Chapter 90.58 RCW
SHORELINE MANAGEMENT ACT OF 1971

Sections

Marine oil pollution—Baseline study program: RCW 43.21A.405 through 43.21A.420.

RCW 90.58.010 Short title. This chapter shall be known and may be cited as the "Shoreline Management Act of 1971". [1971 ex.s. c 286 § 1.]

RCW 90.58.020 Legislative findings—State policy enunciated—Use preference. The legislature finds that the shorelines of the state are among the most valuable and fragile of its natural resources and that there is great concern throughout the state relating to their utilization, protection, restoration, and preservation. In addition it finds that ever increasing pressures of additional uses are being placed on the shorelines necessitating increased coordination in the management and development of the shorelines of the state. The legislature further finds that much of the shorelines of the state and the uplands adjacent thereto are in private ownership; that unrestricted construction on the privately owned or publicly owned shorelines of the state is not in the best public interest; and therefore, coordinated planning is necessary in order to protect the public interest associated with the shorelines of the state while, at the same time, recognizing and protecting private property rights consistent with the public interest. There is, therefore, a clear and urgent demand for a planned, rational, and concerted effort, jointly performed by federal, state, and local governments, to prevent the inherent harm in an uncoordinated and piecemeal development of the state's shorelines.

It is the policy of the state to provide for the management of the shorelines of the state by planning for and fostering all reasonable and appropriate uses. This policy is designed to insure the development of these shorelines in a manner which, while allowing for limited reduction of rights of the public in the navigable waters, will promote and enhance the public interest. This policy contemplates protecting against adverse effects to the public health, the land and its vegetation and wildlife, and the waters of the state and their aquatic life, while protecting generally public rights of navigation and corollary rights incidental thereto.

The legislature declares that the interest of all of the people shall be paramount in the management of shorelines of statewide significance. The department, in adopting guidelines for shorelines of statewide significance, and local government, in developing master

programs for shorelines of statewide significance, shall give preference to uses in the following order of preference which:

(1) Recognize and protect the statewide interest over local interest;

(2) Preserve the natural character of the shoreline;

(3) Result in long term over short term benefit;

(4) Protect the resources and ecology of the shoreline;

(5) Increase public access to publicly owned areas of the shorelines;

(6) Increase recreational opportunities for the public in the shoreline;

(7) Provide for any other element as defined in RCW 90.58.100 deemed appropriate or necessary.

In the implementation of this policy the public's opportunity to enjoy the physical and aesthetic qualities of natural shorelines of the state shall be preserved to the greatest extent feasible consistent with the overall best interest of the state and the people generally. To this end uses shall be preferred which are consistent with control of pollution and prevention of damage to the natural environment, or are unique to or dependent upon use of the state's shoreline. Alterations of the natural condition of the shorelines of the state, in those limited instances when authorized, shall be given priority for single-family residences and their appurtenant structures, ports, shoreline recreational uses including but not limited to parks, marinas, piers, and other improvements facilitating public access to shorelines of the state, industrial and commercial developments which are particularly dependent on their location on or use of the shorelines of the state and other development that will provide an opportunity for substantial numbers of the people to enjoy the shorelines of the state. Alterations of the natural condition of the shorelines and shorelands of the state shall be recognized by the department. Shorelines and shorelands of the state shall be appropriately classified and these classifications shall be revised when circumstances warrant regardless of whether the change in circumstances occurs through man-made causes or natural causes. Any areas resulting from alterations of the natural condition of the shorelines and shorelands of the state no longer meeting the definition of "shorelines of the state" shall not be subject to the provisions of chapter 90.58 RCW.

Permitted uses in the shorelines of the state shall be designed and conducted in a manner to minimize, insofar as practical, any resultant damage to the ecology and environment of the shoreline area and any interference with the public's use of the water. [1995 c 347 § 301; 1992 c 105 § 1; 1982 1st ex.s. c 13 § 1; 1971 ex.s. c 286 § 2.]

Finding—Severability—Part headings and table of contents not law—1995 c 347: See notes following RCW 36.70A.470.

RCW 90.58.030 Definitions and concepts. As used in this chapter, unless the context otherwise requires, the following definitions and concepts apply:

(1) Administration:

(a) "Department" means the department of ecology;

(b) "Director" means the director of the department of ecology;

(c) "Hearings board" means the shorelines hearings board established by this chapter;

(d) "Local government" means any county, incorporated city, or town which contains within its boundaries any lands or waters subject to this chapter;

(e) "Person" means an individual, partnership, corporation, association, organization, cooperative, public or municipal corporation, or agency of the state or local governmental unit however designated.

(2) Geographical:

(a) "Extreme low tide" means the lowest line on the land reached by a receding tide;

(b) "Floodway" means the area, as identified in a master program, that either: (i) Has been established in federal emergency management agency flood insurance rate maps or floodway maps; or (ii) consists of those portions of a river valley lying streamward from the outer limits of a watercourse upon which flood waters are carried during periods of flooding that occur with reasonable regularity, although not necessarily annually, said floodway being identified, under normal condition, by changes in surface soil conditions or changes in types or quality of vegetative ground cover condition, topography, or other indicators of flooding that occurs with reasonable regularity, although not necessarily annually. Regardless of the method used to identify the floodway, the floodway shall not include those lands that can reasonably be expected to be protected from flood waters by flood control devices maintained by or maintained under license from the federal government, the state, or a political subdivision of the state;

(c) "Ordinary high water mark" on all lakes, streams, and tidal water is that mark that will be found by examining the bed and banks and ascertaining where the presence and action of waters are so common and usual, and so long continued in all ordinary years, as to mark upon the soil a character distinct from that of the abutting upland, in respect to vegetation as that condition exists on June 1, 1971, as it may naturally change thereafter, or as it may change thereafter in accordance with permits issued by a local government or the department: PROVIDED, That in any area where the ordinary high water mark cannot be found, the ordinary high water mark adjoining salt water shall be the line of mean higher high tide and the ordinary high water mark adjoining fresh water shall be the line of mean high water;

(d) "Shorelands" or "shoreland areas" means those lands extending landward for two hundred feet in all directions as measured on a horizontal plane from the ordinary high water mark; floodways and contiguous floodplain areas landward two hundred feet from such floodways; and all wetlands and river deltas associated with the streams, lakes, and tidal waters which are subject to the provisions of this chapter; the same to be designated as to location by the department of ecology.

(i) Any county or city may determine that portion of a one-hundred-year-flood plain to be included in its master program as long as such portion includes, as a minimum, the floodway and the adjacent land extending landward two hundred feet therefrom.

(ii) Any city or county may also include in its master program land necessary for buffers for critical areas, as defined in chapter 36.70A RCW, that occur within shorelines of the state, provided that forest practices regulated under chapter 76.09 RCW, except conversions to nonforestland use, on lands subject to the provisions of this

subsection (2)(d)(ii) are not subject to additional regulations under this chapter;

(e) "Shorelines" means all of the water areas of the state, including reservoirs, and their associated shorelands, together with the lands underlying them; except (i) shorelines of statewide significance; (ii) shorelines on segments of streams upstream of a point where the mean annual flow is twenty cubic feet per second or less and the wetlands associated with such upstream segments; and (iii) shorelines on lakes less than twenty acres in size and wetlands associated with such small lakes;

(f) "Shorelines of statewide significance" means the following shorelines of the state:

(i) The area between the ordinary high water mark and the western boundary of the state from Cape Disappointment on the south to Cape Flattery on the north, including harbors, bays, estuaries, and inlets;

(ii) Those areas of Puget Sound and adjacent salt waters and the Strait of Juan de Fuca between the ordinary high water mark and the line of extreme low tide as follows:

(A) Nisqually Delta—from DeWolf Bight to Tatsolo Point,

(B) Birch Bay—from Point Whitehorn to Birch Point,

(C) Hood Canal—from Tala Point to Foulweather Bluff,

(D) Skagit Bay and adjacent area—from Brown Point to Yokeko Point, and

(E) Padilla Bay—from March Point to William Point;

(iii) Those areas of Puget Sound and the Strait of Juan de Fuca and adjacent salt waters north to the Canadian line and lying seaward from the line of extreme low tide;

(iv) Those lakes, whether natural, artificial, or a combination thereof, with a surface acreage of one thousand acres or more measured at the ordinary high water mark;

(v) Those natural rivers or segments thereof as follows:

(A) Any west of the crest of the Cascade range downstream of a point where the mean annual flow is measured at one thousand cubic feet per second or more,

(B) Any east of the crest of the Cascade range downstream of a point where the annual flow is measured at two hundred cubic feet per second or more, or those portions of rivers east of the crest of the Cascade range downstream from the first three hundred square miles of drainage area, whichever is longer;

(vi) Those shorelands associated with (f)(i), (ii), (iv), and (v) of this subsection (2);

(g) "Shorelines of the state" are the total of all "shorelines" and "shorelines of statewide significance" within the state;

(h) "Wetlands" means areas that are inundated or saturated by surface water or groundwater at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that under normal circumstances do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions. Wetlands generally include swamps, marshes, bogs, and similar areas. Wetlands do not include those artificial wetlands intentionally created from nonwetland sites, including, but not limited to, irrigation and drainage ditches, grass-lined swales, canals, detention facilities, wastewater treatment facilities, farm ponds, and landscape amenities, or those wetlands created after July 1, 1990, that were unintentionally created as a result of the construction of a road, street, or highway. Wetlands may include those artificial wetlands

intentionally created from nonwetland areas to mitigate the conversion of wetlands.

(3) Procedural terms:

(a) "Development" means a use consisting of the construction or exterior alteration of structures; dredging; drilling; dumping; filling; removal of any sand, gravel, or minerals; bulkheading; driving of piling; placing of obstructions; or any project of a permanent or temporary nature which interferes with the normal public use of the surface of the waters overlying lands subject to this chapter at any state of water level;

(b) "Guidelines" means those standards adopted to implement the policy of this chapter for regulation of use of the shorelines of the state prior to adoption of master programs. Such standards shall also provide criteria to local governments and the department in developing master programs;

(c) "Master program" means the comprehensive use plan for a described area, and the use regulations together with maps, diagrams, charts, or other descriptive material and text, a statement of desired goals, and standards developed in accordance with the policies enunciated in RCW 90.58.020. "Comprehensive master program update" means a master program that fully achieves the procedural and substantive requirements of the department guidelines effective January 17, 2004, as now or hereafter amended;

(d) "State master program" is the cumulative total of all master programs approved or adopted by the department of ecology;

(e) "Substantial development" means any development of which the total cost or fair market value exceeds five thousand dollars, or any development which materially interferes with the normal public use of the water or shorelines of the state. The dollar threshold established in this subsection (3)(e) must be adjusted for inflation by the office of financial management every five years, beginning July 1, 2007, based upon changes in the consumer price index during that time period. "Consumer price index" means, for any calendar year, that year's annual average consumer price index, Seattle, Washington area, for urban wage earners and clerical workers, all items, compiled by the bureau of labor and statistics, United States department of labor. The office of financial management must calculate the new dollar threshold and transmit it to the office of the code reviser for publication in the Washington State Register at least one month before the new dollar threshold is to take effect. The following shall not be considered substantial developments for the purpose of this chapter:

(i) Normal maintenance or repair of existing structures or developments, including damage by accident, fire, or elements;

(ii) Construction of the normal protective bulkhead common to single-family residences;

(iii) Emergency construction necessary to protect property from damage by the elements;

(iv) Construction and practices normal or necessary for farming, irrigation, and ranching activities, including agricultural service roads and utilities on shorelands, and the construction and maintenance of irrigation structures including but not limited to head gates, pumping facilities, and irrigation channels. A feedlot of any size, all processing plants, other activities of a commercial nature, alteration of the contour of the shorelands by leveling or filling other than that which results from normal cultivation, shall not be considered normal or necessary farming or ranching activities. A feedlot shall be an enclosure or facility used or capable of being

used for feeding livestock hay, grain, silage, or other livestock feed, but shall not include land for growing crops or vegetation for livestock feeding and/or grazing, nor shall it include normal livestock wintering operations;

(v) Construction or modification of navigational aids such as channel markers and anchor buoys;

(vi) Construction on shorelands by an owner, lessee, or contract purchaser of a single-family residence for his own use or for the use of his or her family, which residence does not exceed a height of thirty-five feet above average grade level and which meets all requirements of the state agency or local government having jurisdiction thereof, other than requirements imposed pursuant to this chapter;

(vii) Construction of a dock, including a community dock, designed for pleasure craft only, for the private noncommercial use of the owner, lessee, or contract purchaser of single and multiple family residences. This exception applies if either: (A) In salt waters, the fair market value of the dock does not exceed two thousand five hundred dollars; or (B) in fresh waters, the fair market value of the dock does not exceed: (I) Twenty thousand dollars for docks that are constructed to replace existing docks, are of equal or lesser square footage than the existing dock being replaced, and are located in a county, city, or town that has updated its master program consistent with the master program guidelines in chapter 173-26 WAC as adopted in 2003; or (II) ten thousand dollars for all other docks constructed in fresh waters. However, if subsequent construction occurs within five years of completion of the prior construction, and the combined fair market value of the subsequent and prior construction exceeds the amount specified in either (e)(vii)(A) or (B) of this subsection (3), the subsequent construction shall be considered a substantial development for the purpose of this chapter. All dollar thresholds under (e)(vii)(B) of this subsection (3) must be adjusted for inflation by the office of financial management every five years, beginning July 1, 2018, based upon changes in the consumer price index during that time period. "Consumer price index" means, for any calendar year, that year's annual average consumer price index, Seattle, Washington area, for urban wage earners and clerical workers, all items, compiled by the bureau of labor and statistics, United States department of labor. The office of financial management must calculate the new dollar thresholds, rounded to the nearest hundred dollar, and transmit them to the office of the code reviser for publication in the Washington State Register at least one month before the new dollar thresholds are to take effect;

(viii) Operation, maintenance, or construction of canals, waterways, drains, reservoirs, or other facilities that now exist or are hereafter created or developed as a part of an irrigation system for the primary purpose of making use of system waters, including return flow and artificially stored groundwater for the irrigation of lands;

(ix) The marking of property lines or corners on state owned lands, when such marking does not significantly interfere with normal public use of the surface of the water;

(x) Operation and maintenance of any system of dikes, ditches, drains, or other facilities existing on September 8, 1975, which were created, developed, or utilized primarily as a part of an agricultural drainage or diking system;

(xi) Site exploration and investigation activities that are prerequisite to preparation of an application for development authorization under this chapter, if:

(A) The activity does not interfere with the normal public use of the surface waters;

(B) The activity will have no significant adverse impact on the environment including, but not limited to, fish, wildlife, fish or wildlife habitat, water quality, and aesthetic values;

(C) The activity does not involve the installation of a structure, and upon completion of the activity the vegetation and land configuration of the site are restored to conditions existing before the activity;

(D) A private entity seeking development authorization under this section first posts a performance bond or provides other evidence of financial responsibility to the local jurisdiction to ensure that the site is restored to preexisting conditions; and

(E) The activity is not subject to the permit requirements of RCW 90.58.550;

(xii) The process of removing or controlling an aquatic noxious weed, as defined in RCW 17.26.020, through the use of an herbicide or other treatment methods applicable to weed control that are recommended by a final environmental impact statement published by the department of agriculture or the department jointly with other state agencies under chapter 43.21C RCW;

(xiii) The external or internal retrofitting of an existing structure with the exclusive purpose of compliance with the Americans with disabilities act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. Sec. 12101 et seq.) or to otherwise provide physical access to the structure by individuals with disabilities. [2016 c 193 § 1; 2014 c 23 § 1. Prior: 2010 c 107 § 3; 2007 c 328 § 1; 2003 c 321 § 2; 2002 c 230 § 2; 1996 c 265 § 1; prior: 1995 c 382 § 10; 1995 c 255 § 5; 1995 c 237 § 1; 1987 c 474 § 1; 1986 c 292 § 1; 1982 1st ex.s. c 13 § 2; 1980 c 2 § 3; 1979 ex.s. c 84 § 3; 1975 1st ex.s. c 182 § 1; 1973 1st ex.s. c 203 § 1; 1971 ex.s. c 286 § 3.]

