



CLARK COUNTY WASHINGTON
COMMUNITY PLANNING

TO: Kathleen Otto, Interim County Manager
FROM: Oliver Orjiako, Director
PREPARED BY: Jenna Kay, Planner II
DATE: August 26, 2020
SUBJECT: October 21, 2020 County Council Work session on Shoreline Master Program

BACKGROUND

Clark County is undertaking a periodic review of its Shoreline Master Program (SMP), as required by the Washington State Shoreline Management Act (SMA), RCW 90.58.080(4). The SMA requires each SMP be reviewed and revised, if needed, on an eight-year schedule established by the Legislature. The review ensures the SMP stays current with changes in laws and rules, remains consistent with other Clark County plans and regulations, and is responsive to changed circumstances, new information and improved data.

The county needs to submit to the Department of Ecology SMP amendments and periodic review documents by June 30, 2021. The Planning Commission held a remote work session (August 6, 2020) and hearing (August 20, 2020) on the project and has made a recommendation for Council consideration. The county is on track to meet the project due date as long as we can continue to move the project along through the legislative process. The project is largely funded through grant funds from the Department of Ecology, and funds are budgeted to be used during the 2020 county budget cycle.

OPTIONS FOR CONSIDERATION

The attached work session request form is to inquire if the County Council would like to hold a work session or not. The work session would serve two purposes:

1. To brief Council on the Shoreline Master Program Periodic Review project for an upcoming hearing, including review of the proposed amendments and comments received to date, and
2. To initiate a discussion on the public policy suggestions submitted in comments, which are not included in the proposed amendments. The purpose of this item is to find out if staff should add any of the policy suggestions to their 2021 work program.

If Council would prefer to use Council Time as the forum to discuss the project, or go directly to a hearing on the proposal, staff is okay with those options as well.

NEXT STEPS

At the end of the work session, the questions for Council would be:

1. What questions do you have about the shoreline periodic review proposal?
2. What next steps would you like staff to take, if any, regarding policy comments received on the shoreline amendment proposal?

**NINE STEP PLANNER
CLARK COUNTY WORK SESSIONS**

This form needs to be reviewed and approved by the council before a work session is scheduled.

REQUESTED BY: *Community Planning*

1. **TOPIC:** Shoreline Master Program 2020 Periodic Review

2. **WORK SESSION:**

Clark County is undertaking a periodic review of its Shoreline Master Program (SMP), as required by the Washington State Shoreline Management Act (SMA), RCW 90.58.080(4). The SMA requires each SMP be reviewed and revised, if needed, on an eight-year schedule established by the Legislature. The review ensures the SMP stays current with changes in laws and rules, remains consistent with other Clark County plans and regulations, and is responsive to changed circumstances, new information and improved data.

This work session would serve two purposes:

1. To brief Council on the Shoreline Master Program Periodic Review project for an upcoming hearing, including review of the proposed amendments and comments received to date, and
2. To discuss if any of the public policy suggestions submitted in comments, which are not included in the proposed amendments, are of Council interest for staff to add to their future work program.

NAMES OF STAFF MEMBERS TO PRESENT AND ATTEND THE WORK SESSION:

Jenna Kay, Oliver Orjiako, Chris Cook, Brent Davis. Staff would also like to invite Kim van Zwalenburg from the Washington State Department of Ecology to attend the work session.

3. **TIME FRAME:**

LENGTH OF TIME NEEDED: 1 hour

DESIRED DATE: October 21, 2020

SCHEDULED DATE OF WORK SESSION: _____

4. **TIMING CONSIDERATIONS:** The county needs to submit to the Department of Ecology SMP amendments and periodic review documents by June 30, 2021. The Planning Commission held a remote work session and hearing on the project and has made a recommendation for Council consideration. The county is on track to meet the project due date as long as we can continue to move the project along through the legislative process. The project is largely funded through grant funds from the Department of Ecology, and funds are budgeted to be used during the 2020 county budget cycle.

5. **DESIRED RESULTS:** This work session would provide information on proposed amendments to the Shoreline Master Program and answer Council's questions about the project prior to a hearing. This work session would also confirm any next steps regarding policy items proposed by members of the public that are not included in the current proposed amendments.

6. **IMPACTS (COMMUNITY/FINANCIAL/STAFF/OTHER):** If Council is interested in being briefed on the Shoreline Master Program Periodic Review amendment proposal prior to a hearing, then this work session makes sense at this time. If Council would like to provide

policy direction to staff regarding policy-related public comments on the Shoreline Master Program, then this work session makes sense at this time.

7. **POLICY IMPLICATIONS**: The proposed amendments include updates to the Shoreline Master Program map, comprehensive plan text, and Title 40 development code. No major policy changes are being proposed. However, please see #8 below regarding policy-related comments received.
8. **ISSUES TO BE CONSIDERED**: Approximately 10 comments were submitted during a 30-day public comment period on the draft proposal. Approximately 5 additional comments/testimony were provided for the Planning Commission hearing. Staff will provide a comment summary and copies of comments as part of this work session. Staff are looking for Council policy direction regarding some of the comments received.
9. **RECOMMENDED ACTION**: At the end of the work session, the questions for Council are:
 1. What questions do you have about the shoreline periodic review proposal?
 2. What next steps would you like staff to take, if any, regarding policy comments received on the shoreline amendment proposal?

Signature of requestor:

oliver orjiako

DATE: 8-26-20

APPROVED FOR SCHEDULING: