

# Thurston County Board Briefing

<b><u>Briefing Date/Time:</u></b>	February 22, 2023   2:00-3:00 PM	
<b><u>Office/Department &amp; Staff Contact:</u></b>	<b>Community Planning &amp; Economic Development</b>  <b>Andrew Deffobis, ext. 5467</b>  <b>Christina Chaput, ext. 5475</b>  <b>Joshua Cummings, Director, ext. 4995</b>	
<b><u>Topic:</u></b>	Shoreline Master Program Update	
<b><u>Purpose:</u></b> (check all that apply)	<div> <input type="checkbox"/> Information only         </div> <div> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Decision needed         </div> <div> <input type="checkbox"/> Follow up from previous briefing         </div> <div>           Optimal Time Frame for Decision is:            (March 2023)         </div>	
<b><u>Synopsis/Request/Recommendation:</u></b>		
Staff will provide project background, an overview of issues requiring BOCC decision, and additional potential revisions that would clarify the implementation of the SMP and ensure it meets the requirements of State law. Changes requested by the BOCC will be reflected in the BOCC's public hearing draft.		
<b><u>Background</u></b>		
<p>Thurston County is updating its Shoreline Master Program (SMP), as required by the Shoreline Management Act (SMA, 90.58 RCW). The County's SMP update includes the necessary periodic and comprehensive changes to meet state law implemented since the current 1990 SMP was enacted.</p> <p>SMPs contain the goals, policies, and regulations that govern development and redevelopment within shoreline jurisdiction, are tailored to the needs of their local communities and must be consistent with the SMA and its implementing rules. In addition, the County SMP must demonstrate that it will result in no net loss of ecological function and requires approval from the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology).</p> <p>The County's SMP applies to "shorelines of the state," which generally include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Marine waters</li> <li>• Lakes and reservoirs 20 acres or greater</li> <li>• Rivers and creeks with a mean annual flow of 20 cubic feet per second or greater</li> <li>• Upland areas called shorelands that extend 200 feet landward from the edge of these waters</li> <li>• Floodways and contiguous floodplains within 200 feet of floodways</li> <li>• Associated wetlands</li> </ul> <p>It also applies to shorelines of statewide significance, as defined in RCW 90.58.030(2)(f). These areas are collectively referred to as "shoreline jurisdiction." Thurston County's draft SMP also includes regulated frequently flooded areas associated with shoreline waterbodies and the buffers necessary to</p>		

protect those critical areas which are partially or wholly within shoreline jurisdiction. This enables all permitting in shoreline areas to be conducted under one program.

#### Process To Date

The Planning Commission held approximately 80 work sessions on the SMP between June 2017 and August 2022, with a public hearing held in October 2021. The Planning Commission issued its recommendation on August 3, 2022. A minority report was also produced by four (4) members of the Planning Commission.

#### Decision Points for BOCC

The Planning Commission recommendation has undergone an informal review by Ecology, who have relayed their guidance to County staff. Attachment 'A' of this briefing includes several decision points for the BOCC derived from this work and topics of significant public and Planning Commission discussion. Decision points are separated into three categories:

- Main Decision Points, including select items which have had significant discussion to date by the Planning Commission and the public, and
- Ecology Indicated Required Items, which include changes to the Planning Commission recommendation that Ecology is likely to require before final approval of the SMP, and
- Ecology Indicated Helpful Items include proposed changes to increase clarity and aid implementation of the SMP, reduce redundancy or duplication, and ensure the protection of shoreline ecological function. Ecology may recommend that these items be addressed before final approval of the SMP

Staff will review the Main Decision Points with the BOCC at the February 22, 2023, briefing. Staff will also seek direction on the Ecology items in Attachment 'A' to guide the preparation of the BOCC's public hearing draft.

#### **Documents Attached:**

- Attachment A: SMP BOCC Decision Matrix

#### **Summary & Financial Impact:**

Staff is completing this work under the General Fund. CPED was also awarded an \$84,000 grant in 2020 to aid the updates to the SMP.

#### **Affected Parties:**

County residents, County departments (e.g., CPED, Public Works)

#### **Options with Pros & Cons:**

##### A. Main Decision Points

Staff will review the main decision points with the BOCC during the February 22, 2023 briefing to obtain guidance on how to proceed.

##### B. Ecology Indicated Required Items

**Option B-1: Incorporate proposed changes into BOCC public hearing draft.**

Pros:

- Increases likelihood the County SMP will be approved by Ecology without additional required changes.
- Provides a complete draft for the public to review for the public hearing.

Cons:

- Some items are contrary to Planning Commission recommendations.

**Option B-2: Do not make further changes to the draft SMP.**

Pros:

- Enables BOCC to schedule the public hearing sooner.

