

Row	Summary of change	Review	Action
2017			
a.	The Washington State Office of Financial Management (OFM) adjusted the <b>cost threshold for substantial development</b> to \$7,047.	Section 7.6.3 references WAC 173-27-040 and cites a cost threshold of \$5,718. Definition for “Exemption” (Section 8(A) references WAC 173-27-040. Definition for “Substantial Development” references RCW 90.58.030(3)(e).  <b>Relevant Sections:</b> Section 7.6.3, definitions for “Exemption” and “Substantial Development”.	<b>Mandatory:</b> Update language in Section 7.6.3 to cite the updated cost threshold.  <b>Note:</b> This section becomes section 7.8.3 in revised draft (page 7-5).
b.	Ecology amended rules to clarify that the <b>definition of “development”</b> does not include dismantling or removing structures.	The SMP does not clarify that removing structures does not constitute development.  <b>Relevant Section:</b> Definition for “Development”.	<b>Mandatory:</b> Revise definition of “Development.” Ecology has provided suggested language.  <b>Note:</b> Development definition revised in Section 8 Definitions (Page 8-5).
c.	Ecology adopted rules that clarify <b>exceptions to local review under the SMA.</b>	The SMP refers to exemptions under WAC 173-27-040, but does not refer to exceptions under WAC 173-27-044 or -045.	<b>Mandatory:</b> Add reference to statutory exceptions.  <b>Note:</b> Section 7.3 Exceptions added, page 7-2.

<b>Row</b>	<b>Summary of change</b>	<b>Review</b>	<b>Action</b>
		<b>Relevant Section:</b> Section 7.6.3.	
<b>d.</b>	Ecology amended rules that clarify <b>permit filing procedures</b> consistent with a 2011 statute.	Sections 7.10(D) references RCW 90.58.140 and Section 7.11(A) references RCW 90.58.140 and WAC 173-27-130.  <b>Relevant Sections:</b> Section 7.10(D) and 7.11(A)	<b>Recommended:</b> Modify language for consistency with Ecology’s recommended language.  <b>Note:</b> Added @ 7.13 and 7.15 (pages 7-13 and 7-14).
<b>e.</b>	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.	Forest practices are prohibited in South Prairie’s SMP.  <b>Relevant Sections:</b> Section 3.2.3, Table 3-1, page 3-5.	<b>No change needed.</b>  <b>Note:</b> Forestry practices are prohibited in the SMP.
<b>f.</b>	Ecology clarified the SMA does not apply to lands under <b>exclusive federal jurisdiction</b>	The SMP does not address federal lands.	<b>No change needed.</b>
<b>g.</b>	Ecology clarified “default” provisions for <b>nonconforming uses and development.</b>	Section 6 of the SMP establishes the Town’s provisions for nonconforming uses and developments.  <b>Relevant Sections:</b> Section 6, definition of “Nonconforming use or development” (Section 8(N)).	<b>Optional:</b> Consider updating language for clarity, including updating definitions to define nonconforming structures, uses, and lots.  <b>Note:</b> Updates made to Section 6 (page 6-1) and to Section 8 (page 8-13).

<b>Row</b>	<b>Summary of change</b>	<b>Review</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>h.</b>	Ecology adopted rule amendments to clarify the scope and process for conducting <b>periodic reviews</b> .	The SMP includes reference to RCW 90.58.080, but not to WAC 173-26-090.  <b>Relevant Section:</b> Section 7.1.3	<b>Optional:</b> Consider updating language for periodic review process through reference to RCW 90.58.080 and WAC 173-26-090.  <b>Note:</b> Added to Section 7.1.3, page 7-2.
<b>i.</b>	Ecology adopted a new rule creating an <b>optional SMP amendment process</b> that allows for a shared local/state public comment period.	The SMP establishes amendment procedure through reference to WAC 173-26-100.  <b>Relevant Sections:</b> Section 7.1.3	<b>Optional:</b> Consider updating language to include reference to optional joint notice process for SMP amendments (WAC 173-26-104).  <b>Note:</b> Added to Section 7.1.3.B, page 7-2.
<b>j.</b>	<b>Submittal</b> to Ecology of proposed SMP amendments.	The SMP does not include discussion of SMP amendment submittal to Ecology.	<b>Optional:</b> Consider updating language to include reference to submittal process for SMP amendments (WAC 173-26-110).  <b>Note:</b> Added to Section 7.1.3.B, page 7-2.
<b>2016</b>			
<b>a.</b>	The Legislature created a new shoreline permit exemption for retrofitting existing structures to	Section 7.6.3 references WAC 173-27-040 and RCW 90.58. <b>Relevant Section:</b> Section 7.6.3.	<b>No change needed.</b>  <b>Note:</b> This section becomes 7.8.3, page 7-5. The word