Intent—Retroactive application—Effective date—2010 c 107: See notes following RCW 36.70A.480.

Finding—Intent—2003 c 321: "(1) The legislature finds that the final decision and order in *Everett Shorelines Coalition v. City of Everett and Washington State Department of Ecology*, Case No. 02-3-0009c, issued on January 9, 2003, by the central Puget Sound growth management hearings board was a case of first impression interpreting the addition of the shoreline management act into the growth management act, and that the board considered the appeal and issued its final order and decision without the benefit of shorelines guidelines to provide guidance on the implementation of the shoreline management act and the adoption of shoreline master programs.

(2) This act is intended to affirm the legislature's intent that:

(a) The shoreline management act be read, interpreted, applied, and implemented as a whole consistent with decisions of the shoreline[s] hearings board and Washington courts prior to the decision of the central Puget Sound growth management hearings board in *Everett Shorelines Coalition v. City of Everett and Washington State Department of Ecology*;

(b) The goals of the growth management act, including the goals and policies of the shoreline management act, set forth in RCW 36.70A.020 and included in RCW 36.70A.020 by RCW 36.70A.480, continue to be listed without an order of priority; and

(c) Shorelines of statewide significance may include critical areas as defined by RCW 36.70A.030(5), but that shorelines of statewide significance are not critical areas simply because they are shorelines of statewide significance.

(3) The legislature intends that critical areas within the jurisdiction of the shoreline management act shall be governed by the shoreline management act and that critical areas outside the jurisdiction of the shoreline management act shall be governed by the growth management act. The legislature further intends that the quality of information currently required by the shoreline management act to be applied to the protection of critical areas within shorelines of the state shall not be limited or changed by the provisions of the growth management act." [2003 c 321 § 1.]

Finding—Intent—2002 c 230: "The legislature finds that the dollar threshold for what constitutes substantial development under the shoreline management act has not been changed since 1986. The legislature recognizes that the effects of inflation have brought in many activities under the jurisdiction of chapter 90.58 RCW that would have been exempted under its original provisions. It is the intent of the legislature to modify the current dollar threshold for what constitutes substantial development under the shoreline management act, and to have this threshold readjusted on a five-year basis." [2002 c 230 § 1.]

Effective date—1995 c 255: See RCW 17.26.901.

Severability—1986 c 292: "If any provision of this act or its application to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the act or the application of the provision to other persons or circumstances is not affected." [1986 c 292 § 5.]

Intent—1980 c 2; 1979 ex.s. c 84: "The legislature finds that high tides and hurricane force winds on February 13, 1979, caused conditions resulting in the catastrophic destruction of the Hood Canal bridge on state route 104, a state highway on the federal-aid system; and, as a consequence, the state of Washington has sustained a sudden and complete failure of a major segment of highway system with a disastrous impact on transportation services between the counties of Washington's Olympic peninsula and the remainder of the state. The governor has by proclamation found that these conditions constitute an emergency. To minimize the economic loss and hardship to residents of the Puget Sound and Olympic peninsula regions, it is the intent of 1979 ex.s. c 84 to authorize the department of transportation to undertake immediately all necessary actions to restore interim transportation services across Hood Canal and Puget Sound and upon the Kitsap and Olympic peninsulas and to design and reconstruct a permanent bridge at the site of the original Hood Canal bridge. The department of transportation is directed to proceed with such actions in an environmentally responsible manner that would meet the substantive objectives of the state environmental policy act and the shorelines management act, and shall consult with the department of

ecology in the planning process. The exemptions from the state environmental policy act and the shorelines management act contained in RCW 43.21C.032 and 90.58.030 are intended to approve and ratify the timely actions of the department of transportation taken and to be taken to restore interim transportation services and to reconstruct a permanent Hood Canal bridge without procedural delays." [1980 c 2 § 1; 1979 ex.s. c 84 § 1.]

RCW 90.58.040 Program applicable to shorelines of the state. The shoreline management program of this chapter shall apply to the shorelines of the state as defined in this chapter. [1971 ex.s. c 286 § 4.]

RCW 90.58.045 Environmental excellence program agreements—Effect on chapter. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any legal requirement under this chapter, including any standard, limitation, rule, or order is superseded and replaced in accordance with the terms and provisions of an environmental excellence program agreement, entered into under chapter 43.21K RCW. [1997 c 381 § 28.]

Purpose—1997 c 381: See RCW 43.21K.005.

RCW 90.58.050 Program as cooperative between local government and state—Responsibilities differentiated. This chapter establishes a cooperative program of shoreline management between local government and the state. Local government shall have the primary responsibility for initiating the planning required by this chapter and administering the regulatory program consistent with the policy and provisions of this chapter. The department shall act primarily in a supportive and review capacity with an emphasis on providing assistance to local government and on insuring compliance with the policy and provisions of this chapter. [1995 c 347 § 303; 1971 ex.s. c 286 § 5.]

Finding—Severability—Part headings and table of contents not law—1995 c 347: See notes following RCW 36.70A.470.

RCW 90.58.060 Review and adoption of guidelines—Public hearings, notice of—Amendments. (1) The department shall periodically review and adopt guidelines consistent with RCW 90.58.020, containing the elements specified in RCW 90.58.100 for:

(a) Development of master programs for regulation of the uses of shorelines; and

(b) Development of master programs for regulation of the uses of shorelines of statewide significance.

(2) Before adopting or amending guidelines under this section, the department shall provide an opportunity for public review and comment as follows:

(a) The department shall mail copies of the proposal to all cities, counties, and federally recognized Indian tribes, and to any other person who has requested a copy, and shall publish the proposed guidelines in the Washington state register. Comments shall be

submitted in writing to the department within sixty days from the date the proposal has been published in the register.

(b) The department shall hold at least four public hearings on the proposal in different locations throughout the state to provide a reasonable opportunity for residents in all parts of the state to present statements and views on the proposed guidelines. Notice of the hearings shall be published at least once in each of the three weeks immediately preceding the hearing in one or more newspapers of general circulation in each county of the state. If an amendment to the guidelines addresses an issue limited to one geographic area, the number and location of hearings may be adjusted consistent with the intent of this subsection to assure all parties a reasonable opportunity to comment on the proposed amendment. The department shall accept written comments on the proposal during the sixty-day public comment period and for seven days after the final public hearing.

(c) At the conclusion of the public comment period, the department shall review the comments received and modify the proposal consistent with the provisions of this chapter. The proposal shall then be published for adoption pursuant to the provisions of chapter 34.05 RCW.

(3) The department may adopt amendments to the guidelines not more than once each year. Such amendments shall be limited to: (a) Addressing technical or procedural issues that result from the review and adoption of master programs under the guidelines; or (b) issues of guideline compliance with statutory provisions. [2003 c 262 § 1; 1995 c 347 § 304; 1971 ex.s. c 286 § 6.]

Finding—Severability—Part headings and table of contents not law—1995 c 347: See notes following RCW 36.70A.470.

RCW 90.58.065 Application of guidelines and master programs to agricultural activities. (1) The guidelines adopted by the department and master programs developed or amended by local governments according to RCW 90.58.080 shall not require modification of or limit agricultural activities occurring on agricultural lands. In jurisdictions where agricultural activities occur, master programs developed or amended after June 13, 2002, shall include provisions addressing new agricultural activities on land not meeting the definition of agricultural land, conversion of agricultural lands to other uses, and development not meeting the definition of agricultural activities. Nothing in this section limits or changes the terms of the *current exception to the definition of substantial development in RCW 90.58.030(3)(e)(iv). This section applies only to this chapter, and shall not affect any other authority of local governments.

(2) For the purposes of this section:

(a) "Agricultural activities" means agricultural uses and practices including, but not limited to: Producing, breeding, or increasing agricultural products; rotating and changing agricultural crops; allowing land used for agricultural activities to lie fallow in which it is plowed and tilled but left unseeded; allowing land used for agricultural activities to lie dormant as a result of adverse agricultural market conditions; allowing land used for agricultural activities to lie dormant because the land is enrolled in a local, state, or federal conservation program, or the land is subject to a conservation easement; conducting agricultural operations;

maintaining, repairing, and replacing agricultural equipment; maintaining, repairing, and replacing agricultural facilities, provided that the replacement facility is no closer to the shoreline than the original facility; and maintaining agricultural lands under production or cultivation;

(b) "Agricultural products" includes but is not limited to horticultural, viticultural, floricultural, vegetable, fruit, berry, grain, hops, hay, straw, turf, sod, seed, and apiary products; feed or forage for livestock; Christmas trees; hybrid cottonwood and similar hardwood trees grown as crops and harvested within twenty years of planting; and livestock including both the animals themselves and animal products including but not limited to meat, upland finfish, poultry and poultry products, and dairy products;

(c) "Agricultural equipment" and "agricultural facilities" includes, but is not limited to: (i) The following used in agricultural operations: Equipment; machinery; constructed shelters, buildings, and ponds; fences; upland finfish rearing facilities; water diversion, withdrawal, conveyance, and use equipment and facilities including but not limited to pumps, pipes, tapes, canals, ditches, and drains; (ii) corridors and facilities for transporting personnel, livestock, and equipment to, from, and within agricultural lands; (iii) farm residences and associated equipment, lands, and facilities; and (iv) roadside stands and on-farm markets for marketing fruit or vegetables; and

(d) "Agricultural land" means those specific land areas on which agriculture activities are conducted.

(3) The department and local governments shall assure that local shoreline master programs use definitions consistent with the definitions in this section. [2002 c 298 § 1.]

***Reviser's note:** "Current" first appears in chapter 298, Laws of 2002.

Implementation—2002 c 298: "The provisions of this act do not become effective until the earlier of either January 1, 2004, or the date the department of ecology amends or updates chapter 173-16 or 173-26 WAC." [2002 c 298 § 2.]

RCW 90.58.070 Local governments to submit letters of intent—Department to act upon failure of local government. (1) Local governments are directed with regard to shorelines of the state in their various jurisdictions to submit to the director of the department, within six months from June 1, 1971, letters stating that they propose to complete an inventory and develop master programs for these shorelines as provided for in RCW 90.58.080.

(2) If any local government fails to submit a letter as provided in subsection (1) of this section, or fails to adopt a master program for the shorelines of the state within its jurisdiction in accordance with the time schedule provided in this chapter, the department shall carry out the requirements of RCW 90.58.080 and adopt a master program for the shorelines of the state within the jurisdiction of the local government. [1971 ex.s. c 286 § 7.]

RCW 90.58.080 Timetable for local governments to develop or amend master programs—Review of master programs—Grants. ***(Effective***

until July 1, 2025.) (1) Local governments shall develop or amend a master program for regulation of uses of the shorelines of the state consistent with the required elements of the guidelines adopted by the department in accordance with the schedule established by this section.

(2)(a) Subject to the provisions of subsections (5) and (6) of this section, each local government subject to this chapter shall develop or amend its master program for the regulation of uses of shorelines within its jurisdiction according to the following schedule:

(i) On or before December 1, 2005, for the city of Port Townsend, the city of Bellingham, the city of Everett, Snohomish county, and Whatcom county;

(ii) On or before December 1, 2009, for King county and the cities within King county greater in population than ten thousand;

(iii) Except as provided by (a)(i) and (ii) of this subsection, on or before December 1, 2011, for Clallam, Clark, Jefferson, King, Kitsap, Pierce, Snohomish, Thurston, and Whatcom counties and the cities within those counties;

(iv) On or before December 1, 2012, for Cowlitz, Island, Lewis, Mason, San Juan, Skagit, and Skamania counties and the cities within those counties;

(v) On or before December 1, 2013, for Benton, Chelan, Douglas, Grant, Kittitas, Spokane, and Yakima counties and the cities within those counties; and

(vi) On or before December 1, 2014, for Adams, Asotin, Columbia, Ferry, Franklin, Garfield, Grays Harbor, Klickitat, Lincoln, Okanogan, Pacific, Pend Oreille, Stevens, Wahkiakum, Walla Walla, and Whitman counties and the cities within those counties.

(b) Nothing in this subsection (2) shall preclude a local government from developing or amending its master program prior to the dates established by this subsection (2).