Cons:

- Ecology may require changes before SMP may be approved.

**C. Ecology Indicated Helpful Items**

**Option C-1: Incorporate proposed changes into BOCC public hearing draft.**

Pros:

- Increases clarity of the SMP and makes it easier to implement.
- Helps ensure the protection of shoreline ecological function.

Cons:

- Some items are contrary to Planning Commission recommendations.

**Option C-2: Do not make further changes to the draft SMP.**

Pros:

- Enables BOCC to schedule the public hearing sooner.

Cons:

- Ecology may recommend changes.

**Board Direction:**

Staff is requesting direction from the BOCC on what changes to bring forward or what additional information is required before a final draft is prepared for a public hearing.

**Next Steps/Timeframe:**

The BOCC should provide decisions on how to address the options provided in this briefing and in Attachment 'A'. Staff will make any necessary changes to the SMP documents before returning to request a public hearing before the BOCC. Staff anticipates requesting a public hearing for Q2 2023.

Additional steps in the process include SEPA review, completion of a Cumulative Impacts Analysis, a Board public hearing to take public comment, and a Board final decision. The County's SMP will then be sent to Ecology for review and approval.

	Thurston County SMP Update - BOCC Decision Matrix					
	Topic	Reference location	PC approved recommendation	Ecology relayed position	BoCC Decision (Maintain, Delete, Modify)	Notes
	BOCC Main Decision Points					
1	Shoreline buffer widths	19.400.120 (in general)	<b>Lake and Marine</b> 50 ft Shoreline Residential 100 ft Urban Conservancy 125 ft Rural Conservancy 200 ft Natural  <b>Streams</b> 250 ft (all designations)	<b>This buffer scheme is within the realm of justifiable</b> with revisions to ensure the “minimum necessary” approach and generally requiring a variance for buffer reduction, depending on what you see as you develop the Cumulative Impacts Analysis. WDFW advocated for retaining larger buffers from previous drafts of the SMP.	1. Retain buffers in PC recommendation.  2. Restore larger buffers from earlier drafts:  <b>Lake and Marine</b> 75/85 ft Shoreline Residential 125/250 ft Urban Conservancy 150/250 ft Rural Conservancy 250 ft Natural  <b>Streams</b> 250 ft (all designations)  3. Propose alternative buffer widths.	
2	Shoreline modification allowances in Natural Shoreline Environment Designations - Docks, floats, buoys, beach stairs	19.400.120(D), 19.600.105, 19.600.160	<u>Allow following in Natural SED with CUP:</u> Beach stairs Single Use Docks (marine) <u>Allow in Natural SED with SDP/AdSDP:</u> Floats Buoys Single Use Docks (lakes)	<b>Allowing new docks is inconsistent with the purpose and management policies of the Natural environment (WAC 173-26-211(5)(a)).</b> Recommend prohibiting them (allow joint use docks with CUP).  Ecology recommends prohibiting beach stairs in Natural SED (Allow with CUP if demonstrated to be necessary to provide access to a permitted moorage facility.)  WDFW suggests that dock restrictions remain on Natural shoreline designation to protect sensitive marine embayments, pocket estuaries, salt marsh, and lake fringe wetland habitats.	1. Retain permit requirements proposed in draft SMP.  2. Change permit requirements for shoreline modifications in the Natural SED:  --Prohibit single use docks in Natural SED (allow joint-use docks with CUP). --Prohibit beach stairs in Natural SED (allow for access to permitted moorage facility with a CUP). --Prohibit floats and buoys in Natural SED of lakes.	
3	Dimensional standards for mooring structures	19.600.160(C)(3)	Remove specific development standards for mooring structures (such as docks, piers, buoys) and reference WDFW Hydraulic Project Approval standards.	Ecology has indicated this is a workable approach.	1. Retain reference to HPA standards.  2. Restore specific development standards.	