<b>Row</b>	<b>Summary of change</b>	<b>Review</b>	<b>Action</b>
	comply with the <b>Americans with Disabilities Act</b> .		“listed” becomes “summarized.”
<b>b.</b>	Ecology updated <b>wetlands critical areas guidance</b> including implementation guidance for the 2014 wetlands rating system.	SMP Appendix B (B.2.2) references 2004 wetland rating system. CAO (Chapter 18.13.020 WMC) references 2004 wetland rating system.  <b>Relevant Sections:</b> SMP Appendix B.	<b>Mandatory:</b> Revise SMP Appendix B to reference 2014 wetland rating system.  <b>Note:</b> Appendix B amended to reference 2014 Wetland Rating System at Sections 2.2 (page B-8) and 2.4 (page B-9) and Section 2.5 (page B-13).
<b>2015</b>			
<b>a.</b>	The Legislature adopted a <b>90-day target</b> for local review of Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) projects.	The SMP does not address this.	<b>Optional:</b> Consider amending SMP to define special procedures for WSDOT projects per WAC 173-27-125.  <b>Note:</b> Added new Section 7.14.1, page 7-14.
<b>2014</b>			
<b>a.</b>	The Legislature raised the cost threshold for requiring a Substantial Development Permit (SDP) for <b>replacement docks on lakes and rivers</b> to \$20,000 (from \$10,000).	The SMP references WAC 173-27-040 and RCW 90.58 and does not address cost threshold for docks directly. Docks are not applicable to South Prairie Creek.  <b>Relevant Sections:</b> Section 7.6.3, definitions for	<b>No change needed.</b>  <b>Note:</b> Docks are prohibited in SMP (See Section 3.2.3 Table 3-1, page 3-5). Section 7.8 (formerly Section 7.6) does not include dock exemption.

<i>Row</i>	<i>Summary of change</i>	<i>Review</i>	<i>Action</i>
		“Exemption” and “Substantial Development”.	
<b>b.</b>	The Legislature created a new definition and policy for <b>floating on-water residences</b> legally established before 7/1/2014.	Section 5.8.2(D) prohibits new overwater residences.  <b>Relevant Section:</b> Section 5.8.2(D).	<b>No change needed.</b> South Prairie has no existing floating on-water residences.
<b>2012</b>			
<b>a.</b>	The Legislature amended the SMA to clarify <b>SMP appeal procedures</b> .	South Prairie’s SMP does not outline the SMP appeal process.	<b>No change needed.</b>  <b>Note:</b> Section 7.15 Appeals to the SHB amended, page 7-14.
<b>2011</b>			
<b>a.</b>	Ecology adopted a rule requiring that wetlands be delineated in accordance with the approved <b>federal wetland delineation manual</b> .	Section B.2.1 of SMP Appendix B references the state delineation manual.  <b>Relevant Sections:</b> SMP Appendix B B.2.1	<b>Mandatory:</b> Amend language of SMP Appendix B to reference the approved federal delineation manual. Ecology has provided suggested language.  <b>Note:</b> Appendix B, Section 2.1 amended, pages B-7 and B-8.
<b>b.</b>	Ecology adopted rules for new commercial <b>geoduck aquaculture</b> .	Not applicable: South Prairie has no saltwater shorelines.	<b>Not applicable.</b>
<b>c.</b>	The Legislature created a new definition and policy for <b>floating homes</b> permitted or legally	Section 5.8.2(D) prohibits new overwater residences.	<b>No change needed.</b> South Prairie has no existing floating on-water residences.