(3)(a) Following approval by the department of a new or amended master program, local governments required to develop or amend master programs on or before December 1, 2009, as provided by subsection (2)(a)(i) and (ii) of this section, shall be deemed to have complied with the schedule established by subsection (2)(a)(iii) of this section and shall not be required to complete master program amendments until the applicable dates established by subsection (4)(b) of this section. Any jurisdiction listed in subsection (2)(a)(i) of this section that has a new or amended master program approved by the department on or after March 1, 2002, but before July 27, 2003, shall not be required to complete master program amendments until the applicable date provided by subsection (4)(b) of this section.

(b) Following approval by the department of a new or amended master program, local governments choosing to develop or amend master programs on or before December 1, 2009, shall be deemed to have complied with the schedule established by subsection (2)(a)(iii) through (vi) of this section and shall not be required to complete master program amendments until the applicable dates established by subsection (4)(b) of this section.

(4)(a) Following the updates required by subsection (2) of this section, local governments shall conduct a review of their master programs at least once every eight years as required by (b) of this subsection. Following the review required by this subsection (4), local governments shall, if necessary, revise their master programs. The purpose of the review is:

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

(ii) 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.

(b) Counties and cities shall take action to review and, if necessary, revise their master programs as required by (a) of this subsection as follows:

(i) On or before June 30, 2019, and every eight years thereafter, for King, Pierce, and Snohomish counties and the cities within those counties;

(ii) On or before June 30, 2020, and every eight years thereafter, for Clallam, Clark, Island, Jefferson, Kitsap, Mason, San Juan, Skagit, Thurston, and Whatcom counties and the cities within those counties;

(iii) On or before June 30, 2021, and every eight years thereafter, for Benton, Chelan, Cowlitz, Douglas, Grant, Kittitas, Lewis, Skamania, Spokane, and Yakima counties and the cities within those counties; and

(iv) On or before June 30, 2022, and every eight years thereafter, for Adams, Asotin, Columbia, Ferry, Franklin, Garfield, Grant, Grays Harbor, Klickitat, Lincoln, Okanogan, Pacific, Pend Oreille, Stevens, Wahkiakum, Walla Walla, and Whitman counties and the cities within those counties.

(5) In meeting the update requirements of subsection (2) of this section, local governments are encouraged to begin the process of developing or amending their master programs early and are eligible for grants from the department as provided by RCW 90.58.250, subject to available funding. Except for those local governments listed in subsection (2)(a)(i) and (ii) of this section, the deadline for completion of the new or amended master programs shall be two years after the date the grant is approved by the department. Subsequent master program review dates shall not be altered by the provisions of this subsection.

(6) In meeting the update requirements of subsection (2) of this section, the following shall apply:

(a) Grants to local governments for developing and amending master programs pursuant to the schedule established by this section shall be provided at least two years before the adoption dates specified in subsection (2) of this section. To the extent possible, the department shall allocate grants within the amount appropriated for such purposes to provide reasonable and adequate funding to local governments that have indicated their intent to develop or amend master programs during the biennium according to the schedule established by subsection (2) of this section. Any local government that applies for but does not receive funding to comply with the provisions of subsection (2) of this section may delay the development or amendment of its master program until the following biennium.

(b) Local governments with delayed compliance dates as provided in (a) of this subsection shall be the first priority for funding in subsequent biennia, and the development or amendment compliance deadline for those local governments shall be two years after the date of grant approval.

(c) Failure of the local government to apply in a timely manner for a master program development or amendment grant in accordance with the requirements of the department shall not be considered a delay resulting from the provisions of (a) of this subsection.

(7) In meeting the update requirements of subsection (2) of this section, all local governments subject to the requirements of this chapter that have not developed or amended master programs on or after March 1, 2002, shall, no later than December 1, 2014, develop or amend their master programs to comply with guidelines adopted by the department after January 1, 2003.

(8) In meeting the update requirements of subsection (2) of this section, local governments may be provided an additional year beyond the deadlines in this section to complete their master program or amendment. The department shall grant the request if it determines that the local government is likely to adopt or amend its master program within the additional year. [2011 c 353 § 13; 2007 c 170 § 1; 2003 c 262 § 2; 1995 c 347 § 305; 1974 ex.s. c 61 § 1; 1971 ex.s. c 286 § 8.]

Intent—2011 c 353: See note following RCW 36.70A.130.

Finding—Severability—Part headings and table of contents not law—1995 c 347: See notes following RCW 36.70A.470.

RCW 90.58.080 Timetable for local governments to develop or amend master programs—Review of master programs—Grants. ***(Effective July 1, 2025.)*** (1) Local governments shall develop or amend a master program for regulation of uses of the shorelines of the state consistent with the required elements of the guidelines adopted by the department in accordance with the schedule established by this section.

(2)(a) Subject to the provisions of subsections (5) and (6) of this section, each local government subject to this chapter shall develop or amend its master program for the regulation of uses of shorelines within its jurisdiction according to the following schedule:

(i) On or before December 1, 2005, for the city of Port Townsend, the city of Bellingham, the city of Everett, Snohomish county, and Whatcom county;

(ii) On or before December 1, 2009, for King county and the cities within King county greater in population than ten thousand;

(iii) Except as provided by (a)(i) and (ii) of this subsection, on or before December 1, 2011, for Clallam, Clark, Jefferson, King, Kitsap, Pierce, Snohomish, Thurston, and Whatcom counties and the cities within those counties;

(iv) On or before December 1, 2012, for Cowlitz, Island, Lewis, Mason, San Juan, Skagit, and Skamania counties and the cities within those counties;

(v) On or before December 1, 2013, for Benton, Chelan, Douglas, Grant, Kittitas, Spokane, and Yakima counties and the cities within those counties; and

(vi) On or before December 1, 2014, for Adams, Asotin, Columbia, Ferry, Franklin, Garfield, Grays Harbor, Klickitat, Lincoln, Okanogan, Pacific, Pend Oreille, Stevens, Wahkiakum, Walla Walla, and Whitman counties and the cities within those counties.

(b) Nothing in this subsection (2) shall preclude a local government from developing or amending its master program prior to the dates established by this subsection (2).

(3)(a) Following approval by the department of a new or amended master program, local governments required to develop or amend master programs on or before December 1, 2009, as provided by subsection (2)(a)(i) and (ii) of this section, shall be deemed to have complied with the schedule established by subsection (2)(a)(iii) of this section and shall not be required to complete master program amendments until the applicable dates established by subsection (4)(b) of this section. Any jurisdiction listed in subsection (2)(a)(i) of this section that has a new or amended master program approved by the department on or after March 1, 2002, but before July 27, 2003, shall not be required to complete master program amendments until the applicable date provided by subsection (4)(b) of this section.

(b) Following approval by the department of a new or amended master program, local governments choosing to develop or amend master programs on or before December 1, 2009, shall be deemed to have complied with the schedule established by subsection (2)(a)(iii) through (vi) of this section and shall not be required to complete master program amendments until the applicable dates established by subsection (4)(b) of this section.

(4)(a) Following the updates required by subsection (2) of this section, local governments shall conduct a review of their master programs at least once every eight years as required by (b) of this subsection. Following the review required by this subsection (4), local governments shall, if necessary, revise their master programs. The purpose of the review is:

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

(ii) 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.

(b) Counties and cities shall take action to review and, if necessary, revise their master programs as required by (a) of this subsection as follows:

(i) On or before June 30, 2028, and every eight years thereafter, for King, Kitsap, Pierce, and Snohomish counties and the cities within those counties;

(ii) On or before June 30, 2029, and every eight years thereafter, for Clallam, Clark, Island, Jefferson, Lewis, Mason, San Juan, Skagit, Thurston, and Whatcom counties and the cities within those counties;

(iii) On or before June 30, 2030, and every eight years thereafter, for Benton, Chelan, Cowlitz, Douglas, Franklin, Kittitas, Skamania, Spokane, Walla Walla, and Yakima counties and the cities within those counties; and

(iv) On or before June 30, 2031, and every eight years thereafter, for Adams, Asotin, Columbia, Ferry, Garfield, Grant, Grays Harbor, Klickitat, Lincoln, Okanogan, Pacific, Pend Oreille, Stevens, Wahkiakum, and Whitman counties and the cities within those counties.

(5) In meeting the review requirements of subsection (4) of this section, local governments are encouraged to begin the process of developing or amending their master programs early and are eligible for grants from the department as provided by RCW 90.58.250, subject to available funding. Except for those local governments listed in subsection (2)(a)(i) and (ii) of this section, the deadline for completion of the new or amended master programs shall be two years after the date the grant is approved by the department. Subsequent

master program review dates shall not be altered by the provisions of this subsection.

(6) In meeting the review requirements of subsection (4) of this section, the following shall apply:

(a) Grants to local governments for reviewing master programs pursuant to the schedule established by this section shall be provided at least two years before the adoption dates specified in subsection (4) of this section. To the extent possible, the department shall allocate grants within the amount appropriated for such purposes to provide reasonable and adequate funding to local governments that have indicated their intent to develop or amend master programs during the biennium according to the schedule established by subsection (4) of this section. Any local government that applies for but does not receive funding to comply with the provisions of subsection (4) of this section may delay the development or amendment of its master program until the following biennium.

(b) Local governments with delayed compliance dates as provided in (a) of this subsection shall be the first priority for funding in subsequent biennia, and the periodic review compliance deadline for those local governments shall be two years after the date of grant approval.

(c) Failure of the local government to apply in a timely manner for a master program development or amendment grant in accordance with the requirements of the department shall not be considered a delay resulting from the provisions of (a) of this subsection.

(7) In meeting the update requirements of subsection (2) of this section, all local governments subject to the requirements of this chapter that have not developed or amended master programs on or after March 1, 2002, shall, no later than December 1, 2014, develop or amend their master programs to comply with guidelines adopted by the department after January 1, 2003.

(8) In meeting the review requirements of subsection (4) of this section, local governments may be provided an additional year beyond the deadlines in this section to complete their master program or amendment. The department shall grant the request if it determines that the local government is likely to adopt or amend its master program within the additional year. [2020 c 113 § 2; 2011 c 353 § 13; 2007 c 170 § 1; 2003 c 262 § 2; 1995 c 347 § 305; 1974 ex.s. c 61 § 1; 1971 ex.s. c 286 § 8.]

Effective date—2020 c 113 § 2: "Section 2 of this act takes effect July 1, 2025." [2020 c 113 § 3.]

Intent—2011 c 353: See note following RCW 36.70A.130.

Finding—Severability—Part headings and table of contents not law—1995 c 347: See notes following RCW 36.70A.470.

RCW 90.58.090 Approval of master program or segments or amendments—Procedure—Departmental alternatives when shorelines of statewide significance—Later adoption of master program supersedes departmental program. (1) A master program, segment of a master program, or an amendment to a master program shall become effective when approved by the department as provided in subsection (7) of this section. Within the time period provided in RCW 90.58.080, each local

government shall have submitted a master program, either totally or by segments, for all shorelines of the state within its jurisdiction to the department for review and approval.

The department shall strive to achieve final action on a submitted master program within one hundred eighty days of receipt and shall post an annual assessment related to this performance benchmark on the agency website.

(2) Upon receipt of a proposed master program or amendment, the department shall:

(a) Provide notice to and opportunity for written comment by all interested parties of record as a part of the local government review process for the proposal and to all persons, groups, and agencies that have requested in writing notice of proposed master programs or amendments generally or for a specific area, subject matter, or issue. The comment period shall be at least thirty days, unless the department determines that the level of complexity or controversy involved supports a shorter period;

(b) In the department's discretion, conduct a public hearing during the thirty-day comment period in the jurisdiction proposing the master program or amendment;

(c) Within fifteen days after the close of public comment, request the local government to review the issues identified by the public, interested parties, groups, and agencies and provide a written response as to how the proposal addresses the identified issues;

(d) Within thirty days after receipt of the local government response pursuant to (c) of this subsection, make written findings and conclusions regarding the consistency of the proposal with the policy of RCW 90.58.020 and the applicable guidelines, provide a response to the issues identified in (c) of this subsection, and either approve the proposal as submitted, recommend specific changes necessary to make the proposal approvable, or deny approval of the proposal in those instances where no alteration of the proposal appears likely to be consistent with the policy of RCW 90.58.020 and the applicable guidelines. The written findings and conclusions shall be provided to the local government, and made available to all interested persons, parties, groups, and agencies of record on the proposal;

(e) If the department recommends changes to the proposed master program or amendment, within thirty days after the department mails the written findings and conclusions to the local government, the local government may:

(i) Agree to the proposed changes by written notice to the department; or

(ii) Submit an alternative proposal. If, in the opinion of the department, the alternative is consistent with the purpose and intent of the changes originally submitted by the department and with this chapter it shall approve the changes and provide notice to all recipients of the written findings and conclusions. If the department determines the proposal is not consistent with the purpose and intent of the changes proposed by the department, the department may resubmit the proposal for public and agency review pursuant to this section or reject the proposal.

(3) The department shall approve the segment of a master program relating to shorelines unless it determines that the submitted segments are not consistent with the policy of RCW 90.58.020 and the applicable guidelines.

(4) The department shall approve the segment of a master program relating to critical areas as defined by *RCW 36.70A.030(5) provided

the master program segment is consistent with RCW 90.58.020 and applicable shoreline guidelines, and if the segment provides a level of protection of critical areas at least equal to that provided by the local government's critical areas ordinances adopted and thereafter amended pursuant to RCW 36.70A.060(2).

(5) The department shall approve those segments of the master program relating to shorelines of statewide significance only after determining the program provides the optimum implementation of the policy of this chapter to satisfy the statewide interest. If the department does not approve a segment of a local government master program relating to a shoreline of statewide significance, the department may develop and by rule adopt an alternative to the local government's proposal.

(6) In the event a local government has not complied with the requirements of RCW 90.58.070 it may thereafter upon written notice to the department elect to adopt a master program for the shorelines within its jurisdiction, in which event it shall comply with the provisions established by this chapter for the adoption of a master program for such shorelines.

Upon approval of such master program by the department it shall supersede such master program as may have been adopted by the department for such shorelines.