	Thurston County SMP Update - BOCC Decision Matrix					
	Topic	Reference location	PC approved recommendation	Ecology relayed position	BoCC Decision (Maintain, Delete, Modify)	Notes
4	Referring to nonconforming uses	19.400.100, 19.150.247 & .592	Use the word "conforming" to refer to legally existing development that no longer conforms to modern permit and development standards (e.g. a home built close to shoreline before buffers were adopted).	<b>The proposed approach is inconsistent</b> with the requirement that the SMP’s regulations be of “sufficient scope and detail” to ensure implementation of the SMA (WAC 173-26-191(2)(a)(ii)(A)) and <b>is not approvable as drafted.</b>	1. Proceed with use of phrase "conforming" throughout document.  2.Use "legally nonconforming" throughout document. Clarify that SFRs may be considered "conforming" based on 2011 carve-out law (Note: Alterations of such structures must still meet SMP standards).  3. Use an alternate reference for said development, such as "nonconforming" or "legally existing nonconforming".	
5	Permit standards for bulkheads	19.600.175(A), 19.600.105	Hard Stabilization: Allow with SDP in all upland designations  Hybrid Stabilization: Allow with SDP in all upland designations	Ecology recommendation:  Hard stabilization: Prohibit in Natural SED in most cases (can make allowances for existing SFRs). Recommend administrative CUP for Conservancy SEDs.  Hybrid stabilization: Allow with CUP.	Previous versions of draft required CUPs for all new hard and hybrid stabilization.  1. Retain PC recommenation for stabilization permits.  2. Incorporate permit requirements recommended by Ecology.  3. Revert to previous draft: require CUP for all new hard stabilization; administrative CUP for hybrid or soft stabilization.	
Ecology Indicated Required Items						
6	References to critical areas within the SMP	Throughout		<b>References to critical area standards incorporated into SMP should be clear.</b> The CAO itself is not being adopted into the SMP, rather specific provisions from the CAO are being incorporated, and included in Appendix E of the SMP for reference.	1. Amend references to critical areas in SMP for clarity and accuracy.  2. Retain references to critical areas proposed in draft SMP as-is.	
7	Allowing bulkheads for eutrophic lakes	19.150.210, 19.600.175(B)(2), 19.600.175(D)(2)(c)(v)	PC included an additional allowance for bulkheads on eutrophic lakes in addition to what is permitted by WAC, to prevent erosion and introduction of sediment.	This is inconsistent with the WAC and should be removed.	1. Remove specific allowances for bulkheads in eutrophic lakes to ensure consistency with WAC.  2. Retain allowance for bulkheads in eutrophic lakes proposed in draft SMP.	
8	Definition of floodway	19.150.379.5	PC recommendation includes a definition of floodway that is used in other county codes.	There are two statutory definitions. The County’s definition must be consistent with one of them.	1. Use WAC definition but also referring to floodway definition used in other codes to ensure consistency.  2. Retain definition proposed in draft SMP.	
9	Definition of mitigation sequencing	19.150.560		Refer to WAC for appropriate language to describe mitigation sequencing.	1. Amend definition for consistency with WAC.  2. Retain definition proposed in draft SMP.	

	Thurston County SMP Update - BOCC Decision Matrix					
	Topic	Reference location	PC approved recommendation	Ecology relayed position	BoCC Decision (Maintain, Delete, Modify)	Notes
10	Dollar thresholds in substantial development permit exemption definition	19.150.770	PC included updated cost thresholds in other sections of SMP	Recommend using updated dollar thresholds in document.	1. Update cost thresholds for SDP exemptions to the most current dollar amounts. 2. Retain cost thresholds proposed in draft SMP.	
11	Reference to wetlands in shoreline jurisdiction definition	19.200.109(A)(6)	PC recommendation implies that wetlands are separate from shorelands.	<b>Reference to shorelands is incorrect (RCW 90.58.030(2)(d)).</b> Associated wetlands are included in the definition of “shorelands”; they are not included in SMP jurisdiction <u>in addition to</u> shorelands.	1. Amend reference to wetlands within shorelands for consistency with WAC. 2. Do not amend reference to wetlands within shorelands.	
12	Referencing WAC substantial development permit exemption criteria in Existing Structures regulations	19.400.100(B)(1)(g)	PC intended to allow alterations of structures within existing footprint without an SDP.	Exemption criteria in the WAC control how exemptions may be authorized in SMP.	1. Insert reference to WAC SDP exemptions standards (retains PC intent; clarifies that WAC controls such exemptions) 2. Do not amend statement text proposed in SMP.	
13	Referencing WAC regarding allowances for floating homes to be considered conforming	19.400.100(B)(4)		<b>Revisions required for consistency with statute.</b> This section is combining and conflating a few different topics covered in RCW 90.58.270.	1. Insert language from WAC to clarify how certain existing floating homes/floating on-water residences may be considered conforming. 2. Do not insert WAC language.	
14	Locating structures on constrained lots to prevent need for shoreline stabilization	19.400.105(A)(3)	New development on lots constrained by depth, topography or critical areas shall be located to <u>minimize</u> , to the extent feasible, the need for shoreline stabilization.	<b>This provision is inconsistent with WAC 173-26-231(3)(a)(iii).</b> Such development would require a shoreline variance.	1. Replace "minimize" with "avoid" to be more consistent with statute. 2. Do not make change in draft SMP.	
15	Monitoring requirements for advanced mitigation projects	19.400.110(C)(2)	As written, PC recommendation allows mitigation project monitoring to end after 2 monitoring periods.	As written, is not adequate to document success of mitigation projects.	1. Clarify that monitoring will occur for a minimum of 5 years, and until mitigation success is demonstrated by meeting all performance standards. (This was original intent of this provision--the original draft was not clear.) 2. Retain proposed language in draft SMP.	
16	Addressing critical areas in SMP jurisdiction	19.400.115 (multiple places within)	PC recommendation discusses relationship between critical areas and shorelines. Revisions could increase clarity of document while preserving intent of PC recommendation.	<b>Ecology staff have indicated that the relationship between critical areas and shoreline regulations is not entirely clear in the draft SMP.</b> County staff and Ecology staff have worked together to propose text changes to increase clarity for staff and the public, and to guide implementation.	1. Amend draft SMP to increase clarity on relationship between critical areas and shorelines. 2. Do not make change in draft SMP.	
17	Shoreline buffer reductions - general proposed changes	19.400.120(B)(2), (3), & (4)		<b>As written, this section is not implementable.</b> County staff have worked with Ecology to reduce implementation gaps and clarify how buffer reductions work.	1. Implement various amendments to shoreline buffer reductions. 2. Do not make change in draft SMP.	