<b>Row</b>	<b>Summary of change</b>	<b>Review</b>	<b>Action</b>
	established prior to January 1, 2011.	<b>Relevant Section:</b> Section 5.8.2(D).	
d.	The Legislature authorized a new <b>option to classify existing structures as conforming.</b>	SMP Section 6.1 Policies classifies existing legal uses and structures as legally nonconforming and Section 6.2 Standards allows for expansion of the structure if nonconformity is not increased and there is no net loss of ecological functions.  <b>Relevant Section:</b> Section 6	<b>No change needed.</b>  <b>Note:</b> Updates made to Section 6 (page 6-1) and to Section 8 (page 8-13) for clarity.
<b>2010</b>			
a.	The Legislature adopted <b>Growth Management Act – Shoreline Management Act clarifications.</b>	Shoreline critical areas are addressed in Appendix B. The current SMP and critical areas ordinance were adopted in 2015. The SMP includes no net loss provisions. The SMP states that amendments to the SMP shall become effectively immediately upon approval and adoption by Ecology.  <b>Relevant Section:</b> SMP Appendix B, SMP Section 1.8	<b>Recommended:</b> Revise Section 1.8 to clarify that SMP amendments are effective 14 days from Ecology’s written notice of final action.  <b>Note:</b> Section 1.8, page 1-3 amended.

Row	Summary of change	Review	Action
2009			
a.	The Legislature created new “relief” procedures for instances in which a <b>shoreline restoration project within a UGA</b> creates a shift in Ordinary High-Water Mark.	The SMP references RCW 90.58.580 regarding potential relief in the event that a shoreline restoration project shifts the OHWM landward.	<b>Optional:</b> Update reference to relief procedure for shoreline restoration projects within a UGA for clarity and consistency with current procedure and criteria (WAC 173-27-215)  <b>Note:</b> Added to Section 5.9.2(H), page 5-15.
b.	Ecology adopted a rule for certifying <b>wetland mitigation banks</b> .	The SMP and South Prairie’s CAO authorize the use of mitigation banks.  <b>Relevant Sections:</b> SMP Section 5.9.1(F), SMP Appendix B Sections B.1.8(E) and B.2.5(G).	<b>No change needed.</b>
c.	The Legislature added <b>moratoria authority</b> and procedures to the SMA.	The SMP does not address moratoria authority.	<b>Optional:</b> Consider addressing moratoria authority. Ecology has provided example language.  <b>Note:</b> Added Section 7.5 page 7-2 & 7-3.
2007			
a.	The Legislature clarified <b>options for defining "floodway"</b> as either	The SMP definition of “Floodway” (Section 8(F))	<b>No change needed.</b>

<i>Row</i>	<i>Summary of change</i>	<i>Review</i>	<i>Action</i>
	the area that has been established in FEMA maps, or the floodway criteria set in the SMA.	appears is the FEMA mapped definition of floodway.  <b>Relevant Section:</b> Definition of “Floodway” (Section 8(F)).	
<b>b.</b>	Ecology amended rules to clarify that comprehensively updated SMPs shall include a <b>list and map of streams and lakes</b> that are in shoreline jurisdiction.	Section 3 of the SMP addresses Environment Designations and mapping as does Appendix A.  <b>Relevant Section:</b> Section 3 and Appendix A.	<b>No change needed.</b>  <b>Note:</b> For clarity, a new map was created in Appendix A. The Town also defined the location and width of shoreline buffers below the map.
<b>c.</b>	Ecology’s rule listing statutory exemptions from the requirement for an SDP was amended to include <b>fish habitat enhancement projects</b> that conform to the provisions of RCW 77.55.181.	SMP Section 7.6.3 references WAC 173-27-040 for exemptions.  <b>Relevant Section:</b> Section 7.6.3.	<b>No change needed.</b>  <b>Note:</b> This section becomes section 7.8.3 in revised draft (page 7-5).