(7) A master program or amendment to a master program takes effect when and in such form as approved or adopted by the department. The effective date is fourteen days from the date of the department's written notice of final action to the local government stating the department has approved or rejected the proposal. For master programs adopted by rule, the effective date is governed by RCW 34.05.380. The department's written notice to the local government must conspicuously and plainly state that it is the department's final decision and that there will be no further modifications to the proposal.

(a) Shoreline master programs that were adopted by the department prior to July 22, 1995, in accordance with the provisions of this section then in effect, shall be deemed approved by the department in accordance with the provisions of this section that became effective on that date.

(b) The department shall maintain a record of each master program, the action taken on any proposal for adoption or amendment of the master program, and any appeal of the department's action. The department's approved document of record constitutes the official master program.

(8) Promptly after approval or disapproval of a local government's shoreline master program or amendment, the department shall publish a notice consistent with RCW 36.70A.290 that the shoreline master program or amendment has been approved or disapproved. This notice must be filed for all shoreline master programs or amendments. If the notice is for a local government that does not plan under RCW 36.70A.040, the department must, on the day the notice is published, notify the legislative authority of the applicable local government by telephone or electronic means, followed by written communication as necessary, to ensure that the local government has received the full written decision of the approval or disapproval. [2011 c 353 § 14; 2011 c 277 § 2; 2003 c 321 § 3; 1997 c 429 § 50; 1995 c 347 § 306; 1971 ex.s. c 286 § 9.]

Reviser's note: *(1) RCW 36.70A.030 was alphabetized pursuant to RCW 1.08.015(2)(k), changing subsection (5) to subsection (6).

(2) This section was amended by 2011 c 277 § 2 and by 2011 c 353 § 14, each without reference to the other. Both amendments are incorporated in the publication of this section under RCW 1.12.025(2). For rule of construction, see RCW 1.12.025(1).

Intent—2011 c 353: See note following RCW 36.70A.130.

Finding—Intent—2003 c 321: See note following RCW 90.58.030.

Severability—1997 c 429: See note following RCW 36.70A.3201.

Finding—Severability—Part headings and table of contents not law —1995 c 347: See notes following RCW 36.70A.470.

RCW 90.58.100 Programs as constituting use regulations—Duties when preparing programs and amendments thereto—Program contents. (1) The master programs provided for in this chapter, when adopted or approved by the department shall constitute use regulations for the various shorelines of the state. In preparing the master programs, and any amendments thereto, the department and local governments shall to the extent feasible:

(a) Utilize a systematic interdisciplinary approach which will insure the integrated use of the natural and social sciences and the environmental design arts;

(b) Consult with and obtain the comments of any federal, state, regional, or local agency having any special expertise with respect to any environmental impact;

(c) Consider all plans, studies, surveys, inventories, and systems of classification made or being made by federal, state, regional, or local agencies, by private individuals, or by organizations dealing with pertinent shorelines of the state;

(d) Conduct or support such further research, studies, surveys, and interviews as are deemed necessary;

(e) Utilize all available information regarding hydrology, geography, topography, ecology, economics, and other pertinent data;

(f) Employ, when feasible, all appropriate, modern scientific data processing and computer techniques to store, index, analyze, and manage the information gathered.

(2) The master programs shall include, when appropriate, the following:

(a) An economic development element for the location and design of industries, projects of statewide significance, transportation facilities, port facilities, tourist facilities, commerce and other developments that are particularly dependent on their location on or use of the shorelines of the state;

(b) A public access element making provision for public access to publicly owned areas;

(c) A recreational element for the preservation and enlargement of recreational opportunities, including but not limited to parks, tidelands, beaches, and recreational areas;

(d) A circulation element consisting of the general location and extent of existing and proposed major thoroughfares, transportation routes, terminals, and other public utilities and facilities, all correlated with the shoreline use element;

(e) A use element which considers the proposed general distribution and general location and extent of the use on shorelines and adjacent land areas for housing, business, industry, transportation, agriculture, natural resources, recreation, education, public buildings and grounds, and other categories of public and private uses of the land;

(f) A conservation element for the preservation of natural resources, including but not limited to scenic vistas, aesthetics, and vital estuarine areas for fisheries and wildlife protection;

(g) An historic, cultural, scientific, and educational element for the protection and restoration of buildings, sites, and areas having historic, cultural, scientific, or educational values;

(h) An element that gives consideration to the statewide interest in the prevention and minimization of flood damages; and

(i) Any other element deemed appropriate or necessary to effectuate the policy of this chapter.

(3) The master programs shall include such map or maps, descriptive text, diagrams and charts, or other descriptive material as are necessary to provide for ease of understanding.

(4) Master programs will reflect that state-owned shorelines of the state are particularly adapted to providing wilderness beaches, ecological study areas, and other recreational activities for the public and will give appropriate special consideration to same.

(5) Each master program shall contain provisions to allow for the varying of the application of use regulations of the program, including provisions for permits for conditional uses and variances, to insure that strict implementation of a program will not create unnecessary hardships or thwart the policy enumerated in RCW 90.58.020. Any such varying shall be allowed only if extraordinary circumstances are shown and the public interest suffers no substantial detrimental effect. The concept of this subsection shall be incorporated in the rules adopted by the department relating to the establishment of a permit system as provided in RCW 90.58.140(3).

(6) Each master program shall contain standards governing the protection of single-family residences and appurtenant structures against damage or loss due to shoreline erosion. The standards shall govern the issuance of substantial development permits for shoreline protection, including structural methods such as construction of bulkheads, and nonstructural methods of protection. The standards shall provide for methods which achieve effective and timely protection against loss or damage to single-family residences and appurtenant structures due to shoreline erosion. The standards shall provide a preference for permit issuance for measures to protect single-family residences occupied prior to January 1, 1992, where the proposed measure is designed to minimize harm to the shoreline natural environment. [2009 c 421 § 9; 1997 c 369 § 7; 1995 c 347 § 307; 1992 c 105 § 2; 1991 c 322 § 32; 1971 ex.s. c 286 § 10.]

Effective date—2009 c 421: See note following RCW 43.157.005.

Finding—Severability—Part headings and table of contents not law—1995 c 347: See notes following RCW 36.70A.470.

Findings—Intent—1991 c 322: See note following RCW 86.12.200.

Project of statewide significance—Defined: RCW 43.157.010.

RCW 90.58.110 Development of program within two or more adjacent local government jurisdictions—Development of program in segments, when. (1) Whenever it shall appear to the director that a master program should be developed for a region of the shorelines of the state which includes lands and waters located in two or more adjacent local government jurisdictions, the director shall designate such region and notify the appropriate units of local government thereof. It shall be the duty of the notified units to develop cooperatively an inventory and master program in accordance with and within the time provided in RCW 90.58.080.

(2) At the discretion of the department, a local government master program may be adopted in segments applicable to particular areas so that immediate attention may be given to those areas of the shorelines of the state in most need of a use regulation. [1971 ex.s. c 286 § 11.]

RCW 90.58.120 Adoption of rules, programs, etc., subject to RCW 34.05.310 through 34.05.395—Public hearings, notice of—Public inspection after approval or adoption. All rules, regulations, designations, and guidelines, issued by the department, and master programs and amendments adopted by the department pursuant to RCW 90.58.070(2) or *90.58.090(4) shall be adopted or approved in accordance with the provisions of RCW 34.05.310 through 34.05.395 insofar as such provisions are not inconsistent with the provisions of this chapter. In addition:

(1) Prior to the adoption by the department of a master program, or portion thereof pursuant to RCW 90.58.070(2) or *90.58.090(4), at least one public hearing shall be held in each county affected by a program or portion thereof for the purpose of obtaining the views and comments of the public. Notice of each such hearing shall be published at least once in each of the three weeks immediately preceding the hearing in one or more newspapers of general circulation in the county in which the hearing is to be held.

(2) All guidelines, regulations, designations, or master programs adopted or approved under this chapter shall be available for public inspection at the office of the department or the appropriate county and city. The terms "adopt" and "approve" for purposes of this section, shall include modifications and rescission of guidelines. [1995 c 347 § 308; 1989 c 175 § 182; 1975 1st ex.s. c 182 § 2; 1971 ex.s. c 286 § 12.]

***Reviser's note:** RCW 90.58.090 was amended by 2003 c 321 § 3, changing subsection (4) to subsection (5).

Finding—Severability—Part headings and table of contents not law—1995 c 347: See notes following RCW 36.70A.470.

Effective date—1989 c 175: See note following RCW 34.05.010.

RCW 90.58.130 Involvement of all persons and entities having interest, means. To insure that all persons and entities having an interest in the guidelines and master programs developed under this chapter are provided with a full opportunity for involvement in both their development and implementation, the department and local governments shall:

(1) Make reasonable efforts to inform the people of the state about the shoreline management program of this chapter and in the performance of the responsibilities provided in this chapter, shall not only invite but actively encourage participation by all persons and private groups and entities showing an interest in shoreline management programs of this chapter; and

(2) Invite and encourage participation by all agencies of federal, state, and local government, including municipal and public corporations, having interests or responsibilities relating to the shorelines of the state. State and local agencies are directed to participate fully to insure that their interests are fully considered by the department and local governments. [1971 ex.s. c 286 § 13.]

RCW 90.58.140 Development permits—Grounds for granting—Administration by local government, conditions—Applications—Notices—Rescission—Approval when permit for variance or conditional use. (1) A development shall not be undertaken on the shorelines of the state unless it is consistent with the policy of this chapter and, after adoption or approval, as appropriate, the applicable guidelines, rules, or master program.

(2) A substantial development shall not be undertaken on shorelines of the state without first obtaining a permit from the government entity having administrative jurisdiction under this chapter.

A permit shall be granted:

(a) From June 1, 1971, until such time as an applicable master program has become effective, only when the development proposed is consistent with: (i) The policy of RCW 90.58.020; and (ii) after their adoption, the guidelines and rules of the department; and (iii) so far as can be ascertained, the master program being developed for the area;

(b) After adoption or approval, as appropriate, by the department of an applicable master program, only when the development proposed is consistent with the applicable master program and this chapter.

(3) The local government shall establish a program, consistent with rules adopted by the department, for the administration and enforcement of the permit system provided in this section. The administration of the system so established shall be performed exclusively by the local government.

(4) Except as otherwise specifically provided in subsection (11) of this section, the local government shall require notification of the public of all applications for permits governed by any permit system established pursuant to subsection (3) of this section by ensuring that notice of the application is given by at least one of the following methods:

(a) Mailing of the notice to the latest recorded real property owners as shown by the records of the county assessor within at least three hundred feet of the boundary of the property upon which the substantial development is proposed;

(b) Posting of the notice in a conspicuous manner on the property upon which the project is to be constructed; or

(c) Any other manner deemed appropriate by local authorities to accomplish the objectives of reasonable notice to adjacent landowners and the public.

The notices shall include a statement that any person desiring to submit written comments concerning an application, or desiring to receive notification of the final decision concerning an application as expeditiously as possible after the issuance of the decision, may submit the comments or requests for decisions to the local government within thirty days of the last date the notice is to be published pursuant to this subsection. The local government shall forward, in a timely manner following the issuance of a decision, a copy of the decision to each person who submits a request for the decision.

If a hearing is to be held on an application, notices of such a hearing shall include a statement that any person may submit oral or written comments on an application at the hearing.

(5) The system shall include provisions to assure that construction pursuant to a permit will not begin or be authorized until twenty-one days from the date the permit decision was filed as provided in subsection (6) of this section; or until all review proceedings are terminated if the proceedings were initiated within twenty-one days from the date of filing as defined in subsection (6) of this section except as follows:

(a) In the case of any permit issued to the state of Washington, department of transportation, for the construction and modification of SR 90 (I-90) on or adjacent to Lake Washington, the construction may begin after thirty days from the date of filing, and the permits are valid until December 31, 1995;

(b)(i) In the case of any permit or decision to issue any permit to the state of Washington, department of transportation, for the replacement of the floating bridge and landings of the state route number 520 Evergreen Point bridge on or adjacent to Lake Washington, the construction may begin twenty-one days from the date of filing. Any substantial development permit granted for the floating bridge and landings is deemed to have been granted on the date that the local government's decision to grant the permit is issued. This authorization to construct is limited to only those elements of the floating bridge and landings that do not preclude the department of transportation's selection of a four-lane alternative for state route number 520 between Interstate 5 and Medina. Additionally, the Washington state department of transportation shall not engage in or contract for any construction on any portion of state route number 520 between Interstate 5 and the western landing of the floating bridge until the legislature has authorized the imposition of tolls on the Interstate 90 floating bridge and/or other funding sufficient to complete construction of the state route number 520 bridge replacement and HOV program. For the purposes of this subsection (5)(b), the "western landing of the floating bridge" means the least amount of new construction necessary to connect the new floating bridge to the existing state route number 520 and anchor the west end of the new floating bridge;

(ii) Nothing in this subsection (5)(b) precludes the shorelines hearings board from concluding that the project or any element of the project is inconsistent with the goals and policies of the shoreline management act or the local shoreline master program;

(iii) This subsection (5)(b) applies retroactively to any appeals filed after January 1, 2012, and to any appeals filed on or after March 23, 2012, and expires June 30, 2014;

(c)(i) In the case of permits for projects addressing significant public safety risks, as defined by the department of transportation, it is not in the public interest to delay construction until all

review proceedings are terminated. In the case of any permit issued under this chapter or decision to issue any permit under this chapter for a transportation project of the Washington state department of transportation, construction may begin twenty-one days after the date of filing if all components of the project achieve a no net loss of shoreline ecological functions, as defined by department guidelines adopted pursuant to RCW 90.58.060 and as determined through the following process:

(A) The department of transportation, as part of the permit review process, must provide the local government with an assessment of how the project affects shoreline ecological functions. The assessment must include specific actions for avoiding, minimizing, and mitigating impacts to shoreline ecological functions, developed in consultation with the department, that ensure there is no net loss of shoreline ecological functions; and

(B) The local government, after reviewing the assessment required in (c)(i)(A) of this subsection and prior to the final issuance of all appropriate shoreline permits and variances, must determine that the project will result in no net loss of shoreline ecological functions.

(ii) Nothing in this subsection (5)(c) precludes the shorelines hearings board from concluding that the shoreline project or any element of the project is inconsistent with this chapter, the local shoreline master program, chapter 43.21C RCW and its implementing regulations, or the applicable shoreline regulations.

(iii) This subsection (5)(c) does not apply to permit decisions for the replacement of the floating bridge and landings of the state route number 520 Evergreen Point bridge on or adjacent to Lake Washington;

(d) Except as authorized in (b) and (c) of this subsection, construction may be commenced no sooner than thirty days after the date of the appeal of the board's decision is filed if a permit is granted by the local government and (i) the granting of the permit is appealed to the shorelines hearings board within twenty-one days of the date of filing, (ii) the hearings board approves the granting of the permit by the local government or approves a portion of the substantial development for which the local government issued the permit, and (iii) an appeal for judicial review of the hearings board decision is filed pursuant to chapter 34.05 RCW. The appellant may request, within ten days of the filing of the appeal with the court, a hearing before the court to determine whether construction pursuant to the permit approved by the hearings board or to a revised permit issued pursuant to the order of the hearings board should not commence. If, at the conclusion of the hearing, the court finds that construction pursuant to such a permit would involve a significant, irreversible damaging of the environment, the court shall prohibit the permittee from commencing the construction pursuant to the approved or revised permit until all review proceedings are final. Construction pursuant to a permit revised at the direction of the hearings board may begin only on that portion of the substantial development for which the local government had originally issued the permit, and construction pursuant to such a revised permit on other portions of the substantial development may not begin until after all review proceedings are terminated. In such a hearing before the court, the burden of proving whether the construction may involve significant irreversible damage to the environment and demonstrating whether such construction would or would not be appropriate is on the appellant;

(e) Except as authorized in (b) and (c) of this subsection, if the permit is for a substantial development meeting the requirements of subsection (11) of this section, construction pursuant to that permit may not begin or be authorized until twenty-one days from the date the permit decision was filed as provided in subsection (6) of this section.

If a permittee begins construction pursuant to (a), (b), (c), (d), or (e) of this subsection, the construction is begun at the permittee's own risk. If, as a result of judicial review, the courts order the removal of any portion of the construction or the restoration of any portion of the environment involved or require the alteration of any portion of a substantial development constructed pursuant to a permit, the permittee is barred from recovering damages or costs involved in adhering to such requirements from the local government that granted the permit, the hearings board, or any appellant or intervener.

(6) Any decision on an application for a permit under the authority of this section, whether it is an approval or a denial, shall, concurrently with the transmittal of the ruling to the applicant, be filed with the department and the attorney general. This shall be accomplished by return receipt requested mail. A petition for review of such a decision must be commenced within twenty-one days from the date of filing of the decision.

(a) With regard to a permit other than a permit governed by subsection (10) of this section, "date of filing" as used in this section refers to the date of actual receipt by the department of the local government's decision.

(b) With regard to a permit for a variance or a conditional use governed by subsection (10) of this section, "date of filing" means the date the decision of the department is transmitted by the department to the local government.

(c) When a local government simultaneously transmits to the department its decision on a shoreline substantial development with its approval of either a shoreline conditional use permit or variance, or both, "date of filing" has the same meaning as defined in (b) of this subsection.

(d) The department shall notify in writing the local government and the applicant of the date of filing by telephone or electronic means, followed by written communication as necessary, to ensure that the applicant has received the full written decision.

(7) Applicants for permits under this section have the burden of proving that a proposed substantial development is consistent with the criteria that must be met before a permit is granted. In any review of the granting or denial of an application for a permit as provided in RCW 90.58.180 (1) and (2), the person requesting the review has the burden of proof.

(8) Any permit may, after a hearing with adequate notice to the permittee and the public, be rescinded by the issuing authority upon the finding that a permittee has not complied with conditions of a permit. If the department is of the opinion that noncompliance exists, the department shall provide written notice to the local government and the permittee. If the department is of the opinion that the noncompliance continues to exist thirty days after the date of the notice, and the local government has taken no action to rescind the permit, the department may petition the hearings board for a rescission of the permit upon written notice of the petition to the local government and the permittee if the request by the department is

made to the hearings board within fifteen days of the termination of the thirty-day notice to the local government.

(9) The holder of a certification from the governor pursuant to chapter 80.50 RCW shall not be required to obtain a permit under this section.

(10) Any permit for a variance or a conditional use issued with approval by a local government under their approved master program must be submitted to the department for its approval or disapproval.

(11)(a) An application for a substantial development permit for a limited utility extension or for the construction of a bulkhead or other measures to protect a single-family residence and its appurtenant structures from shoreline erosion shall be subject to the following procedures:

(i) The public comment period under subsection (4) of this section shall be twenty days. The notice provided under subsection (4) of this section shall state the manner in which the public may obtain a copy of the local government decision on the application no later than two days following its issuance;

(ii) The local government shall issue its decision to grant or deny the permit within twenty-one days of the last day of the comment period specified in (a)(i) of this subsection; and

(iii) If there is an appeal of the decision to grant or deny the permit to the local government legislative authority, the appeal shall be finally determined by the legislative authority within thirty days.

(b) For purposes of this section, a limited utility extension means the extension of a utility service that:

(i) Is categorically exempt under chapter 43.21C RCW for one or more of the following: Natural gas, electricity, telephone, water, or sewer;

(ii) Will serve an existing use in compliance with this chapter; and

(iii) Will not extend more than twenty-five hundred linear feet within the shorelines of the state.

(12) A permit under this section is not required in order to dispose of dredged materials at a disposal site approved through the cooperative planning process referenced in RCW 79.105.500, provided the dredged material disposal proponent obtains a valid site use authorization from the dredged material management program office within the department of natural resources. [2019 c 225 § 1; 2015 3rd sp.s. c 15 § 7; 2012 c 84 § 2; 2011 c 277 § 3; 2010 c 210 § 36; 1995 c 347 § 309; 1992 c 105 § 3; 1990 c 201 § 2; 1988 c 22 § 1; 1984 c 7 § 386; 1977 ex.s. c 358 § 1; 1975-'76 2nd ex.s. c 51 § 1; 1975 1st ex.s. c 182 § 3; 1973 2nd ex.s. c 19 § 1; 1971 ex.s. c 286 § 14.]

Effective date—Findings—Intent—2015 3rd sp.s. c 15: See notes following RCW 47.01.485.

Findings—2012 c 84: "In adopting the shoreline management act in 1971, the legislature declared that it is the policy of the state to provide for the management of the shorelines of the state by planning for and fostering all reasonable and appropriate uses, to ensure the development of these shorelines in a manner that will promote and enhance the public interest, and to protect against adverse effects to the public health, the land and its vegetation and wildlife, and the waters of the state and their aquatic life, while protecting generally public rights of navigation and corollary rights incidental thereto.

The legislature declares that the policies recognized in 1971 are still vital to the protection of shorelines of the state.

The legislature recognizes that the replacement of the Evergreen Point bridge affects shorelines of the state and shorelines of statewide significance. However, the legislature finds that the state route number 520 corridor, including the Evergreen Point bridge, is a critical component of the state highway system and of the Puget Sound region's transportation infrastructure and is essential to maintaining and improving the region's and the state's economy.

The legislature further finds that the Evergreen Point bridge and its approaches are in danger of structural failure and that it is highly likely that the bridge will sustain serious structural damage from an earthquake or windstorm over the next fifteen years. The floating span sustained serious damage during the 1993 storm, which required major repair and retrofit. Retrofitting the span has added weight, which causes the floating span to sit lower in the water, increasing the likelihood of waves breaking over the span and causing traffic hazards. The floating span cannot be further retrofitted to withstand severe windstorms. Recent storms have continued to cause damage to the floating span, including cracks in the pontoons that allow water to enter the pontoons.

The legislature further finds that replacement of the floating span and its approaches presents unique challenges in that it is subject to narrow windows in which work on Lake Washington can be performed because of weather and environmental constraints.

The legislature further finds that significant delays in replacing the floating span and east approach of the Evergreen Point bridge must be avoided in order to: Avoid the catastrophic loss of the bridge; protect the safety of the traveling public; prevent injury, loss of life, and property damage; and provide for a strong economy in the Puget Sound region and in Washington state. In the past, the legislature has only provided exemptions to the shoreline management act for bridges that have sunk, and it is the intent of the legislature to only allow this exemption to the automatic stay provision of the shoreline management act because the Evergreen Point floating bridge is in danger of further damage and sinking." [2012 c 84 § 1.]

Effective date—2012 c 84: "This act is necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health, or safety, or support of the state government and its existing public institutions, and takes effect immediately [March 23, 2012]." [2012 c 84 § 3.]

Intent—Effective dates—Application—Pending cases and rules—2010 c 210: See notes following RCW 43.21B.001.

Finding—Severability—Part headings and table of contents not law—1995 c 347: See notes following RCW 36.70A.470.

Finding—Intent—1990 c 201: "The legislature finds that delays in substantial development permit review for the extension of vital utility services to existing and lawful uses within the shorelines of the state have caused hardship upon existing residents without serving any of the purposes and policies of the shoreline management act. It is the intent of this act to provide a more expeditious permit review process for that limited category of utility extension activities

only, while fully preserving safeguards of public review and appeal rights regarding permit applications and decisions." [1990 c 201 § 1.]

RCW 90.58.143 Time requirements—Substantial development permits, variances, conditional use permits. (1) The time requirements of this section shall apply to all substantial development permits and to any development authorized pursuant to a variance or conditional use permit authorized under this chapter. Upon a finding of good cause, based on the requirements and circumstances of the project proposed and consistent with the policy and provisions of the master program and this chapter, local government may adopt different time limits from those set forth in subsections (2) and (3) of this section as a part of action on a substantial development permit.

(2) Construction activities shall be commenced or, where no construction activities are involved, the use or activity shall be commenced within two years of the effective date of a substantial development permit. However, local government may authorize a single extension for a period not to exceed one year based on reasonable factors, if a request for extension has been filed before the expiration date and notice of the proposed extension is given to parties of record on the substantial development permit and to the department.

(3) Authorization to conduct construction activities shall terminate five years after the effective date of a substantial development permit. However, local government may authorize a single extension for a period not to exceed one year based on reasonable factors, if a request for extension has been filed before the expiration date and notice of the proposed extension is given to parties of record and to the department.

(4) The effective date of a substantial development permit shall be the date of filing as provided in RCW 90.58.140(6). The permit time periods in subsections (2) and (3) of this section do not include the time during which a use or activity was not actually pursued due to the pendency of administrative appeals or legal actions or due to the need to obtain any other government permits and approvals for the development that authorize the development to proceed, including all reasonably related administrative or legal actions on any such permits or approvals. [1997 c 429 § 51; 1996 c 62 § 1.]

Severability—1997 c 429: See note following RCW 36.70A.3201.

RCW 90.58.147 Substantial development permit—Exemption for projects to improve fish or wildlife habitat or fish passage. (1) A public or private project that is designed to improve fish or wildlife habitat or fish passage shall be exempt from the substantial development permit requirements of this chapter when all of the following apply:

(a) The project has been approved by the department of fish and wildlife or, for forest practices hydraulic projects within the scope of RCW 77.55.181, the department of natural resources if the local government notification provisions of RCW 77.55.181 are satisfied;

(b) The project has received hydraulic project approval by the department of fish and wildlife pursuant to chapter 77.55 RCW or

approval of a forest practices hydraulic project within the scope of RCW 77.55.181 from the department of natural resources if the local government notification provisions of RCW 77.55.181 are satisfied; and

(c) The local government has determined that the project is substantially consistent with the local shoreline master program. The local government shall make such determination in a timely manner and provide it by letter to the project proponent.

(2) Fish habitat enhancement projects that conform to the provisions of RCW 77.55.181 are determined to be consistent with local shoreline master programs.

(3) Public projects for the primary purpose of fish passage improvement or fish passage barrier removal are exempt from the substantial development permit requirements of this chapter. [2021 c 289 § 2; 2019 c 150 § 2; 2003 c 39 § 49; 1998 c 249 § 4; 1995 c 333 § 1.]

Findings—Purpose—Report—Effective date—1998 c 249: See notes following RCW 77.55.181.

RCW 90.58.150 Selective commercial timber cutting, when. With respect to timber situated within two hundred feet abutting landward of the ordinary high water mark within shorelines of statewide significance, the department or local government shall allow only selective commercial timber cutting, so that no more than thirty percent of the merchantable trees may be harvested in any ten year period of time: PROVIDED, That other timber harvesting methods may be permitted in those limited instances where the topography, soil conditions or silviculture practices necessary for regeneration render selective logging ecologically detrimental: PROVIDED FURTHER, That clear cutting of timber which is solely incidental to the preparation of land for other uses authorized by this chapter may be permitted. [1971 ex.s. c 286 § 15.]

RCW 90.58.160 Prohibition against seabed mining for hard minerals and surface drilling for oil or gas, where. (1) Seabed mining for hard minerals and surface drilling for oil or gas is prohibited in the waters of Puget Sound north to the Canadian boundary and the Strait of Juan de Fuca seaward from the ordinary high water mark and on all lands within one thousand feet landward from said mark.

(2)(a) For purposes of this section, "hard minerals" means natural deposits of valuable minerals including, but not limited to, metals and placer deposits of metals, nonmetallic minerals, gemstones, ores, sediments, gold, silver, copper, lead, iron, manganese, silica, chrome, platinum, tungsten, zirconium, titanium, garnet, and phosphorus.

(b) "Hard minerals" does not include rock, gravel, sand, silt, coal, or hydrocarbons. [2021 c 181 § 3; 1971 ex.s. c 286 § 16.]

RCW 90.58.170 Shorelines hearings board—Established—Members—Chair—Quorum for decision—Expenses of members. A shorelines hearings board sitting as a quasi-judicial body is hereby established within the environmental and land use hearings office under *RCW 43.21B.005.