	Thurston County SMP Update - BOCC Decision Matrix					
	Topic	Reference location	PC approved recommendation	Ecology relayed position	BoCC Decision (Maintain, Delete, Modify)	Notes
18	Clarifying buffer reductions for streams	19.400.120(B)(3)	PC recommendation does not draw distinction between how stream and marine/lake buffer reductions would be managed. Stream buffers are larger to start out with and may require different buffer reduction standards.	<b>Reducing a 250' buffer down to 50'-150' is not appropriate or supported by science.</b> In general, a 25% buffer reduction is supported.	1. Amend text to allow 25% reduction of stream buffer, and relocate this text for increased clarity.  2. Retain language in proposed SMP (allows larger reductions).	
19	Clarifying buffer reduction requirements in Urban Conservancy SED	19.400.120(B)(3)(b)	Reduced buffer width is 75-90 feet in this SED. As written, the language implies buffer may be even smaller.	Recommend clarifying intent of language.	1. Clarify that buffer reductions in a range of 75-90 feet are authorized by this section.  2. Do not make change in draft SMP.	
20	Characterization of shoreline setback	19.400.120(B)(5)	Included statement that setback is intended to protect buffer during construction and is not needed after construction.	<b>Delete incorrect language that states setback is no longer needed after construction.</b> The setback allows room for maintenance access outside of the buffer for the life of the structure.	1. Remove incorrect language and also clarify that a lack of a shoreline setback shall not preclude maintenance of legally existing structures.  2. Do not make change in draft SMP.	
21	Relocating text relating to water-dependent development from constrained lot section	19.400.120(C)(1)	PC recommendation implies that buffers apply to water dependent development.	<b>It does not make sense to provide alternative buffer options for water-dependent development.</b> Water-dependent development is already allowed in the buffer; it just has to mitigate to ensure no net loss.	1. Remove reference to water-dependent development, and relocate accompanying text on water-dependent development to more appropriate section of SMP. Expand to clarify how different types of water-oriented development is managed, and that this development may be sited in buffers if no net loss criteria is met.  2. Do not change or relocate text.	
22	Providing mitigation sequencing context to allowances for decks/platforms in buffers	19.400.120(D)(1)(b)	PC recommendation increases allowances for decks and platforms in buffers.	Revisions needed to bring this allowance into consistency with mitigation sequencing.	1. Introduce amendments to text to highlight that decks/platforms in buffer must be minimum size necessary to support permitted use, and shall encroach on buffer the minimum amount necessary.  2. Do not include these provisions in the draft SMP.	
23	Correcting reference to floating residences in dimensional standards table	Table 19.400.140(A)	PC recommendation draft uses the phrase "boat houses" in correlation with WAC that speaks to floating homes/floating on-water residences, which is technically incorrect.	Recommend revising text for consistency with RCW.	1. Change reference to floating homes/floating on-water residences for consistency with RCW.  2. Do not make change in draft SMP.	
24	Waiver of public access requirements	19.400.145(A)(5)(d)	PC recommendation allows waiver of public access requirements if cost of providing them is disproportionate to total project cost.	<b>Recommend revision to align with the purpose of requiring public access, consistent w/the policy directives of the Act</b> - allow waiver if cost of providing access is disproportionate to the project's impact on public access.	1. Revise public access waiver.  2. Do not make change in draft SMP.	

