

**Chapter 6 Shorelines**  
2/2/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
S-101 King County has primary responsibility within its boundaries for planning required by the Shoreline Management Act and for administering its shoreline regulatory program.	Policy staff flag					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>S-101 could be deleted. It's state law that doesn't need to be in the policies.</li> </ul>
S-102 King County's Shoreline Master Program is to be interpreted consistently with the policies and requirements of the Shoreline Management Act (Chapter 90.58 Revised Code of Washington ((90.58))).	Technical change	Grammar	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified</li> </ul>
S-102 King County's Shoreline Master Program is to be interpreted consistently with the policies and requirements of the Shoreline Management Act (Chapter 90.58 Revised Code of Washington ((90.58))).  S-103 King County's Shoreline Master Program is to be interpreted consistently with the required elements of the shoreline guidelines found in Chapters 173-26 and 173-27 of the Washington Administrative Code.	Policy staff flag					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Councilmembers may wish to consolidate the policies of S-102 and S-103 given the similarities between the policies. Policies S-102 and S-103 identify which state laws the Shoreline Master Program is subject to.</li> </ul>
S-104 King County's Shoreline Master Program is exempted from the rules of strict construction and shall be construed liberally to give full effect to its objectives and purpose.	Policy staff flag					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This policy parallels RCW 90.58.100 and could be deleted.</li> </ul>
S-105 King County's shoreline jurisdiction extends over all shorelines of the state, as that term is defined in the Shoreline Management Act, in unincorporated King County. This includes jurisdiction over shorelines, shorelines of statewide significance and shorelands.  S-106 King County includes within its shoreline jurisdiction the 100-year floodplains of shorelines of the state.	Policy staff flag					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policies S-105 and S-106 could be combined to clearly define the County's shoreline jurisdiction in one policy instead of two.</li> <li>Language around floodways and adjacent land could be added to the policy to reflect what is included in the 100-year floodplain consistent with state law.</li> <li>State law allows the County the option to include the 100-year floodplain in its shoreline jurisdiction, which the County has elected to include. The current plan describes this option, splitting the scope of the shoreline jurisdiction into two policies, S-105 and S-106. These two policies must be read together in order to understand the boundaries, which may cause confusion.</li> </ul>
S-107 Where critical areas are located within the unincorporated King County shorelands, the shoreline jurisdiction shall not include the critical area buffers that extend outside of the shoreline jurisdiction boundary.	Policy staff flag					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The policy could be amended to be consistent with state law, which uses "shorelines of the state" instead of "shorelands." "Shorelands" does not include the actual waterbody that the Shoreline Master Program covers. This would clarify this policy, consistent with state law.</li> <li>Flag for CAO update.</li> </ul>

**Chapter 6 Shorelines**  
2/2/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
<p>S-201 All proposed uses and development occurring within King County's shoreline jurisdiction (<del>must</del>) shall conform to the Shoreline Management Act and to King County's Shoreline Master Program.</p>	<p>Clarification of existing policy intent</p>	<p>"Shall" is more consistent with Comprehensive Plan nomenclature</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>
<p>S-203 King County, when determining allowable uses and resolving use conflicts in the shoreline jurisdiction, shall apply the following preferences and priorities in the order listed below:</p> <p>a. Reserve appropriate areas for protecting and restoring shoreline ecological processes and functions to control pollution and prevent damage to the natural environment and to public health.</p> <p>b. Reserve shoreline areas for water-dependent and associated water-related uses. Harbor areas, established pursuant to Article XV of the State Constitution, and other areas that have reasonable commercial navigational accessibility and necessary support facilities, such as transportation and utilities, should be reserved for water-dependent and water-related uses that are associated with commercial navigation, unless adequate shoreline is reserved for future water-dependent and water-related uses and unless protection of the existing natural resource values of such areas preclude such uses. Shoreline mixed-use developments may be allowed if they include and support water-dependent uses and address specific conditions that affect water-dependent uses.</p> <p>c. Reserve shoreline areas for other water-related and water-enjoyment uses that are compatible with ecological protection and restoration objectives.</p> <p>d. Locate single (<del>family</del>) detached residential uses where they are appropriate and can be developed without significant impact to shoreline ecological processes and functions or displacement of water-dependent uses.</p> <p>e. Limit nonwater-oriented uses to those locations that are inappropriate for higher priority uses or locations where the nonwater-oriented uses demonstrably contribute to the objectives of the Shoreline Management Act.</p>	<p>Clarification of existing policy intent</p>	<p>Edits for clarity and to reflect current terminology</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>"Single detached" is not the terminology used in the Shoreline Management Act. References to "single detached residential uses" could be changed back to "single-family residential uses" or clarified elsewhere in this chapter.</li> <li>Exec staff state that the change to single detached was done for consistency throughout the Comprehensive Plan to align with current code and current county terminology for housing planning; the SMA does not define single-family residences, but definitions could be updated to reference that the intent is to include single-family homes.</li> </ul>
<p>S-205 The following policy goals apply to all of the shoreline jurisdiction. The goals are not ranked in importance and have been assigned a number for identification purposes only.</p> <p>a. The use of the shoreline jurisdiction for those economically productive uses that are particularly dependent on shoreline location or use.</p> <p>b. The use of the shoreline jurisdiction for public access and recreation.</p> <p>c. Protection and restoration of the ecological processes and functions of shoreline natural resources.</p> <p>d. Protection of the public right of navigation and corollary uses of waters of the state.</p> <p>e. The protection and restoration of buildings and sites having historic, cultural, and educational value.</p> <p>f. Planning for public facilities and utilities correlated with other shorelines uses.</p> <p>g. Prevention and minimization of flood damage.</p> <p>h. Recognizing and protecting private property rights.</p>	<p>Technical change</p>	<p>Current terminology</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>"Single detached" is not the terminology used in the Shoreline Management Act. References to "single detached residential uses" could be changed back to "single-family residential uses" or clarified elsewhere in this chapter.</li> <li>Could add "shall" near the beginning of the policy to give the policy direction.</li> </ul>