The shorelines hearings board shall be made up of six members: Three members shall be members of the pollution control hearings board; two members, one appointed by the association of Washington cities and one appointed by the association of county commissioners, both to serve at the pleasure of the associations; and the commissioner of public lands or his or her designee. The chair of the pollution control hearings board shall be the chair of the shorelines hearings board. Except as provided in RCW 90.58.185, a decision must be agreed to by at least four members of the board to be final. The members of the shorelines hearings board shall receive the compensation, travel, and subsistence expenses as provided in RCW 43.03.050 and 43.03.060. [2013 c 23 § 614; 1994 c 253 § 1; 1988 c 128 § 76; 1979 ex.s. c 47 § 6; 1971 ex.s. c 286 § 17.]

***Reviser's note:** RCW 43.21B.005 was amended by 2010 c 210 § 4, changing the "environmental hearings office" to the "environmental and land use hearings office", effective July 1, 2011.

Intent—1979 ex.s. c 47: See note following RCW 43.21B.005.

RCW 90.58.175 Rules and regulations. The shorelines hearings board may adopt rules and regulations governing the administrative practice and procedure in and before the board. [1973 1st ex.s. c 203 § 3.]

RCW 90.58.180 Review of granting, denying, or rescinding permits by shorelines hearings board—Board to act—Local government appeals to board—Grounds for declaring rule, regulation, or guideline invalid—Appeals to court. (1) Any person aggrieved by the granting, denying, or rescinding of a permit on shorelines of the state pursuant to RCW 90.58.140 may seek review from the shorelines hearings board by filing a petition for review within twenty-one days of the date of filing of the decision as defined in RCW 90.58.140(6).

Within seven days of the filing of any petition for review with the board as provided in this section pertaining to a final decision of a local government, the petitioner shall serve copies of the petition on the department, the office of the attorney general, and the local government. The department and the attorney general may intervene to protect the public interest and ensure that the provisions of this chapter are complied with at any time within fifteen days from the date of the receipt by the department or the attorney general of a copy of the petition for review filed pursuant to this section. The shorelines hearings board shall schedule review proceedings on the petition for review without regard as to whether the period for the department or the attorney general to intervene has or has not expired.

(2) The department or the attorney general may obtain review of any final decision granting a permit, or granting or denying an application for a permit issued by a local government by filing a written petition with the shorelines hearings board and the appropriate local government within twenty-one days from the date the final decision was filed as provided in RCW 90.58.140(6).

(3) The review proceedings authorized in subsections (1) and (2) of this section are subject to the provisions of chapter 34.05 RCW pertaining to procedures in adjudicative proceedings. Judicial review

of such proceedings of the shorelines hearings board is governed by chapter 34.05 RCW. The board shall issue its decision on the appeal authorized under subsections (1) and (2) of this section within one hundred eighty days after the date the petition is filed with the board or a petition to intervene is filed by the department or the attorney general, whichever is later. The time period may be extended by the board for a period of thirty days upon a showing of good cause or may be waived by the parties.

(4) Any person may appeal any rules, regulations, or guidelines adopted or approved by the department within thirty days of the date of the adoption or approval. The board shall make a final decision within sixty days following the hearing held thereon.

(5) The board shall find the rule, regulation, or guideline to be valid and enter a final decision to that effect unless it determines that the rule, regulation, or guideline:

(a) Is clearly erroneous in light of the policy of this chapter; or

(b) Constitutes an implementation of this chapter in violation of constitutional or statutory provisions; or

(c) Is arbitrary and capricious; or

(d) Was developed without fully considering and evaluating all material submitted to the department during public review and comment; or

(e) Was not adopted in accordance with required procedures.

(6) If the board makes a determination under subsection (5)(a) through (e) of this section, it shall enter a final decision declaring the rule, regulation, or guideline invalid, remanding the rule, regulation, or guideline to the department with a statement of the reasons in support of the determination, and directing the department to adopt, after a thorough consultation with the affected local government and any other interested party, a new rule, regulation, or guideline consistent with the board's decision.

(7) A decision of the board on the validity of a rule, regulation, or guideline shall be subject to review in superior court, if authorized pursuant to chapter 34.05 RCW. A petition for review of the decision of the shorelines hearings board on a rule, regulation, or guideline shall be filed within thirty days after the date of final decision by the shorelines hearings board. [2011 c 277 § 4; 2010 c 210 § 37; 2003 c 393 § 22; 1997 c 199 § 1; 1995 c 347 § 310; 1994 c 253 § 3; 1989 c 175 § 183; 1986 c 292 § 2; 1975-'76 2nd ex.s. c 51 § 2; 1975 1st ex.s. c 182 § 4; 1973 1st ex.s. c 203 § 2; 1971 ex.s. c 286 § 18.]

Intent—Effective dates—Application—Pending cases and rules—2010 c 210: See notes following RCW 43.21B.001.

Finding—Severability—Part headings and table of contents not law—1995 c 347: See notes following RCW 36.70A.470.

Effective date—1989 c 175: See note following RCW 34.05.010.

Severability—1986 c 292: See note following RCW 90.58.030.

Appeal under this chapter also subject of appeal under state environmental policy act: RCW 43.21C.075.

RCW 90.58.185 Appeals involving single-family residences, involving penalties of fifteen thousand dollars or less, or other designated cases—Composition of board—Rules to expedite appeals. (1) In the case of an appeal involving a single-family residence or appurtenance to a single-family residence, including a dock or pier designed to serve a single-family residence, appeals involving a penalty of fifteen thousand dollars or less, or other cases designated by the chair of the hearings board, the request for review may be heard by a panel of three board members, at least one and not more than two of whom shall be members of the pollution control hearings board. Two members of the three must agree to issue a final decision of the board. In designating appeals for review by panels of three hearings board members, the chair shall consider factors such as the complexity and precedential nature of the case and the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of using a short board versus a full board.

(2) The board shall define by rule alternative processes to expedite appeals, including those involving a single-family residence or appurtenance to a single-family residence, including a dock or pier designed to serve a single-family residence, or involving a penalty of fifteen thousand dollars or less. These alternatives may include: Mediation, upon agreement of all parties; submission of testimony by affidavit; or other forms that may lead to less formal and faster resolution of appeals. [2009 c 422 § 1; 2005 c 34 § 1; 1994 c 253 § 2.]

RCW 90.58.190 Appeal of department's decision to adopt or amend a master program. (1) The appeal of the department's decision to adopt a master program or amendment pursuant to RCW 90.58.070(2) or 90.58.090(5) is governed by RCW 34.05.510 through 34.05.598.

(2)(a) The department's final decision to approve or reject a proposed master program or master program amendment by a local government planning under RCW 36.70A.040 shall be appealed to the growth management hearings board by filing a petition as provided in RCW 36.70A.290.

(b) If the appeal to the growth management hearings board concerns shorelines, the growth management hearings board shall review the proposed master program or amendment solely for compliance with the requirements of this chapter, the policy of RCW 90.58.020 and the applicable guidelines, the internal consistency provisions of RCW 36.70A.070, 36.70A.040(4), 35.63.125, and 35A.63.105, and chapter 43.21C RCW as it relates to the adoption of master programs and amendments under chapter 90.58 RCW.

(c) If the appeal to the growth management hearings board concerns a shoreline of statewide significance, the board shall uphold the decision by the department unless the board, by clear and convincing evidence, determines that the decision of the department is noncompliant with the policy of RCW 90.58.020 or the applicable guidelines, or chapter 43.21C RCW as it relates to the adoption of master programs and amendments under this chapter.

(d) The appellant has the burden of proof in all appeals to the growth management hearings board under this subsection.

(e) Any party aggrieved by a final decision of the growth management hearings board under this subsection may appeal the decision to superior court as provided in RCW 36.70A.300.

(3)(a) The department's final decision to approve or reject a proposed master program or master program amendment by a local government not planning under RCW 36.70A.040 shall be appealed to the shorelines hearings board by filing a petition within thirty days of the date that the department publishes notice of its final decision under RCW 90.58.090(8).

(b) In an appeal relating to shorelines, the shorelines hearings board shall review the proposed master program or master program amendment and, after full consideration of the presentations of the parties, shall determine the validity of the local government's master program or amendment in light of the policy of RCW 90.58.020 and the applicable guidelines, and chapter 43.21C RCW as it relates to the adoption of master programs and amendments under this chapter.

(c) In an appeal relating to shorelines of statewide significance, the shorelines hearings board shall uphold the decision by the department unless the board determines, by clear and convincing evidence that the decision of the department is noncompliant with the policy of RCW 90.58.020 or the applicable guidelines, or chapter 43.21C RCW as it relates to the adoption of master programs and amendments under this chapter.

(d) Review by the shorelines hearings board shall be considered an adjudicative proceeding under chapter 34.05 RCW, the administrative procedure act. The appellant shall have the burden of proof in all such reviews.

(e) Whenever possible, the review by the shorelines hearings board shall be heard within the county where the land subject to the proposed master program or master program amendment is primarily located. The department and any party aggrieved by a final decision of the hearings board may appeal the decision to superior court as provided in chapter 34.05 RCW.

(4) A master program amendment shall become effective after the approval of the department or after the decision of the growth management hearings board or shorelines hearings board to uphold the master program or master program amendment, provided that either the growth management hearings board or the shorelines hearings board may remand the master program or master program amendment to the local government or the department for modification prior to the final adoption of the master program or master program amendment. [2012 c 172 § 1; 2011 c 277 § 5. Prior: 2010 c 211 § 14; 2010 c 210 § 38; 2003 c 321 § 4; 1995 c 347 § 311; 1989 c 175 § 184; 1986 c 292 § 3; 1971 ex.s. c 286 § 19.]

Effective date—Transfer of power, duties, and functions—2010 c 211: See notes following RCW 36.70A.250.

Intent—Effective dates—Application—Pending cases and rules—2010 c 210: See notes following RCW 43.21B.001.

Finding—Intent—2003 c 321: See note following RCW 90.58.030.

Finding—Severability—Part headings and table of contents not law—1995 c 347: See notes following RCW 36.70A.470.

Effective date—1989 c 175: See note following RCW 34.05.010.

Severability—1986 c 292: See note following RCW 90.58.030.

RCW 90.58.195 Shoreline master plan review—Local governments with coastal waters or coastal shorelines. (1) The department of ecology, in cooperation with other state agencies and coastal local governments, shall prepare and adopt ocean use guidelines and policies to be used in reviewing, and where appropriate, amending, shoreline master programs of local governments with coastal waters or coastal shorelines within their boundaries. These guidelines shall be finalized by April 1, 1990.

(2) After the department of ecology has adopted the guidelines required in subsection (1) of this section, counties, cities, and towns with coastal waters or coastal shorelines shall review their shoreline master programs to ensure that the programs conform with RCW 43.143.010 and 43.143.030 and with the department of ecology's ocean use guidelines. Amended master programs shall be submitted to the department of ecology for its approval under RCW 90.58.090 by June 30, 1991. [1989 1st ex.s. c 2 § 13.]

RCW 90.58.200 Rules and regulations. The department and local governments are authorized to adopt such rules as are necessary and appropriate to carry out the provisions of this chapter. [1971 ex.s. c 286 § 20.]

RCW 90.58.210 Court actions to ensure against conflicting uses and to enforce—Civil penalty—Review. (1) Except as provided in RCW 43.05.060 through 43.05.080 and 43.05.150, the attorney general or the attorney for the local government shall bring such injunctive, declaratory, or other actions as are necessary to ensure that no uses are made of the shorelines of the state in conflict with the provisions and programs of this chapter, and to otherwise enforce the provisions of this chapter.

(2) Any person who shall fail to conform to the terms of a permit issued under this chapter or who shall undertake development on the shorelines of the state without first obtaining any permit required under this chapter shall also be subject to a civil penalty not to exceed one thousand dollars for each violation. Each permit violation or each day of continued development without a required permit shall constitute a separate violation.

(3) The penalty provided for in this section shall be imposed by a notice in writing, either by certified mail with return receipt requested or by personal service, to the person incurring the same from the department or local government, describing the violation with reasonable particularity and ordering the act or acts constituting the violation or violations to cease and desist or, in appropriate cases, requiring necessary corrective action to be taken within a specific and reasonable time.

(4) The person incurring the penalty may appeal within thirty days from the date of receipt of the penalty. The term "date of receipt" has the same meaning as provided in RCW 43.21B.001. Any penalty imposed pursuant to this section by the department shall be subject to review by the shorelines hearings board. Any penalty imposed pursuant to this section by local government shall be subject to review by the local government legislative authority. Any penalty jointly imposed by the department and local government shall be

appealed to the shorelines hearings board. [2010 c 210 § 39; 1995 c 403 § 637; 1986 c 292 § 4; 1971 ex.s. c 286 § 21.]

Intent—Effective dates—Application—Pending cases and rules—2010 c 210: See notes following RCW 43.21B.001.

Findings—Short title—Intent—1995 c 403: See note following RCW 34.05.328.

Severability—1986 c 292: See note following RCW 90.58.030.

RCW 90.58.220 General penalty. In addition to incurring civil liability under RCW 90.58.210, any person found to have wilfully engaged in activities on the shorelines of the state in violation of the provisions of this chapter or any of the master programs, rules, or regulations adopted pursuant thereto shall be guilty of a gross misdemeanor, and shall be punished by a fine of not less than twenty-five nor more than one thousand dollars or by imprisonment in the county jail for not more than ninety days, or by both such fine and imprisonment: PROVIDED, That the fine for the third and all subsequent violations in any five-year period shall be not less than five hundred nor more than ten thousand dollars: PROVIDED FURTHER, That fines for violations of RCW 90.58.550, or any rule adopted thereunder, shall be determined under RCW 90.58.560. [1983 c 138 § 3; 1971 ex.s. c 286 § 22.]

RCW 90.58.230 Violators liable for damages resulting from violation—Attorney's fees and costs. Any person subject to the regulatory program of this chapter who violates any provision of this chapter or permit issued pursuant thereto shall be liable for all damage to public or private property arising from such violation, including the cost of restoring the affected area to its condition prior to violation. The attorney general or local government attorney shall bring suit for damages under this section on behalf of the state or local governments. Private persons shall have the right to bring suit for damages under this section on their own behalf and on the behalf of all persons similarly situated. If liability has been established for the cost of restoring an area affected by a violation the court shall make provision to assure that restoration will be accomplished within a reasonable time at the expense of the violator. In addition to such relief, including money damages, the court in its discretion may award attorney's fees and costs of the suit to the prevailing party. [1971 ex.s. c 286 § 23.]