	Thurston County SMP Update - BOCC Decision Matrix					
	Topic	Reference location	PC approved recommendation	Ecology relayed position	BoCC Decision (Maintain, Delete, Modify)	Notes
25	Use of "E" for projects that are exempt from SDP requirement	19.600.105 Table (general)	PC recommendation denotes projects that are exempt from an SDP with an "E" for Exempt, vs. "P" for SDP.	<b>Calling only certain uses/mods out is misleading and can lead to incorrect assumptions and implementation.</b> In general, Ecy staff do not recommend identifying uses and modifications as exempt in the table. Any one of the uses/mods in the table may qualify for an SSDP exemption if the proposal meets the criteria in WAC 173-27-040.	1. Recharacterize any uses/modifications currently shown as "Exempt" to "P" (for SDP). Use legend to explain that projects meeting exemption criteria will be exempt from SDP.  2. Do not make change in draft SMP - continue to use "E" for Exempt.	
26	Permit standards for dredge disposal	19.600.105 Table - Dredge Disposal, 19.600.135	PC recommendation proposes the following permit standards:  Natural SED: CUP  Rural/Urban Conservancy SED: Administrative SDP	<b>Dredge disposal in the Natural environment, except for ecological restoration, is inconsistent with the purpose of the designation (WAC 173-26-211(5)(a)).</b> Rural Conservancy and Urban Conservancy designations also prioritize protection of ecological function. Disposal of dredge materials in these environments warrants additional scrutiny and analysis of cumulative impacts. Recommend:  Natural: Prohibited Rural/Urban Conservancy: CUP or Administrative CUP	1. Change permit requirements for dredge disposal.  2. Do not change permit requirements for dredge disposal.	
27	Permit standards for flood hazard reduction measures	19.600.105 Table - Flood Hazard Reduction Measures, 19.400.150(A)	Natural SED: SDP Rural Conservancy SED: SDP	Given the extent of floodplain and floodway included in the County's shoreline jurisdiction (i.e. all of it), <b>there needs to be more scrutiny applied to proposals to install new flood control structures.</b> These can have a significant impact on shoreline ecological functions and processes. Recommend:  Natural SED: Prohibited Rural Conservancy: CUP	1. Change permit requirements for flood hazard reduction measures.  2. Do not change permit requirements for flood hazard reduction measures.	
28	Permit standards for boat houses	19.600.105 Table - Mooring Structures	PC recommendation mentions permit standards in text of SMP, but not in the land use table.	[Note: This item was observed by County staff, but general guidance from Ecology has included ensuring consistency between the land use table and text sections of the SMP.]	1. Include permit standards for boat houses in the land use table, for internal consistency.  2. Do not make change in draft SMP.	
29	Reducing required mitigation when providing public access	Appendix B - Section B.1.J	PC recommendation allows project mitigation to be reduced by half when public access is provided.	As written, this is inconsistent with no net loss requirements.	1. Make changes to this section for consistency with statute.  2. Do not make change in draft SMP.	
30	Implementation of mitigation for shoreline stabilization/barrier structures	Appendix B - Section B.3		In general this section needs more language/explanation to be implementable.	1. Include additional context and reorganization of this section of the draft SMP.  2. Do not make change in draft SMP.	
	<b>Ecology Indicated Helpful Items</b>					
31	Minor sentence rewording for clarity	Throughout		Suggest minor wording/phrasing revisions for clarity.	1. Implement minor wording/phrasing revisions.  2. Do not implement minor wording/phrasing revisions.	