Chapter 6 Shorelines

2/2/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
i. Preferential accommodation of single ((family)) detached residential uses. j. Coordination of shoreline management with other relevant local, state and federal programs.						
S-212 ((The policy of achieving)) Development regulations shall provide both shoreline use and protection ((is reflected in the provision that)) by requiring permitted uses in the shoreline jurisdiction ((shall)) to be designed and conducted in a manner to avoid or minimize, in so far as practical, any resultant damage to the ecology and environment of the shoreline area and the public's use of the water.	Clarification of existing policy intent	Reoriented from statement to policy direction, consistent with existing intent	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>
S-309 The King County Shoreline Master Program should guide the ((e))County's transportation plans and projects within the shoreline jurisdiction.	Technical change	Grammar	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>
S-314 Historic resources in the shoreline jurisdiction should be protected to prevent the destruction of, or damage to, any site having archaeological, historic, cultural, or scientific value through coordination and consultation with the appropriate local, state and federal authorities, including affected Indian tribes. a. Sites should be protected in collaboration with appropriate Indian tribal, state, federal, and other local governments. Cooperation among public and private parties ((is to)) should be encouraged in the identification, protection, and management of cultural resources. b. Where appropriate, access to such sites should be made available to parties of interest. Access to such sites ((must)) shall be designed and managed in a manner that gives maximum protection to the resource. c. Opportunities for education related to archaeological, historical, and cultural features should be provided where appropriate and incorporated into public and private programs and development.	Clarification of existing policy intent	"Should" and "shall" are more consistent with Comprehensive Plan nomenclature  Other edits to reflect current terminology	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>
S-315 King County should work with Indian tribal, state, federal, and local governments to maintain an inventory of all known historic resources. King County shall protect these inventories from public disclosure to the extent permitted or required under applicable federal and state law. As appropriate, such sites should be preserved and restored for study, education, and public enjoyment to the maximum possible extent.	Technical change	Current terminology	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>
S-317 Cooperation among involved private and public parties should be encouraged to achieve these historic, cultural, scientific, and educational objectives.	Policy staff flag					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As written, this policy doesn't stand on its own, it could be reworded focus on protecting resources.</li> </ul>
S-320 Owners of historic resource are encouraged to make substantial development plans known well in advance of application so that appropriate agencies, such as the Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation, Indian ((T))tribes, and others, may have ample time to assess the site and make arrangements to preserve historic, cultural, scientific, and educational values as applicable.	Technical change	Current terminology	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Substantial development is a term that has a specific definition. The language could be broadened so that all shoreline development is communicated to interested parties, by deleting "substantial development".</li> </ul>

**Chapter 6 Shorelines**  
2/2/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
<del>S-401 The King County Shoreline Master Program must be consistent with the Washington State Growth Management Act.</del>	Clarification of existing policy intent	Redundant to state law; not necessary for Comprehensive Plan to state.	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>
<del>S-402 The King County Shoreline Master Program must be consistent with and coordinated with the King County Countywide Planning Policies.</del>	Clarification of existing policy intent	Redundant to state law; not necessary for Comprehensive Plan to state.	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>
S-404 The King County Shoreline Master Program includes by reference portions of the King County critical areas regulations into the Shoreline Master Program to meet the requirements of Revised Code of Washington 90.58.090((3) and 90.58.090(4)).	Clarification of existing policy intent	Raised RCW reference up a level for more timelessness to help ensure accuracy over the next 10 years	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>
S-405 To the maximum extent practical, King County's Shoreline Master Program shall rely on King County's existing regulations, including critical areas regulations, surface water management regulations, clearing and grading regulations, and zoning ((in order)) to comply with the Shoreline Management Act and the Ecology's guidelines.	Technical change	Grammar	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>
S-406 The King County Shoreline Master Program ((will)) shall rely on the policies and programs established in the King County Flood Hazard Management Plan and flood hazard regulations to meet the requirements of the Shoreline Management Act and the Department of Ecology's guidelines for flood hazard reduction.	Clarification of existing policy intent	"Will" is predictive but "shall" is directive; policies should be directive, not statements of what is anticipated to happen.	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>
[Lead-in text on page 6-29] Shoreline areas that meet the jurisdictional criteria, but that are not mapped or designated, are assigned a Conservancy designation until the Shoreline Master Program is amended to assign a shoreline environment to that shoreline reach.	Policy staff flag					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This lead-in text provides policy direction and guidance. The text could be a policy.</li> </ul>
[Lead-in text on page 6-33] Purpose The purpose of the High Intensity Shoreline Environment is to provide for high intensity water-oriented commercial and industrial uses.	Policy staff flag					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The purpose statement could be a policy. This is currently lead-in text, but works in conjunction with criteria policies and management policies for this shoreline environment to establish the policy framework.</li> </ul>
[Lead-in text on page 6-34] Purpose The purpose of the Residential Shoreline Environment is to accommodate residential and commercial uses on a scale appropriate with urban residential zones.	Policy staff flag					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The purpose statement could be a policy. This is currently lead-in text, but it works in conjunction with criteria policies and management policies for this shoreline environment to establish the policy framework.</li> </ul>
S-509 King County shall require that the scale and intensity of new uses and development within the Residential Shoreline Environment	Technical change	Grammar	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>