RCW 90.58.240 Additional authority granted department and local governments. In addition to any other powers granted hereunder, the department and local governments may:

(1) Acquire lands and easements within shorelines of the state by purchase, lease, or gift, either alone or in concert with other governmental entities, when necessary to achieve implementation of master programs adopted hereunder;

(2) Accept grants, contributions, and appropriations from any agency, public or private, or individual for the purposes of this chapter;

(3) Appoint advisory committees to assist in carrying out the purposes of this chapter;

(4) Contract for professional or technical services required by it which cannot be performed by its employees. [1972 ex.s. c 53 § 1; 1971 ex.s. c 286 § 24.]

RCW 90.58.250 Intent—Department to cooperate with local governments—Grants for development of master programs. (1) The legislature intends to eliminate the limits on state funding of shoreline master program development and amendment costs. The legislature further intends that the state will provide funding to local governments that is reasonable and adequate to accomplish the costs of developing and amending shoreline master programs consistent with the schedule established by RCW 90.58.080. Except as specifically described herein, nothing in chapter 262, Laws of 2003 is intended to alter the existing obligation, duties, and benefits provided by chapter 262, Laws of 2003 to local governments and the department.

(2) The department is directed to cooperate fully with local governments in discharging their responsibilities under this chapter. Funds shall be available for distribution to local governments on the basis of applications for preparation of master programs and the provisions of RCW 90.58.080(7). Such applications shall be submitted in accordance with regulations developed by the department. The department is authorized to make and administer grants within appropriations authorized by the legislature to any local government within the state for the purpose of developing a master shorelines program. [2003 c 262 § 3; 1971 ex.s. c 286 § 25.]

RCW 90.58.260 State to represent its interest before federal agencies, interstate agencies and courts. The state, through the department of ecology and the attorney general, shall represent its interest before water resource regulation management, development, and use agencies of the United States, including among others, the federal power commission, environmental protection agency, corps of engineers, department of the interior, department of agriculture and the atomic energy commission, before interstate agencies and the courts with regard to activities or uses of shorelines of the state and the program of this chapter. Where federal or interstate agency plans, activities, or procedures conflict with state policies, all reasonable steps available shall be taken by the state to preserve the integrity of its policies. [1971 ex.s. c 286 § 26.]

RCW 90.58.270 Nonapplication to certain structures, docks, developments, etc., placed in navigable waters—Nonapplication to certain rights of action, authority—Floating homes and floating on-water residences must be classified as a conforming preferred use. (1) Nothing in this section shall constitute authority for requiring or ordering the removal of any structures, improvements, docks, fills, or developments placed in navigable waters prior to December 4, 1969, and the consent and authorization of the state of Washington to the

impairment of public rights of navigation, and corollary rights incidental thereto, caused by the retention and maintenance of said structures, improvements, docks, fills or developments are hereby granted: PROVIDED, That the consent herein given shall not relate to any structures, improvements, docks, fills, or developments placed on tidelands, shorelands, or beds underlying said waters which are in trespass or in violation of state statutes.

(2) Nothing in this section shall be construed as altering or abridging any private right of action, other than a private right which is based upon the impairment of public rights consented to in subsection (1) of this section.

(3) Nothing in this section shall be construed as altering or abridging the authority of the state or local governments to suppress or abate nuisances or to abate pollution.

(4) Subsection (1) of this section shall apply to any case pending in the courts of this state on June 1, 1971 relating to the removal of structures, improvements, docks, fills, or developments based on the impairment of public navigational rights.

(5)(a) A floating home permitted or legally established prior to January 1, 2011, must be classified as a conforming preferred use.

(b) For the purposes of this subsection:

(i) "Conforming preferred use" means that applicable development and shoreline master program regulations may only impose reasonable conditions and mitigation that will not effectively preclude maintenance, repair, replacement, and remodeling of existing floating homes and floating home moorages by rendering these actions impracticable.

(ii) "Floating home" means a single-family dwelling unit constructed on a float, that is moored, anchored, or otherwise secured in waters, and is not a vessel, even though it may be capable of being towed.

(6)(a) A floating on-water residence legally established prior to July 1, 2014, must be considered a conforming use and accommodated through reasonable shoreline master program regulations, permit conditions, or mitigation that will not effectively preclude maintenance, repair, replacement, and remodeling of existing floating on-water residences and their moorages by rendering these actions impracticable. A substantial development permit is not required when replacing or remodeling a floating on-water residence if the size of the existing residence is not materially exceeded. A substantial development permit is required if the replacement or remodel of a floating on-water residence materially exceeds the size of the existing residence. All replacements and remodels which add one hundred twenty square feet or more to the living space must require on-board graywater containment or a wastewater connection that disposes of the graywater to a wastewater disposal system.

(b) For the purpose of this subsection, "floating on-water residence" means a vessel or any other floating structure other than a floating home, as defined under subsection (5) of this section: (i) That is designed or used primarily as a residence on the water and has detachable utilities; and (ii) whose owner or primary occupant has held an ownership interest in space in a marina, or has held a lease or sublease to use space in a marina, since a date prior to July 1, 2014. [2021 c 148 § 1; 2014 c 56 § 2; 2011 c 212 § 2; 1971 ex.s. c 286 § 27.]

Finding—Intent—2014 c 56: "(1) The legislature recognizes that all Washington residents benefit from the unique aesthetic, recreational, and economic opportunities that are derived from the state's aquatic resources, including its navigable waters and shoreline areas. The legislature also recognizes that, as affirmed in chapter 212, Laws of 2011, existing floating homes are an important cultural amenity and an element of the state's maritime history and economy. The 2011 legislation, which clarified the legal status of floating homes, was intended to ensure the vitality and long-term survival of existing floating single-family home communities.

(2) The legislature finds that further clarification of the status of other residential uses on water that meet specific requirements and share important cultural, historical, and economic commonalities with floating homes, is necessary.

(3) The legislature, therefore, intends to: Preserve the existence and vitality of current, floating on-water residential uses; establish greater clarity and regulatory uniformity for these uses; and respect the well-established authority of local governments to determine compliance with regulatory requirements applicable to their jurisdiction." [2014 c 56 § 1.]

Finding—2011 c 212: "The legislature recognizes that existing floating homes, as part of our state's existing houseboat communities, are an important cultural amenity and element of our maritime history. These surviving floating home communities are a linkage to the past, when our waterways were the focus of commerce, transport, and development. In order to ensure the vitality and long-term survival of these existing floating home communities, consistent with the legislature's goal of allowing their continued use, improvement, and replacement without undue burden, the legislature finds that it is necessary to clarify their legal status." [2011 c 212 § 1.]

RCW 90.58.280 Application to all state agencies, counties, public and municipal corporations. The provisions of this chapter shall be applicable to all agencies of state government, counties, and public and municipal corporations and to all shorelines of the state owned or administered by them. [1971 ex.s. c 286 § 28.]

RCW 90.58.290 Restrictions as affecting fair market value of property. The restrictions imposed by this chapter shall be considered by the county assessor in establishing the fair market value of the property. [1971 ex.s. c 286 § 29.]

RCW 90.58.300 Department as regulating state agency—Special authority. The department of ecology is designated the state agency responsible for the program of regulation of the shorelines of the state, including coastal shorelines and the shorelines of the inner tidal waters of the state, and is authorized to cooperate with the federal government and sister states and to receive benefits of any statutes of the United States whenever enacted which relate to the programs of this chapter. [1971 ex.s. c 286 § 30.]

RCW 90.58.310 Designation of shorelines of statewide significance by legislature—Recommendation by director, procedure. Additional shorelines of the state shall be designated shorelines of statewide significance only by affirmative action of the legislature.

The director of the department may, however, from time to time, recommend to the legislature areas of the shorelines of the state which have statewide significance relating to special economic, ecological, educational, developmental, recreational, or aesthetic values to be designated as shorelines of statewide significance.

Prior to making any such recommendation the director shall hold a public hearing in the county or counties where the shoreline under consideration is located. It shall be the duty of the county commissioners of each county where such a hearing is conducted to submit their views with regard to a proposed designation to the director at such date as the director determines but in no event shall the date be later than sixty days after the public hearing in the county. [1971 ex.s. c 286 § 31.]

RCW 90.58.320 Height limitation respecting permits. No permit shall be issued pursuant to this chapter for any new or expanded building or structure of more than thirty-five feet above average grade level on shorelines of the state that will obstruct the view of a substantial number of residences on areas adjoining such shorelines except where a master program does not prohibit the same and then only when overriding considerations of the public interest will be served. [1971 ex.s. c 286 § 32.]

RCW 90.58.340 Use policies for land adjacent to shorelines, development of. All state agencies, counties, and public and municipal corporations shall review administrative and management policies, regulations, plans, and ordinances relative to lands under their respective jurisdictions adjacent to the shorelines of the state so as the [to] achieve a use policy on said land consistent with the policy of this chapter, the guidelines, and the master programs for the shorelines of the state. The department may develop recommendations for land use control for such lands. Local governments shall, in developing use regulations for such areas, take into consideration any recommendations developed by the department as well as any other state agencies or units of local government. [1971 ex.s. c 286 § 34.]

RCW 90.58.350 Nonapplication to treaty rights. Nothing in this chapter shall affect any rights established by treaty to which the United States is a party. [1971 ex.s. c 286 § 35.]

RCW 90.58.355 Persons, projects, and activities not required to obtain certain permits, variances, letters of exemption, or other local review. Requirements to obtain a substantial development permit, conditional use permit, variance, letter of exemption, or other review conducted by a local government to implement this chapter do not apply to:

(1) Any person conducting a remedial action at a facility pursuant to a consent decree, order, or agreed order issued pursuant to chapter 70A.305 RCW, or to the department of ecology when it conducts a remedial action under chapter 70A.305 RCW. The department must ensure compliance with the substantive requirements of this chapter through the consent decree, order, or agreed order issued pursuant to chapter 70A.305 RCW, or during the department-conducted remedial action, through the procedures developed by the department pursuant to RCW 70A.305.090;

(2) Any person installing site improvements for stormwater treatment in an existing boatyard facility to meet requirements of a national pollutant discharge elimination system stormwater general permit. The department must ensure compliance with the substantive requirements of this chapter through the review of engineering reports, site plans, and other documents related to the installation of boatyard stormwater treatment facilities;

(3) The department of transportation projects and activities that meet the conditions of RCW 90.58.356; or

(4) Actions taken on the Columbia river by the United States army corps of engineers, under the authority of United States Code Titles 33 and 42 and 33 C.F.R. Sec. 335, to maintain and improve federal navigation channels in accordance with federally mandated dredged material management and improvement project plans, provided the project: (a) Has undergone environmental review under both the national environmental policy act, 42 U.S.C. Sec. 4321-4370h and the state environmental policy act, chapter 43.21C RCW; and (b) has applied for federal clean water act section 401 water quality certifications issued by the department. [2021 c 299 § 1; 2020 c 20 § 1506; 2015 3rd sp.s. c 15 § 9; 2012 c 169 § 1; 1994 c 257 § 20.]

Finding—Intent—2015 3rd sp.s. c 15: See note following RCW 90.58.356.

Severability—1994 c 257: See note following RCW 36.70A.270.

RCW 90.58.356 Projects and activities not required to obtain certain permits, variances, letters of exemption, or other local review—Written notice, when required. (1) For purposes of this section, the following definitions apply:

(a) "Maintenance" means the preservation of the transportation facility, including surface, shoulders, roadsides, structures, and such traffic control devices as are necessary for safe and efficient utilization of the highway in a manner that substantially conforms to the preexisting design, function, and location as the original except to meet current engineering standards or environmental permit requirements.

(b) "Repair" means to restore a structure or development to a state comparable to its original condition including, but not limited to, restoring the development's size, shape, configuration, location, and external appearance, within a reasonable period after decay or partial destruction. Repair of a structure or development may not cause substantial adverse effects to shoreline resources or the shoreline environment. Replacement of a structure or development may be considered a repair if: Replacement is the common method of repair for the type of structure or development; the replacement structure or

development is comparable to the original structure or development including, but not limited to, the size, shape, configuration, location, and external appearance of the original structure or development; and the replacement does not cause substantial adverse effects to shoreline resources or the shoreline environment.

(c) "Replacement" of any existing transportation facility means to replace in a manner that substantially conforms to the preexisting design, function, and location as the original except to meet current engineering standards or environmental permit requirements. Maintenance or replacement activities do not involve expansion of automobile lanes, and do not result in significant negative shoreline impact.

(2) The following department of transportation projects and activities do not require a substantial development permit, conditional use permit, variance, letter of exemption, or other review conducted by a local government:

(a) Maintenance, repair, or replacement that occurs within the roadway prism of a state highway as defined in RCW 46.04.560, the lease or ownership area of a state ferry terminal, or the lease or ownership area of a transit facility, including ancillary transportation facilities such as pedestrian paths, bicycle paths, or both, and bike lanes;

(b) Construction or installation of safety structures and equipment, including pavement marking, freeway surveillance and control systems, railroad protective devices not including grade separated crossings, grooving, glare screen, safety barriers, energy attenuators, and hazardous or dangerous tree removal;

(c) Maintenance occurring within the right-of-way; or

(d) Construction undertaken in response to unforeseen, extraordinary circumstances that is necessary to prevent a decline, lapse, or cessation of service from a lawfully established transportation facility.

(3) The department of transportation must provide written notification of projects and activities authorized under this section with a cost in excess of one million dollars before the design or plan is finalized to all agencies with jurisdiction, agencies with facilities or services that may be impacted, and adjacent property owners. [2015 3rd sp.s. c 15 § 10.]

Finding—2015 3rd sp.s. c 15: "To ensure that vital maintenance and minor safety upgrades to state transportation facilities are efficiently achieved while still protecting the shoreline environment, the legislature finds that it is in the public interest to exclude state highway maintenance and minor safety upgrade activities from local review and approval processes under the shoreline management act, as provided in RCW 90.58.355 and 90.58.356." [2015 3rd sp.s. c 15 § 8.]