Thurston County SMP Update - BOCC Decision Matrix						
	Topic	Reference location	PC approved recommendation	Ecology relayed position	BoCC Decision (Maintain, Delete, Modify)	Notes
32	Minor technical corrections	Throughout		<p>Examples:</p> <p>SMP amendment not required to remove annexed land from County's SMP jurisdiction. (19.100.120(D))</p> <p>Recommend deleting reference to dock setbacks; it does not belong here (19.400.120(D)(1)(e)(iv))</p>	<p>1. Implement minor technical corrections.</p> <p>2. Do not implement minor technical corrections.</p>	
33	Minor revisions or relocations to aid comprehension, implementation, or reduce redundancy/duplication	Throughout. Examples at right		<p>Examples:</p> <p>--Recommend simplifying references to shorelines that are regulated by the SMP. (19.100.130)(F)</p> <p>--Insert "buffer and" to clarify that this language applies to expansions outside both the shoreline buffer and setback. (19.400.100)(B)(1)(c))</p> <p>--Clarify how expansions of existing structures within the buffer are addressed. (19.400.120(B)(1))</p> <p>--Add "parallel to OHWM" to clarify where this provision applies. (19.400.100(B)(1)(e))</p> <p>--Recommend adding note that vegetation conservation buffers may also be referred to as shoreline buffers. (19.400.100(B)(1)(f))</p> <p>--Recommend removing 'Alternatives for Existing Development' section - this language is covered elsewhere. (19.400.120(C)(2))</p> <p>--Relocating standards for beach stairs in the land use table (Table 19.600.105)</p>	<p>1. Include minor revisions to increase clarity and comprehension, reduce redundancy and duplication, and aid implementation of the draft SMP.</p> <p>2. Do not make changes to the draft SMP.</p>	
34	Recommended additions/modifications to definitions	Various	Some terms used in the PC recommendation are not defined in the document.	<p><u>Recommend adding definitions for:</u></p> <p>Beach stairs (19.150.167)</p> <p>Shoreline Jurisdiction (19.150.714)</p> <p>Stair Tower (19.150.747)</p> <p><u>Recommend modifying select definitions:</u></p> <p>Guidelines (19.150.395): Clarify that Chapter 173-27 WAC is not SMP guidelines.</p> <p>Pervious Surface (19.150.615): Clarify that decks may be considered pervious (already stated elsewhere in document)</p> <p>Prohibited (19.150.645): Remove extraneous language.</p>	<p>1. Implement proposed changes to SMP definitions.</p> <p>2. Do not make changes to draft SMP.</p>	
35	Update formatting, numbering, internal code references, spelling	Throughout			<p>1. Implement minor changes in draft SMP.</p> <p>2. Do not make changes to draft SMP.</p>	
36	Parallel shoreline environment designation scenarios	19.200.145(A)(6)	PC recommendation excludes some possible scenarios of how parallel shoreline designations may be interpreted.	[Note: This issue was observed by County staff.]	<p>1. Include additional language to aid interpretation of shoreline designations.</p> <p>2. Do not make changes to draft SMP.</p>	
37	Determining when parcels disconnected from shoreline are subject to SMP	19.200.145(A)(9)	PC recommendation does not stipulate how these determinations are made.	Recommend adding language that the Director shall make determinations on which standards apply to properties with a distinct break in connectivity to the shoreline.	<p>1. Include language clarifying that the Director shall make determinations of when SMP standards apply.</p> <p>2. Do not make change in draft SMP.</p>	

	Thurston County SMP Update - BOCC Decision Matrix					
	Topic	Reference location	PC approved recommendation	Ecology relayed position	BoCC Decision (Maintain, Delete, Modify)	Notes
38	Inserting a preamble for nonconforming uses	19.400	This language was removed from the PC recommendation draft when the term 'conforming' was employed to refer to legally nonconforming uses/structures/lots.	This language could be added back in to provide additional context for what nonconforming uses/structures/lots are and how they are addressed in SMP.	1. Re-establish preamble for nonconforming uses to provide context for how these uses are managed in SMP. 2. Do not make change in draft SMP.	
39	Internal consistency - variances for buffer reductions	19.400.105(A)(6)	PC recommendation stipulates when variances are required for buffer reductions, but that is not referenced here.	Proposed language to alert reader that a variance may be required to locate a structure within the buffer, per other sections of SMP.	1. Include proposed language in draft SMP. 2. Do not include proposed language in draft SMP.	
40	Internal consistency - water depending uses in buffers, mitigation sequencing required	19.400.105(B)(1)	This section of PC recommendation is not entirely clear as written.	Revisions recommended to clarify that water-dependent uses are allowed in buffers, subject to mitigation sequencing.	1. Include clarification in draft SMP. 2. Do not make change in draft SMP.	
41	Clarifying effective date and requirements for advanced mitigation projects	19.400.110(B)(5)	PC recommendation does not stipulate a start date for when advanced mitigation projects may be considered for use.	[Note: Effective date issue was observed by County staff.]  Recommend language that indicates all requirements of this section must be met in order to qualify for advanced mitigation.	1. Make proposed changes to draft SMP. 2. Do not make changes in draft SMP.	
42	Advising applicants of other agency approvals for advanced mitigation projects	19.400.110(B)(5)(a)	PC recommendation does not include this language as written.	Ecology suggests adding a requirement that all other applicable permits be obtained, at least to put it on the applicant's radar.	1. Add reminder to applicants that other agency approvals may be required for advanced mitigation projects. 2. Do not make change in draft SMP.	
43	Clarifying reporting requirements for advanced mitigation projects	19.400.110(C)(2)	PC recommendation does not specify that monitoring reports must be submitted to County, or that maintenance criteria and a monitoring schedules is part of an applicant's mitigation plan.	[Note: These issues where observed by County staff.]	1. Make proposed changes to draft SMP. 2. Do not make changes in draft SMP.	
44	Should/shall for avoiding extensive vegetation removal	19.400.120(A)(3)	PC recommendation states that extensive vegetation removal to create views/expansive lawns <u>should</u> not be allowed within shoreline jurisdiction.	If this is a requirement, the word "shall" should be used. "Should" is for policy language.	1. Change language to "shall" to prohibit extensive vegetation removal for lawns/views within shoreline jurisdiction. 2. Do not make change in draft SMP.	
45	Adding a reference to critical area buffers in shoreline buffers section	19.400.120(B)(6)	PC recommendation does not include this language as written.	Recommend adding language to remind reader that critical area buffers also apply within shoreline jurisdiction.	1. Include reminder that critical area buffers also apply in shoreline jurisdiction. 2. Do not make change in draft SMP.	
46	Reorganizing constrained lot provisions for single family homes	19.400.120(C)(1)		Revisions proposed to this section to retain its intent while resolving the inconsistencies and duplicities with the variance criteria. Also propose removing reference to Inventory & Characterization document; mitigation plans should rely on existing conditions. [Staff note: Proposed changes make use of statutory carve-out to waive or reduce variance requirements for single family homes/garages with a combined footprint of less than 1,200 square feet].	1. Make proposed changes to draft SMP. 2. Do not make changes in draft SMP.	