Chapter 6 Shorelines

2/2/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
is compatible with((;)) and protects or enhances the existing character of the area.					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Description of proposed regulations:</u> n/a</li> <li>• <u>Anticipated resource need:</u> n/a</li> <li>• <u>Anticipated timeline:</u> n/a</li> </ul>	
<p>[Lead-in text on page 6-35] Purpose</p> <p>The purpose of the Rural Shoreline Environment is to accommodate land uses normally associated with rural levels of development while providing appropriate public access and recreational uses to the maximum extent practicable.</p>	Policy staff flag					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The purpose statement could be a policy. This is currently lead-in text, but it works in conjunction with criteria policies and management policies for this shoreline environment to establish the policy framework.</li> </ul>
<p>S-514 King County should require that multi-family and multi-lot residential and recreational developments in the Rural Shoreline Environment provide public access and joint use for community recreational facilities.</p>	Policy staff flag					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Multifamily development is not permitted in the Rural Shoreline Environment. This policy could be revised to be consistent with the regulations.</li> <li>• "Multi-lot" development is not a term that is typically used. "Lot division" could be used instead as it is a more common term</li> </ul>
<p>[Lead-in text on page 6-36] Purpose</p> <p>The purpose of the Conservancy Shoreline Environment is to conserve areas that are a high priority for restoration, include valuable historic properties or provide recreational opportunities.</p>	Policy staff flag					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The purpose statement could be a policy. This is currently lead-in text, but it works in conjunction with criteria policies and management policies for this shoreline environment to establish the policy framework.</li> </ul>
<p>S-517 King County shall require that new uses or development in the Conservancy Shoreline Environment preserve the existing character of the shoreline consistent with the purpose of the environment, including:</p> <p>a. Limiting the total effective impervious surface in the shoreline jurisdiction to no more than ((<del>ten</del>)) 10 percent ((<del>in order</del>)) to maintain the existing hydrologic character of the site; and</p> <p>b. Allowing more effective impervious surface coverage on lots legally created prior to the date of adoption of this update to King County's Shoreline Master Program. In these cases, effective impervious surface coverage shall be limited to the maximum extent practicable.</p>	Technical change	Grammar	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Planned implementation of proposal:</u> n/a</li> <li>• <u>Description of proposed regulations:</u> n/a</li> <li>• <u>Anticipated resource need:</u> n/a</li> <li>• <u>Anticipated timeline:</u> n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No issues identified.</li> </ul>
<p>[Lead-in text on page 6-37] Purpose</p> <p>The purpose of the Resource Shoreline Environment is to allow for mining and agricultural uses on lands that have been designated under the Growth Management Act as agricultural lands of long-term commercial significance or mineral resource lands where those lands do not provide significant shoreline ecological processes and functions.</p>	Policy staff flag					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The purpose statement could be a policy. This is currently lead-in text, but it works in conjunction with criteria policies and management policies for this shoreline environment to establish the policy framework.</li> </ul>
<p>[Lead-in text on page 6-38] Purpose</p>	Policy staff flag					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The purpose statement could be a policy. This is currently lead-in text, but it works in conjunction with criteria policies and management</li> </ul>

Chapter 6 Shorelines

2/2/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
The purpose of the Forestry Shoreline Environment is to allow for forestry uses in the Forest Production District and to protect municipal watersheds.						policies for this shoreline environment to establish the policy framework.
S-522 King County shall require forest practices in the Forestry Shoreline Environment to comply with standards that provide protection for shoreline ecological processes and functions equal to or greater than the forest practice rules adopted by the Washington State Department of Natural Resources ((and in effect on January 1, 2007)).	Clarification of existing policy intent	Date is not needed to reflect current adopted rules	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>
[Lead-in text on page 6-39] Purpose The purpose of the Natural Shoreline Environment is to protect those shoreline areas that are relatively free of human influence and are of high ecological quality. This designation allows only very low intensity uses ((in order)) to maintain the existing high levels of ecological process and function.	Policy staff flag					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The purpose statement could be a policy. This is currently lead-in text, but it works in conjunction with criteria policies and management policies for this shoreline environment to establish the policy framework.</li> </ul>
S-528 King County may allow single ((family)) detached residential development in the Natural Shoreline Environment as a shoreline conditional use if the scale and intensity of the use is limited to protect shoreline ecological processes and functions and is consistent with the purpose of the environment. King County shall require new subdivisions and short-subdivisions in the Natural Shoreline Environment to locate new structures and impervious surfaces outside of the shoreline jurisdiction to the maximum extent practicable.	Technical change	Current terminology	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>"Single detached" is not the terminology used in the Shoreline Management Act. Councilmembers may wish to use terminology consistent with state law, which is "single-family residence"</li> </ul>
S-532 King County shall allow passive and low((-))_impact recreational activities in the Natural Shoreline Environment. New passive and low impact recreation activities shall use designs that avoid or minimize impacts to shoreline processes and functions. Maintenance of trails and campsites shall minimize disturbance and restoration of impacted areas is encouraged.	Technical change	Grammar	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>
[Lead-in text on page 6-40] Purpose The purpose of the Aquatic Environment is to protect, restore, and manage the unique characteristics and resources of the areas waterward of the ordinary high water mark.	Policy staff flag					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The purpose statement could be a policy. This is currently lead-in text, but it works in conjunction with criteria policies and management policies for this shoreline environment to establish the policy framework.</li> </ul>
S-537 King County shall encourage multiple uses of over-water facilities in the Aquatic Shoreline Environment ((in order)) to reduce the impacts of shoreline development and increase the effective use of water resources.	Technical change	Grammar	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>
S-539 King County shall not allow uses in the Aquatic Shoreline Environment that adversely impact the ecological processes and functions of critical saltwater and freshwater habitats, except when necessary to achieve the objectives of Revised Code of Washington 90.58.020, and then only when the adverse impacts are mitigated according to the sequence described in Washington Administrative	Clarification of existing policy intent	Raised RCW reference up a level for more timelessness to help ensure accuracy over the next 10 years	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>

**Chapter 6 Shorelines**  
2/2/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
Code 173-26-201( <del>(2)(e)</del> ) as necessary to assure no net loss of shoreline ecological processes and functions.						
S-604 King County's Shoreline Master Program shall include regulations and mitigation standards to ensure that permitted and exempt developments in the aggregate will not cause a net loss of shoreline ecological processes and functions.	Policy staff flag					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This concept is covered by S-601, and S-604 could be deleted.</li> </ul>
S-605 King County's Shoreline Master Program goals and policies ( <del>(will)</del> ) shall promote restoration of impaired shoreline ecological processes and functions. Policies and programs and non-regulatory actions that contribute to restoration goals ( <del>(will)</del> ) shall be identified. King County should consider the direct and indirect effects of regulatory or non-regulatory programs of other local, state, and federal governments, as well as any restoration effects that may result from shoreline development regulations and mitigation standards.	Clarification of existing policy intent	"Will" is predictive but "shall" is directive; policies should be directive, not statements of what is anticipated to happen.	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>
S-606 The King County Shoreline Master Program identifies restoration opportunities and planning elements that together should improve the overall condition of habitat and resources within the shoreline jurisdiction.	Policy staff flag					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This does not provide policy direction and is well covered by other policies. S-606 could be deleted.</li> </ul>
S-607 King County should provide options for property-specific technical assistance and tailored applications of shoreline management regulations through Rural Stewardship Plans for single ( <del>(family)</del> ) detached residential uses in the upland areas of the Rural, Conservancy and Natural Shoreline Environments. Rural Stewardship Plans must be consistent with the goals of the Shoreline Management Act and King County Shoreline Protection and Restoration Plan, and ensure no net loss of shoreline ecological processes and functions.	Technical change	Current terminology	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>"Single detached" is not the terminology used in the Shoreline Management Act. Councilmembers may wish to use terminology consistent with state law, which is "single-family residence"</li> <li>Flag –CAO update.</li> </ul>
S-613 King County shall consider and address cumulative impacts of shoreline development on shoreline ecological processes and functions and on shoreline uses given priority under Chapter 90.58 Revised Code of Washington ( <del>(Chapter 90.58)</del> ).	Technical change	Grammar	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>
S-615 In considering development regulations to protect shoreline ecological processes and functions, King County shall consider the scientific and technical information contained in functional plans adopted to implement the Comprehensive Plan, adopted watershed plans, King County critical areas regulations, and state, Indian tribal, and federal programs.	Technical change	Current terminology	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>
S-616 King County shall apply the following sequence of steps listed in order of priority in evaluating the impacts of development and redevelopment on critical areas within the shoreline jurisdiction: a. Avoid the impacts altogether; b. Minimize impacts; c. Rectify impacts by repairing, rehabilitating, or restoring the affected environment; d. Reduce or eliminate the impacts over time; e. Compensate for impacts by replacing, enhancing, or providing substitute resources; and f. Monitor the impact and taking appropriate corrective measures.	Policy staff flag					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Currently, S-616 applies only to critical areas within the shoreline jurisdiction. State laws states that the language in this policy should apply to the entire shoreline jurisdiction, not only in critical areas. Mitigation sequencing is required for all actions that occur within the shoreline jurisdiction. State law (WAC 173-26-201(2)(e)) prescribes how and in what order mitigation sequencing should occur. Policy S-616 includes</li> </ul>

**Chapter 6 Shorelines**  
2/2/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
						<p>some of the language by identifying the steps, but it does not fully include the language in each step.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Councilmembers may wish to 1) expand this mitigation sequencing standard to all areas of the shoreline jurisdiction, 2) make the language consistent with state law, and 3) clarify the order of priority is high to low.</li> </ul>
<p>S-617 King County wetland regulations shall address the following uses to achieve, at a minimum, no net loss of wetland area and functions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Removal, excavation, grading, or dredging of soil, sand, gravel, minerals, organic matter, or material of any kind;</li> <li>Dumping, discharging, or filling with any material, including discharges of stormwater and domestic, commercial, or industrial wastewater;</li> <li>Draining, flooding, or disturbing of the open water level, duration of inundation, or groundwater table;</li> <li>Driving of pilings;</li> <li>Placing of obstructions;</li> <li>Construction, reconstruction, demolition, or expansion of any structure;</li> <li>Significant vegetation removal, except for non-conversion forest practices regulated under <u>Chapter 76.09</u> Revised Code of Washington (<del>chapter 76.09</del>);</li> <li>Other uses or development that results in a significant ecological impact to the physical, chemical or biological characteristics of wetlands; and</li> <li>Activities reducing the functions of buffers.</li> </ol>	<p>Technical change</p>	<p>Grammar</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Planned implementation of proposal:</u> n/a</li> <li>• <u>Description of proposed regulations:</u> n/a</li> <li>• <u>Anticipated resource need:</u> n/a</li> <li>• <u>Anticipated timeline:</u> n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No issues identified.</li> </ul>
<p>S-618 King County shall categorize wetlands within shorelines of the state as provided for in Chapter 5((:)), Environment(<del>(-of the King County Comprehensive Plan)</del>)).</p>	<p>Clarification of existing policy intent</p>	<p>"Of the Comprehensive Plan" is implied and not consistent with nomenclature for internal references within the plan</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Planned implementation of proposal:</u> n/a</li> <li>• <u>Description of proposed regulations:</u> n/a</li> <li>• <u>Anticipated resource need:</u> n/a</li> <li>• <u>Anticipated timeline:</u> n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wetlands are required to be categorized under state law using state wetland manuals, which is stated as such in the critical areas regulations. The corresponding policy in Chapter 5, E-470, is proposed for removal, as it is a state requirement and does not need to be a policy. This policy could also be removed in conjunction.</li> </ul>
<p>S-619 King County should allow alterations to wetlands only if there is no net loss of wetland functions and values.</p>	<p>Policy staff flag</p>					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The policy could be modified to make the connection to the critical areas regulations clearer. As written, Policy S-619 implies that alterations in wetlands should be generally allowed. However, the County's critical areas regulations establishes parameters for what kinds of alterations and where they can occur.</li> </ul>
<p>S-620 King County shall delineate buffers around wetlands to protect and maintain wetland functions. Buffer widths shall be based</p>	<p>Policy staff flag</p>					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wetland category could be included in the list of factors used to delineate buffers, consistent with the critical</li> </ul>

**Chapter 6 Shorelines**  
2/2/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
on ecological function, characteristics and setting, potential impacts with adjacent land use, and other relevant factors.						<p>areas code. Buffers are established based on a number of factors in the critical areas ordinance. One such factor, the wetland category, is not included in the existing policy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wetlands are required to be delineated under state law using the federal wetland delineation manuals, which is stated as such in the critical areas regulations. The corresponding policy in Chapter 5, E-470, is proposed for removal, as it is a state requirement and does not need to be a policy. This policy could also be removed in conjunction.</li> </ul>
S-621 In determining appropriate mitigation measures applicable to shoreline development, the mitigation sequencing requirements described in Washington Administrative Code 173-26-201((2)(e)) require that lower priority measures shall be applied only where higher priority measures are determined to be infeasible or inapplicable.	Clarification of existing policy intent	Raised RCW reference up a level for more timelessness to help ensure accuracy over the next 10 years	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This policy duplicates S-616, above, which lists this mitigation sequencing priorities in WAC 173-26-201, and could be deleted.</li> </ul>
<del>((S-624 Development regulations for geologically hazardous areas shall meet the minimum requirements in Washington Administrative Code 365-190-120.))</del>	Clarification of existing policy intent	Redundant to state law; not necessary for Comprehensive Plan to state.	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>
S-625 King County shall prohibit development and new lot creation in geologically hazardous areas if it would result in increased risk of injury to people or property damage, consistent with King County Code ((e))Chapter 21A.24.	Technical change	Grammar	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>
<del>((S-626 King County shall prohibit new development that requires structural stabilization in geologically hazardous areas. Stabilization will be allowed in these areas only if the stabilization is necessary to protect existing allowed uses, there is no alternative location available, and no net loss of shoreline ecological processes and functions will result. Stabilization measures shall conform to Washington Administrative Code 173-26-231.))</del>	Clarification of existing policy intent	Consolidated in S-774 and S-774a	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>
<del>S-627 King County may allow stabilization structures or measures in geologically hazardous areas to protect existing primary residential structures, if there are no alternatives, including relocation or reconstruction of the residential structure, the stabilization is in conformance with Washington Administrative Code 173-26-231, and no net loss of shoreline ecological processes and functions will result.</del>	Clarification of existing policy intent	Consolidated in S-774 and S-774a	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>
S-630 As part of its management planning for critical saltwater habitats, King County should include an evaluation of current data and trends regarding:	Technical change	Current terminology and grammar	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>

**Chapter 6 Shorelines**  
2/2/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
<p>a. Available inventory and collection of necessary data regarding physical characteristics of the habitat, including upland conditions, and any information on species population trends;</p> <p>b. Terrestrial and aquatic vegetation;</p> <p>c. The level of human activity in such areas, including the presence of roads and level of recreational types. Passive or active recreation may be appropriate for certain areas and habitats;</p> <p>d. Restoration potential;</p> <p>e. Tributaries and small streams flowing into marine waters;</p> <p>f. Dock and bulkhead construction, including an inventory of bulkheads serving no protective purpose;</p> <p>g. Conditions and ecological function in the near-shore area;</p> <p>h. Uses surrounding the critical saltwater habitat areas that may negatively impact those areas, including permanent or occasional upland, beach, or over-water uses;</p> <p>i. Potential <u>Indian</u> tribal uses of critical saltwater habitats to ensure that these uses are protected and restored when possible; and</p> <p>j. An analysis of what data gaps exist and a strategy for gaining this information.</p>						
<p>S-631 Docks, bulkheads, bridges, fill, floats, jetties, utility crossings, and other human-made structures shall not intrude into or over critical saltwater habitats except when all of the conditions below are met:</p> <p>a. The public's need for such an action or structure is clearly demonstrated, and the proposal is consistent with protection of the public trust, as embodied in Revised Code of Washington 90.58.020;</p> <p>b. Avoidance of impacts to critical saltwater habitats by an alternative alignment or location is not feasible or would result in unreasonable and disproportionate cost to accomplish the same general purpose;</p> <p>c. The project, including any required mitigation, will result in no net loss of ecological functions associated with critical saltwater habitat; and</p> <p>d. The project is consistent with state and <u>Indian</u> ((ᑦ)) tribal interests in resource protection and species recovery.</p>	<p>Technical change</p>	<p>Current terminology</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>
<p>S-635 King County ((shoud)) shall regulate uses and development as necessary within and along stream channels, associated channel migration zones, wetlands, lake shorelines, ((and)) floodplains, and other critical areas within the shoreline jurisdiction, to assure that no net loss of shoreline ecological processes and functions results from new development near freshwaters of the state, including associated hyporheic zones.</p>	<p>Clarification of existing policy intent</p>	<p>Updated to shall to be consistent with Shoreline Management Act standards (WAC 173-26-186).</p> <p>Added "other critical areas" for clarity and completeness, in response to a comment from Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife and consistent with existing intent.</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>
<p>S-641 Vegetation conservation provisions apply to all shoreline uses and developments, regardless of whether ((or not)) the use or development requires a shoreline substantial development permit.</p>	<p>Technical change</p>	<p>Grammar</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The term "shoreline substantial development permit" could be changed to "shoreline permit" to cover all types of permits.</li> </ul>