Effective date—Findings—Intent—2015 3rd sp.s. c 15: See notes following RCW 47.01.485.

RCW 90.58.360 Existing requirements for permits, certificates, etc., not obviated. Nothing in this chapter shall obviate any requirement to obtain any permit, certificate, license, or approval from any state agency or local government. [1971 ex.s. c 286 § 36.]

RCW 90.58.370 Processing of permits or authorizations for emergency water withdrawal and facilities to be expedited. All state and local agencies with authority under this chapter to issue permits or other authorizations in connection with emergency water withdrawals and facilities authorized under RCW 43.83B.410 shall expedite the processing of such permits or authorizations in keeping with the emergency nature of such requests and shall provide a decision to the applicant within fifteen calendar days of the date of application. [1989 c 171 § 11; 1987 c 343 § 5.]

Severability—1989 c 171: See note following RCW 43.83B.400.

RCW 90.58.380 Adoption of wetland manual. The department by rule shall adopt a manual for the delineation of wetlands under this chapter that implements and is consistent with the 1987 manual in use on January 1, 1995, by the United States army corps of engineers and the United States environmental protection agency. If the corps of engineers and the environmental protection agency adopt changes to or a different manual, the department shall consider those changes and may adopt rules implementing those changes. [1995 c 382 § 11.]

RCW 90.58.515 Watershed restoration projects—Exemption. Watershed restoration projects as defined in RCW 89.08.460 are exempt from the requirement to obtain a substantial development permit. Local government shall review the projects for consistency with the locally adopted shoreline master program in an expeditious manner and shall issue its decision along with any conditions within forty-five days of receiving a complete consolidated application form from the applicant. No fee may be charged for accepting and processing applications for watershed restoration projects as used in this section. [1995 c 378 § 16.]

RCW 90.58.550 Oil or natural gas exploration in marine waters—Definitions—Application for permit—Requirements—Review—Enforcement. (1) Within this section the following definitions apply:

(a) "Exploration activity" means reconnaissance or survey work related to gathering information about geologic features and formations underlying or adjacent to marine waters;

(b) "Marine waters" include the waters of Puget Sound north to the Canadian border, the waters of the Strait of Juan de Fuca, the waters between the western boundary of the state and the ordinary high water mark, and related bays and estuaries;

(c) "Vessel" includes ships, boats, barges, or any other floating craft.

(2) A person desiring to perform oil or natural gas exploration activities by vessel located on or within marine waters of the state shall first obtain a permit from the department of ecology. The department may approve an application for a permit only if it determines that the proposed activity will not:

(a) Interfere materially with the normal public uses of the marine waters of the state;

(b) Interfere with activities authorized by a permit issued under RCW 90.58.140(2);

(c) Injure the marine biota, beds, or tidelands of the waters;

(d) Violate water quality standards established by the department; or

(e) Create a public nuisance.

(3) Decisions on an application under subsection (2) of this section are subject to review only by the pollution control hearings board under chapter 43.21B RCW.

(4) This section does not apply to activities conducted by an agency of the United States or the state of Washington.

(5) This section does not lessen, reduce, or modify RCW 90.58.160.

(6) The department may adopt rules necessary to implement this section.

(7) The attorney general shall enforce this section. [1983 c 138 § 1.]

Ocean resources management act: Chapter 43.143 RCW.

Transport of petroleum products or hazardous substances: Chapter 88.40 RCW.

RCW 90.58.560 Oil or natural gas exploration—Violations of RCW 90.58.550—Penalty—Appeal. (1) Except as provided in RCW 43.05.060 through 43.05.080 and 43.05.150, a person who violates RCW 90.58.550, or any rule adopted thereunder, is subject to a penalty in an amount of up to five thousand dollars a day for every such violation. Each and every such violation shall be a separate and distinct offense, and in case of a continuing violation, every day's continuance shall be and be deemed to be a separate and distinct violation. Every act of commission or omission which procures, aids or abets in the violation shall be considered a violation under the provisions of this section and subject to the penalty provided for in this section.

(2) The penalty shall be imposed by a notice in writing, either by certified mail with return receipt requested or by personal service, to the person incurring the penalty from the director or the director's representative describing such violation with reasonable particularity.

(3) Any person incurring any penalty under this section may appeal the penalty to the hearings board as provided for in chapter 43.21B RCW. Such appeals shall be filed within thirty days from the date of receipt of the penalty. Any penalty imposed under this section shall become due and payable thirty days after receipt of a notice imposing the same unless an appeal is filed. Whenever an appeal of any penalty incurred under this section is filed, the penalty shall become due and payable only upon completion of all review proceedings and the issuance of a final order confirming the penalty in whole or in part.

(4) If the amount of any penalty is not paid to the department within thirty days after it becomes due and payable, the attorney general, upon the request of the director, shall bring an action in the name of the state of Washington in the superior court of Thurston county or of any county in which such violator may do business, to recover such penalty. In all such actions the procedure and rules of evidence shall be the same as an ordinary civil action except as otherwise provided in this chapter. All penalties recovered under this

section shall be paid into the state treasury and credited to the general fund. [2010 c 210 § 40; 1995 c 403 § 638; 1983 c 138 § 2.]

Intent—Effective dates—Application—Pending cases and rules—2010 c 210: See notes following RCW 43.21B.001.

Findings—Short title—Intent—1995 c 403: See note following RCW 34.05.328.

RCW 90.58.570 Consultation before responding to federal coastal zone management certificates. The department of ecology shall consult with affected state agencies, local governments, Indian tribes, and the public prior to responding to federal coastal zone management consistency certifications for uses and activities occurring on the federal outer continental shelf. [1989 1st ex.s. c 2 § 15.]

RCW 90.58.580 Shoreline restoration projects—Relief from shoreline master program development standards and use regulations. (1) The local government may grant relief from shoreline master program development standards and use regulations within urban growth areas when the following apply:

(a) A shoreline restoration project causes or would cause a landward shift in the ordinary high water mark, resulting in the following:

(i)(A) Land that had not been regulated under this chapter prior to construction of the restoration project is brought under shoreline jurisdiction; or

(B) Additional regulatory requirements apply due to a landward shift in required shoreline buffers or other regulations of the applicable shoreline master program; and

(ii) Application of shoreline master program regulations would preclude or interfere with use of the property permitted by local development regulations, thus presenting a hardship to the project proponent;

(b) The proposed relief meets the following criteria:

(i) The proposed relief is the minimum necessary to relieve the hardship;

(ii) After granting the proposed relief, there is net environmental benefit from the restoration project;

(iii) Granting the proposed relief is consistent with the objectives of the shoreline restoration project and consistent with the shoreline master program; and

(iv) Where a shoreline restoration project is created as mitigation to obtain a development permit, the project proponent required to perform the mitigation is not eligible for relief under this section; and

(c) The application for relief must be submitted to the department for written approval or disapproval. This review must occur during the department's normal review of a shoreline substantial development permit, conditional use permit, or variance. If no such permit is required, then the department shall conduct its review when the local government provides a copy of a complete application and all supporting information necessary to conduct the review.

(i) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (2) of this section, the department shall provide at least twenty-days notice to parties that have indicated interest to the department in reviewing applications for relief under this section, and post the notice on their website.

(ii) The department shall act within thirty calendar days of close of the public notice period, or within thirty days of receipt of the proposal from the local government if additional public notice is not required.

(2) The public notice requirements of subsection (1)(c) of this section do not apply if the relevant shoreline restoration project was included in a shoreline master program or shoreline restoration plan as defined in WAC 173-26-201, as follows:

(a) The restoration plan has been approved by the department under applicable shoreline master program guidelines;

(b) The shoreline restoration project is specifically identified in the shoreline master program or restoration plan or is located along a shoreline reach identified in the shoreline master program or restoration plan as appropriate for granting relief from shoreline regulations; and

(c) The shoreline master program or restoration plan includes policies addressing the nature of the relief and why, when, and how it would be applied.

(3) A substantial development permit is not required on land within urban growth areas as defined in RCW 36.70A.030 that is brought under shoreline jurisdiction due to a shoreline restoration project creating a landward shift in the ordinary high water mark.

(4) The definitions in this subsection apply throughout this section unless the context clearly requires otherwise.

(a) "Shoreline restoration project" means a project designed to restore impaired ecological function of a shoreline.

(b) "Urban growth areas" has the same meaning as defined in RCW 36.70A.030. [2009 c 405 § 2.]

Finding—Intent—2009 c 405: "The legislature finds that restoration of degraded shoreline conditions is important to the ecological function of our waters. However, restoration projects that shift the location of the shoreline can inadvertently create hardships for property owners, particularly in urban areas. Hardship may occur when a shoreline restoration project shifts shoreline management act regulations into areas that had not previously been regulated under the act or shifts the location of required shoreline buffers. The legislature intends to provide relief to property owners in such cases, while protecting the viability of shoreline restoration projects." [2009 c 405 § 1.]

RCW 90.58.590 Local governments authorized to adopt moratoria—Requirements—Public hearing. (1) Local governments may adopt moratoria or other interim official controls as necessary and appropriate to implement this chapter.

(2)(a) A local government adopting a moratorium or control under this section must:

(i) Hold a public hearing on the moratorium or control;

(ii) Adopt detailed findings of fact that include, but are not limited to justifications for the proposed or adopted actions and explanations of the desired and likely outcomes;

(iii) Notify the department of the moratorium or control immediately after its adoption. The notification must specify the time, place, and date of any public hearing required by this subsection;

(iv) Provide that all lawfully existing uses, structures, or other development shall continue to be deemed lawful conforming uses and may continue to be maintained, repaired, and redeveloped, so long as the use is not expanded, under the terms of the land use and shoreline rules and regulations in place at the time of the moratorium.

(b) The public hearing required by this section must be held within sixty days of the adoption of the moratorium or control.

(3) A moratorium or control adopted under this section may be effective for up to six months if a detailed work plan for remedying the issues and circumstances necessitating the moratorium or control is developed and made available for public review. A moratorium or control may be renewed for two six-month periods if the local government complies with subsection (2)(a) of this section before each renewal. If a moratorium or control is in effect on the date a proposed master program or amendment is submitted to the department, the moratorium or control must remain in effect until the department's final action under RCW 90.58.090; however, the moratorium expires six months after the date of submittal if the department has not taken final action.

(4) Nothing in this section may be construed to modify county and city moratoria powers conferred outside this chapter. [2009 c 444 § 2.]

Intent—2009 c 444: "The legislature recognizes that cities and counties have moratoria authority granted through constitutional and statutory provisions and that this authority, when properly exercised, is an important aspect of complying with environmental stewardship and protection requirements.

Recognizing the fundamental role and value of properly exercised moratoria, the legislature intends to establish new moratoria procedures and to affirm moratoria authority that local governments have and may exercise when implementing the shoreline management act, while recognizing the legitimate interests of existing shoreline-related developments during the period of interim moratoria." [2009 c 444 § 1.]

RCW 90.58.600 Conformance with chapter 43.97 RCW required. With respect to the National Scenic Area, as defined in the Columbia [River] Gorge National Scenic Area Act, P.L. 99-663, the exercise of any power or authority by a local government or the department of ecology pursuant to this chapter shall be subject to and in conformity with the requirements of chapter 43.97 RCW, including the management plan regulations and ordinances adopted by the Columbia River Gorge commission pursuant to the Compact. [1987 c 499 § 10.]

RCW 90.58.610 Relationship between shoreline master programs and development regulations under growth management act governed by RCW 36.70A.480. RCW 36.70A.480 governs the relationship between shoreline master programs and development regulations to protect critical areas that are adopted under chapter 36.70A RCW. [2010 c 107 § 4.]

Intent—Retroactive application—Effective date—2010 c 107: See notes following RCW 36.70A.480.

RCW 90.58.620 New or amended master programs—Authorized provisions. (1) New or amended master programs approved by the department on or after September 1, 2011, may include provisions authorizing:

(a) Residential structures and appurtenant structures that were legally established and are used for a conforming use, but that do not meet standards for the following to be considered a conforming structure: Setbacks, buffers, or yards; area; bulk; height; or density; and

(b) Redevelopment, expansion, change with the class of occupancy, or replacement of the residential structure if it is consistent with the master program, including requirements for no net loss of shoreline ecological functions.

(2) For purposes of this section, "appurtenant structures" means garages, sheds, and other legally established structures. "Appurtenant structures" does not include bulkheads and other shoreline modifications or overwater structures.

(3) Nothing in this section: (a) Restricts the ability of a master program to limit redevelopment, expansion, or replacement of overwater structures located in hazardous areas, such as floodplains and geologically hazardous areas; or (b) affects the application of other federal, state, or local government requirements to residential structures. [2011 c 323 § 2.]

Findings—2011 c 323: "(1) The legislature recognizes that there is concern from property owners regarding legal status of existing legally developed shoreline structures under updated shoreline master programs. Significant concern has been expressed by residential property owners during shoreline master program updates regarding the legal status of existing shoreline structures that may not meet current standards for new development.

(2) Engrossed House Bill No. 1653, enacted as chapter 107, Laws of 2010 clarified the status of existing structures in the shoreline area under the growth management act prior to the update of shoreline regulations. It is in the public interest to clarify the legal status of these structures that will apply after shoreline regulations are updated.

(3) Updated shoreline master programs must include provisions to ensure that expansion, redevelopment, and replacement of existing structures will result in no net loss of the ecological function of the shoreline. Classifying existing structures as legally conforming will not create a risk of degrading shoreline natural resources." [2011 c 323 § 1.]

RCW 90.58.900 Liberal construction—1971 ex.s. c 286. This chapter is exempted from the rule of strict construction, and it shall be liberally construed to give full effect to the objectives and purposes for which it was enacted. [1971 ex.s. c 286 § 37.]

RCW 90.58.920 Effective date—1971 ex.s. c 286. This chapter is necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health and safety, the support of the state government, and its existing institutions. This 1971 act shall take effect on June 1, 1971. The director of ecology is authorized to immediately take such steps as are necessary to insure that this 1971 act is implemented on its effective date. [1971 ex.s. c 286 § 41.]