	Thurston County SMP Update - BOCC Decision Matrix					
	Topic	Reference location	PC approved recommendation	Ecology relayed position	BoCC Decision (Maintain, Delete, Modify)	Notes
47	Clarifying trail requirements	19.400.120(D)(1)(a)		This section needs to be rewritten/reorganized.	1. Reorganize trail standards for clarity.  2. Do not make changes in draft SMP.	
48	Requiring pervious surface for viewing platforms and decks	19.400.120(D)(1)(b)	PC recommendation does not currently require this.	Recommend requiring viewing platforms and decks to be constructed of pervious surface.	1. Require viewing platforms and decks to be constructed of pervious surface (this can include wooden decks with gaps between boards if ground is not compacted).  2. Do not make change in draft SMP.	
49	Prohibiting beach stairs below Ordinary High Water Mark	19.400.120(D)(1)(c)	PC recommendation prohibits these in the land use table, but allows them in the text.	Ecology has indicated it is appropriate to prohibit beach stairs below the ordinary high water mark. (Note: If they are allowed, permit requirements must be identified.)	1. Prohibit beach stairs below ordinary high water mark.  2. Do not prohibit beach stairs below the ordinary high water mark.	
50	Expanding use of water-oriented storage structures	19.400.120(D)(1)(e)	PC recommendation is written more narrowly than suggested language.	Recommend broadening use of water-oriented storage structure-- allow as accessory to water-dependent uses or to support residential access.	1. Expand the scenarios where water-oriented storage structures may be utilized.  2. Do not make change in draft SMP.	
51	Use of water-oriented storage structure roofs for recreation	19.400.120(D)(1)(e)(v & vi)	PC recommendation does not allow roofs of storage structures to be used as recreational platforms.	[Note: This is a County staff suggestion to enable recreational use of the shoreline. Ecology has indicated support for this allowance.]	1. Include language to clarify that storage structure roofs may be used as viewing platforms.  2. Do not make change in draft SMP.	
52	Additional detail for mitigation of hazard tree removal	19.400.120(D)(4)(b)	PC recommendation does not include this specificity as written.	Recommend additional criteria to guide replacement plantings when hazard trees are removed.	1. Include additional language to guide replacement plantings after hazard tree removal.  2. Do not make change in draft SMP.	
53	Development standards for fences in shoreline jurisdiction	19.400.120(D)(5)	PC recommendation does not include this specificity as written.	Recommend adding provisions here to specify height, materials, alignment (e.g. perpendicular to the shoreline), avoidance of vegetation, mitigation to ensure NNL	1. Include development standards for fences in shoreline jurisdiction. May reference standards that already exist in other county codes.  2. Do not make change in draft SMP.	
54	Development standards for nonstructural flood hazard mitigation measures	19.400.150(B)(4-6)	PC recommendation did not apply this section to nonstructural flood hazard mitigation measures.	Ecology commented that the draft had no nonstructural flood hazard reduction measure standards. Applying the standards in this section to all flood hazard reduction measures would address this issue.	1. Apply one set of standards to all types of flood hazard mitigation measures.  2. Do not make change in draft SMP.	
55	Abbreviation for administrative conditional use permits in land use table	19.600.105 Table (general)	PC recommendation uses "C" for Conditional Use Permits.	Unless this is a convention used elsewhere in County code, I recommend “AdC” for administrative CUP to be consistent w/”AdP” and make it clear the conditional use is required.	1. Change abbreviation used for administrative conditional use permits, for internal consistency.  2. Do not make change in draft SMP.	
56	Non-water-oriented industrial uses in Shoreline Residential SED	19.600.105 Table - Industrial Uses	PC recommendation currently allows non-water-dependent industrial uses in Shoreline Residential SED in limited circumstances.	Recommend prohibiting non-water-dependent industrial uses in Shoreline Residential SED, as water-dependent industrial uses are already prohibited.	1. Prohibit non-water-oriented industrial uses in Shoreline Residential SED (water-oriented industrial uses already prohibited).  2. Do not make change in draft SMP.	