**Chapter 6 Shorelines**  
2/2/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
S-644 King County should adopt development regulations for <del>((vegetated))</del> riparian areas along streams, which once supported or could in the future support mature trees, that include buffers of sufficient width to facilitate the growth of mature trees and periodic recruitment of woody vegetation into the water body to <del>((support vegetation-related))</del> provide shoreline <u>ecological</u> function <del>((s))</del> .	Clarification of existing policy intent	Edits for clarity, to reflect current terminology, and existing mandates, in response to a comment from Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife and consistent with existing intent.	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This policy duplicates other policies and could be consolidated into another policy.</li> </ul>
S-650 King County shall ensure that new projects for and major maintenance or replacement of utilities, roads, and other public infrastructure consider the impacts of sea <del>((-))</del> level rise in the location, design, and operation of the projects.	Technical change	Grammar	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>
S-646 Shoreline Master Program water quality, stormwater, and non-point pollution policies apply to all development and uses in the shoreline jurisdiction that affect water quality.	Policy staff flag					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This policy could be deleted, as it duplicates Policy S-201, which states all uses and developments in the shoreline jurisdiction must conform with this shoreline master program.</li> </ul>
S-701 King County shall give preference to uses in the shoreline that are consistent with the control of pollution and prevention of damage to the natural environment or are unique to or dependent upon the shoreline.	Policy staff flag					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This policy could be deleted, as it duplicates Policy S-203.</li> </ul>
S-704 Shoreline Master Program development regulations shall ensure no net loss of shoreline ecological processes and functions.	Policy staff flag					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This policy could be deleted. It's covered by S-601.</li> </ul>
S-706 The following types of uses and development should require a shoreline conditional use permit: <del>((1-))</del> a. Uses and development that may significantly impair or alter the public's use of the waters of the state; <del>((2-))</del> b. Uses and development which, by their intrinsic nature, may have a significant impact on shoreline ecological processes and functions depending on location, design, and site conditions; and <del>((3-))</del> c. Development in critical saltwater habitats.	Technical change	Updated to standard Comprehensive Plan numbering	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>
S-708 New agricultural activities in the shoreline jurisdiction shall comply with the critical areas regulations incorporated into the shoreline master program as they apply to agricultural activities.	Policy staff flag					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This policy could be deleted. It's duplicative to state law and code requirements. All activities in King County have to comply with the critical areas regulations. This doesn't necessarily need to be spelled out in this policy.</li> </ul>
S-713 Within shorelines of statewide significance, selective commercial timber cutting shall be used for timber harvest within two hundred feet abutting landward of the ordinary high water mark so that no more than thirty percent of the merchantable trees may be harvested in any <del>((ten-))</del> 10-year period of time. Through a shoreline conditional use permit, King County may approve: a. Other timber harvesting methods in those limited instances where the topography, soil conditions, or silviculture practices necessary for regeneration render selective logging ecologically detrimental; and b. Clear cutting of timber that is solely incidental to the preparation of land for other uses authorized by the King County Shoreline Master Program.	Technical change	Grammar	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>

Chapter 6 Shorelines

2/2/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
S-715 Surface drilling for oil or gas shall be prohibited in Puget Sound seaward from the ordinary high water mark and on all lands within one thousand feet landward from the ordinary high water mark on Puget Sound.	Policy staff flag					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>S-715 could be deleted, as it duplicates state law.</li> </ul>
S-716 Aquaculture is a water-dependent use and should be an allowed use of the shoreline when consistent with control of pollution and avoidance of adverse impacts to the environment and preservation of habitat for native species, <del>((f))</del> consistent with Washington Administrative Code 173-26-241 <del>((3)(b)))</del> .	Clarification of existing policy intent	Raised RCW reference up a level for more timelessness to help ensure accuracy over the next 10 years, with edit for clarity	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>
S-726 King County should actively seek substantive comment regarding potential adverse impacts of any shoreline permit application for aquaculture from all appropriate Federal, State, Indian tribal, and local agencies <del>((; the Muckleshoot Tribe, the Puyallup Tribe of Indians, the Tulalip Tribes and other tribes with treaty fishing rights))</del> ; and the general public. Comments of nearby residents or property owners directly affected by an aquaculture proposal should be considered and evaluated, especially in regard to use compatibility and aesthetics.	Clarification of existing policy intent	Indian tribal covers all tribes, rather than listing one by one, consistent with Comprehensive Plan nomenclature	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>
S-727 The rights of treaty Indian tribes to aquatic resources within their usual and accustomed areas should be addressed through the permit review process. Direct and early coordination between the applicant or proponent and the relevant tribe(s) should be encouraged.	Technical change	Current terminology	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>
S-744 The King County Shoreline Master Program provisions and permit requirements for mining should be coordinated with the requirements of Chapter 78.44 Revised Code of Washington <del>((Chapter 78.44))</del> .	Technical change	Grammar	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This policy could be deleted. It's duplicative of state law.</li> </ul>
S-746 King County shall permit mining within the active channel of a river only as follows: a. Removal of specified quantities of sand and gravel or other materials at specific locations will not adversely affect the natural processes of gravel transportation for the river system as a whole; b. The mining and any associated permitted activities will not have significant adverse impacts to habitat for threatened or endangered species nor cause a net loss of shoreline ecological processes and functions; c. The determinations required by items <del>((4))</del> a. and <del>((2))</del> b. of this policy shall be consistent with Revised Code of Washington 90.58.100 <del>((4))</del> and Washington Administrative Code 173-26-201 <del>((2)(a))</del> . Such evaluation of impacts should be appropriately integrated with relevant environmental review requirements of the State Environmental Policy Act and the Department of Ecology guidelines; d. In considering renewal, extension, or reauthorization of gravel bar and other in-channel mining operations in locations where they have previously been conducted, King County shall require compliance with this policy if no such review has previously been conducted. Where there has been prior review, King County shall	Clarification of existing policy intent	Raised RCW reference up a level for more timelessness to help ensure accuracy over the next 10 years, with edits for grammar and corrections	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>

