable.	Consultant recommendation to streamline text.
XX.36.030	Delete statement regarding requirement for project sponsor to obtain an authorization if no other permit is required.	Not applicable.	County planning staff suggestion to remove confusing statement.
XX.36.070 (E) and (F)	Delete references to AH zone (not present in County).	Not applicable.	Planning staff recommendation.
XX.36.070 (H)	Delete text regarding AO zone (not present in County).	Not applicable.	Planning staff recommendation.
XX.92.080	County staff indicated the Notice on Title may be removed from code; will reconfirm with County.		
Chapter 3 Part B	Question for County and planning commission: Are any text changes needed to reflect city/town comp		

SMP Section	Summary of proposed change	Citation to any applicable RCW or WAC	Rationale for how the amendment complies with SMA or Rules
	plan or zoning designations, or the UGA language, for the shoreline environment criteria?		
<b>Chapter 5</b>	Revisions to SMP text for consistency with County's current environmentally sensitive areas code (Chapter XX.36).	Not applicable.	Revisions for code consistency.  Note to reviewers: This chapter references the County and County development code in numerous places. We've made some revisions to make the language more general, referring to the Shoreline Administrator and local jurisdictions instead of the County where it seems to make sense.
<b>Chapters 4 through 8</b>	Delete introductory paragraph following Chapter titles (not necessary).	Not applicable.	Consultant recommendation to streamline text.
<b>Appendices</b>	Remove Appendices G through K. Delete note following appendix list regarding periodic review.	Not applicable.	Recommendation of consultant team; these appendices are out of date and not necessary for SMP implementation.