	Thurston County SMP Update - BOCC Decision Matrix					
	Topic	Reference location	PC approved recommendation	Ecology relayed position	BoCC Decision (Maintain, Delete, Modify)	Notes
57	Recreational development - permit footnote	19.600.105 Table - Footnote 13		Footnote that discusses permit standards is unclear.	1. Clarify permit standards for recreational development. 2. Do not make change in draft SMP.	
58	Recreational development - buffer footnote	19.600.105 Table - Footnote 14	PC recommendation has specific reference to buffer standards for non-water oriented recreational development.	Recommend deleting; all non-water oriented uses are subject to buffer standards. This footnote doesn't make sense.	1. Delete footnote. 2. Retain footnote.	
59	Permit standards for shoreline stabilization - Aquatic SED	19.600.105 Table - Shoreline Stabilization, 19.600.175	These cells are blank in the PC recommendation. Footnotes state hard stabilization may be permitted with a CUP, and soft stabilization with an SDP.	Recommend including permit standards for shoreline stabilization in Aquatic SED (CUP for hard/hybrid stabilization, SDP for soft stabilization).	1. Include permit standards for shoreline stabilization in the land use table, for internal consistency. 2. Do not make change in draft SMP.	
60	Shoreline stabilization - substantial development permit footnote	19.600.105 Table - Footnote 17	PC recommendation provides specific call-out for SDP exemption for qualifying soft stabilization.	Any development that meets SDP exemption criteria would be exempt from that permit - this doesn't need to be called out here.	1. Strike footnote. 2. Retain footnote.	
61	Separation of primary and accessory utilities in land use table & footnotes	19.600.105 Table - Utilities	PC recommendation combines permit standards for primary and accessory utilities.	Recommend separating into “primary” and “accessory”, simplify footnotes.	1. Separate permit standards for primary and accessory utilities. 2. Do not make change in draft SMP.	
62	Inserting footnote to clarify when beach stairs are authorized	19.600.105 Table - Footnotes	Other sections of PC recommendation state that water-oriented use is required before allowing beach stairs. The land use table does not include this language.	In general, Ecology has indicated it is appropriate to include reminders in the land use table or text for clarity and internal consistency.	1. Make proposed change to draft SMP. 2. Do not make changes in draft SMP.	
63	Including an applicability section for marinas	19.600.125(C)(2)	PC recommendation does not include this language as written.	Recommend adding an “applicability” section that refers to the County’s definition/threshold for marinas (i.e. moorage facility for ten or more vessels). (Staff note: In general, Ecology has advocated for providing appropriate context in each section of the SMP.)	1. Make proposed change to draft SMP. 2. Do not make changes in draft SMP.	
64	Additional standards for advanced mitigation plans	19.700.112(C)(2), (7), and (13)	PC recommendation does not include this language as written.	Recommend adding additional requirements for advanced mitigation plans. (Note: County staff recommend cross-referencing other Ecology recommendations in this section for internal consistency.)	1. Make proposed change to draft SMP. 2. Do not make changes in draft SMP.	
65	Including an applicability section for general mitigation standards	Appendix B - Section B.1	PC recommendation does not include this language as written.	Suggest opening with an applicability statement.	1. Make proposed change to draft SMP. 2. Do not make changes in draft SMP.	
66	Clarification on mitigation requirements - replacement vegetation	Appendix B - Section B.2.A	PC recommendation does not include this language as written.	This section is currently lacking standards for replacement vegetation, i.e. composition of native and/or non-native vegetation used as mitigation.	1. Include additional standards to clarify that replacement vegetation must be "like for like". 2. Do not make change in draft SMP.	

	Thurston County SMP Update - BOCC Decision Matrix					
	Topic	Reference location	PC approved recommendation	Ecology relayed position	BoCC Decision (Maintain, Delete, Modify)	Notes
67	Use of non-native vegetation in replanting requirements	Appendix B - Section B.2.A	PC recommendation included the concept of using non-native vegetation in mitigation planting. PC requested Ecology weigh in on an approach to implement this.	Concept is consistent with statute. Ecology proposed restrictions to the types of situations in which non-native vegetation may be used for compensatory mitigation.	1. Make proposed changes to draft SMP. 2. Do not make changes in draft SMP.	
68	Reference to county in-lieu fee program	Appendix B - Section B.5.B	PC recommendation includes reference to wetland (critical area) mitigation.	Since this appendix is limited to shoreline buffer and in-water impacts, suggest deleting.	1. Delete reference to critical areas mitigation (this chapter is specifically intended for shorelines). 2. Do not make change in draft SMP.	