**Chapter 6 Shorelines**  
2/2/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
review the previous determinations <del>((in order))</del> to ensure that current site conditions comply with the Program; and e. These requirements do not apply to dredging of authorized navigation channels when conducted in accordance with Washington Administrative Code 173-26-231 <del>((3)(f))</del> .						
S-748 Recreational development is allowed in the shoreline jurisdiction and <del>((must))</del> shall be consistent with the shoreline environment designation in which the property is located.	Clarification of existing policy intent	"Shall" is more consistent with Comprehensive Plan nomenclature	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>
S-749 King County shall plan to provide public recreational uses on <del>((e))</del> County-owned shoreline, consistent with the goals of this chapter.	Technical change	Grammar	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>
S-750 Single <del>((family))</del> detached residential development is a priority use in the shoreline jurisdiction in King County.	Technical change	Current terminology	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>"Single detached" is not the terminology used in the Shoreline Management Act. References to "single detached residential uses" could be changed back to "single-family residential uses" or clarified elsewhere in this chapter</li> </ul>
S-751 King County shall require a conditional use permit for construction or expansion of a single <del>((family residence))</del> detached home that is located within an aquatic area buffer in the Forestry or Natural Shoreline Environment.	Technical change	Current terminology	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>"Environment" should be plural.</li> <li>"Single detached" is not the terminology used in the Shoreline Management Act. References to "single detached residential uses" could be changed back to "single-family residential uses" or clarified elsewhere in this chapter</li> </ul>
<del>((S-752 Shoreline residential development, including accessory structures and uses, should be sufficiently set back from steep slopes and shorelines vulnerable to erosion so that structural improvements, including bluff walls and other stabilization structures, are not required to protect these structures and uses.))</del>	Clarification of existing policy intent	Consolidated in S-774 and S-774a	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>
S-759 Parking facilities in the shoreline jurisdiction are not a preferred use. King County shall allow parking facilities in the shoreline jurisdiction only when necessary to support an authorized use and when an alternatives analysis shows there are no feasible alternatives outside of the 200-foot shoreline jurisdiction. Parking facilities in the shoreline jurisdiction shall use <del>((L))</del> low <del>((I))</del> impact <del>((D))</del> designs, such as porous concrete and vegetated swales, and be planned, located and designed to minimize the environmental and visual impacts.	Technical change	Grammar	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>
S-766 <del>((in order t))</del> To reduce the adverse effects of shoreline modifications, King County should limit shoreline modifications in number and extent to the maximum extent practicable.	Technical change	Grammar	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>

**Chapter 6 Shorelines**  
2/2/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	
S-768 King County shall ensure that shoreline modifications individually and cumulatively do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological processes and functions. <del>((In order to))</del> To achieve this goal, King County shall give preference to those types of shoreline modifications that have a lesser impact on the shoreline and by requiring mitigation of identified impacts resulting from shoreline modifications.	Technical change	Grammar	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>
S-771 King County shall require shoreline stabilization to be consistent with Washington Administrative Code 173-26-221 <del>((5))</del> for vegetation retention and <del>((Washington Administrative Code 173-26-221(2) for))</del> protection of critical areas.	Clarification of existing policy intent	Raised RCW reference up a level for more timelessness to help ensure accuracy over the next 10 years, with edits for grammar and corrections	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>
S-773 King County may allow construction of new or replaced structural shoreline stabilization and flood control works to protect an existing structure if King County determines there is a documented need, including a geotechnical analysis that the structure is in danger from shoreline erosion caused by tidal action, currents, or waves.	Clarification of existing policy intent					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This policy could be consolidated into S-774, S-779, and S-780.</li> </ul>
S-774 Shoreline stabilization shall be allowed only when: a. Necessary to protect existing primary structures at imminent risk; b. No lower-impact alternative exists, including relocation or reconstruction of the structure; c. When impacts are mitigated to ensure no net loss of shoreline ecological processes and functions; and d. Stabilization measures are in conformance with Washington Administrative Code 173-26-231.	Clarification of existing policy intent	S-774 and S-744a consolidates S-626, S-627, S-752, S-775, and S-776 for clarity, to align with existing practice and consistency with other stabilization policies and state guidance	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This policy is intended to cover shoreline stabilization for new and existing development. However, sub a. states that protection of an existing primary structure is required. This policy could be revised to be clearer on which situation this policy applies to.</li> </ul>
S-774a King County shall require: a. <del>((#))</del> New shoreline development to be located and designed, as well as the creation of new subdivisions and short subdivisions, to avoid the need for future structural slope or shoreline stabilization <del>((to the maximum extent practicable)); and</del> b. New development to be set back from steep or eroding slopes so that structural slope or shoreline stabilization is not needed for the life of the development.	Clarification of existing policy intent	S-774 and S-744a consolidates S-626, S-627, S-752, S-775, and S-776 for clarity, to align with existing practice and consistency with other stabilization policies and state guidance	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This policy could be revised to include language from state law and the KCCP lead-in text, which discusses how new development should, on principle, avoid the construction of shoreline stabilization unless no other options are available.</li> </ul>
<del>((S-775 King County shall require that lots in new subdivisions and short subdivisions to be created so that shoreline stabilization will not be necessary in order for reasonable development to occur, using geotechnical analysis of the site and shoreline characteristics.))</del>	Clarification of existing policy intent	Consolidated in S-774 and S-774a	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>
S-776 King County shall require new development on steep slopes or bluffs to be set back sufficiently to ensure that shoreline stabilization is unlikely to be necessary during the life of the structure, as demonstrated by a geotechnical analysis.)	Clarification of existing policy intent	Consolidated in S-774 and S-774a	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>

Chapter 6 Shorelines  
2/2/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
<p><del>((S-778 King County should notify all prospective developers of new development along Vashon-Maury Island that their development may be impacted by sea level rise and should encourage all such new development to be set back a sufficient distance to avoid the need for shoreline protection during the expected life of the development.))</del></p>	<p>Clarification of existing policy intent</p>	<p>This policy is not needed. 1) it overlaps with policies and actions in the Vashon-Maury Island subarea plan. 2) it's mandated by code in K.C.C. 21A.25.170.M.</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>
<p>S-779 King County shall require the use of soft methods of shoreline stabilization to the maximum extent practicable. King County shall allow new <u>and replacement</u> hard structural stabilization measures only as follows:</p> <p>a. To protect existing nonwater-dependent development and structures, including single(<del>-family residences</del>) <u>detached homes</u>, if:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The erosion is not the result of upland conditions, such as the loss of vegetation and drainage;</li> <li>Nonstructural measures, such as locating the development further from the shoreline, planting vegetation, or installing on-site drainage improvements, are not feasible or not sufficient;</li> <li>The need to protect primary structures from <u>imminent risk of damage</u> due to erosion is demonstrated through a geotechnical report submitted by a qualified specialist. The damage must be caused by natural processes, such as tidal action, currents, and waves; and</li> <li>Mitigation is provided such that the erosion control structure will not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological processes and functions.</li> </ol> <p>b. To protect water-dependent development if:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The erosion is not the result of upland conditions, such as the loss of vegetation and drainage;</li> <li>Nonstructural measures, planting vegetation or installing on-site drainage improvements are not feasible or not sufficient;</li> <li>The need to protect primary structures from damage due to erosion is demonstrated through a geotechnical report submitted by a qualified specialist; and</li> <li>The erosion control structure will not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological processes and functions.</li> </ol> <p>c. To protect shoreline restoration projects or hazardous substance remediation projects pursuant to <u>Chapter 70A.305 Revised Code of Washington</u> (<del>(Chapter 70.105D)</del>) if:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nonstructural measures, planting vegetation or installing on-site drainage improvements are not feasible or not sufficient; and</li> <li>The erosion control structure will not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological processes and functions.</li> </ol>	<p>Clarification of existing policy intent</p>	<p>To align with state requirements/guidance and current practice.</p> <p>Added language in sub-a.3 to reflect current practice, clarifying that nonwater-dependent structures can only use structural shoreline stabilization to protect them from imminent risk, not any theoretical risk</p> <p>Other edits for current terminology, corrections, and grammar</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This policy covers three different instances where shoreline stabilization could be allowed. This policy could be broken into three policies addressing protection of existing structures, new nonwater-dependent development, water-dependent development, and restoration projects.</li> </ul>
<p>S-780 An existing shoreline stabilization structure may be replaced (<del>(with a similar structure if)</del>), <u>provided that the least impactful stabilization measure is used and</u> there is a demonstrated need to protect principal uses or structures from erosion caused by currents, tidal action, or waves.</p>	<p>Clarification of existing policy intent</p>	<p>To align with state requirements/guidance and current practice</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This policy could be revised to include more parameters such as where the replacement structure could be located, if the existing structure could be removed, and size limits of the new structure.</li> </ul>

**Chapter 6 Shorelines**  
2/2/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
S-781 King County shall require replaced shoreline protection structures to be designed, located, sized, and constructed to assure no net loss of shoreline ecological processes and functions.	Policy staff flag					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This policy could be combined with Policy S-781.</li> </ul>
S-784 King County shall <del>((encourage))</del> require the use soft shoreline stabilization measures that use placement or growth of natural materials that closely resemble natural scales and configurations, <u>or other soft stabilization measures where appropriate,</u> and that provide restoration of shoreline ecological processes and functions waterward of the ordinary high-water mark.	Clarification of existing policy intent	To align with state requirements/guidance and current practice	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Planned implementation of proposal:</u> n/a</li> <li><u>Description of proposed regulations:</u> n/a</li> <li><u>Anticipated resource need:</u> n/a</li> <li><u>Anticipated timeline:</u> n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>
<del>S-786 ((When shoreline stabilization is proposed, King County shall require a geotechnical report to address the need to prevent potential damage to a primary structure. The report shall estimate time frames and rates of erosion and the urgency associated with the specific situation. King County should not allow hard armoring solutions, unless a geotechnical report confirms that there is a significant possibility that the structure will be damaged within three years as a result of shoreline erosion in the absence of such hard armoring measures, or where waiting until the need is immediate would foreclose the opportunity to use measures that avoid impacts on shoreline ecological processes and functions. If the geotechnical report confirms a need to prevent potential damage to a primary structure, but the need is not as immediate as the three years, the report may still be used to justify more immediate authorization to protect against erosion using soft measures.))</del> <u>When shoreline stabilization is proposed, King County shall ensure that the stabilization method used is the least ecologically impactful, technically feasible option.</u>	Clarification of existing policy intent	To reflect existing practice.	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Planned implementation of proposal:</u> n/a</li> <li><u>Description of proposed regulations:</u> n/a</li> <li><u>Anticipated resource need:</u> n/a</li> <li><u>Anticipated timeline:</u> n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This revised policy language could be consolidated with S-788, as this policy also covers what must be demonstrated in order to allow shoreline stabilization.</li> </ul>
S-788 If structural shoreline stabilization measures are demonstrated to be necessary, King County shall: <del>((1-))</del> <u>a.</u> Limit the size of stabilization measures to the minimum necessary; <del>((2-))</del> <u>b.</u> Require the use of measures designed to assure no net loss of shoreline ecological processes and functions; <u>and</u> <del>((3-))</del> <u>c.</u> Require the use of soft approaches, unless they are demonstrated not to be sufficient to protect primary structures, dwellings, and businesses.	Technical change	Updated to standard Comprehensive Plan numbering	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Planned implementation of proposal:</u> n/a</li> <li><u>Description of proposed regulations:</u> n/a</li> <li><u>Anticipated resource need:</u> n/a</li> <li><u>Anticipated timeline:</u> n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This revised policy language in S-786 could be consolidated with this policy, as this policy also covers what must be demonstrated in order to allow shoreline stabilization..</li> </ul>
S-793 King County shall allow new piers and docks only for water-dependent uses or public access. If it is designed and intended as a facility for access to watercraft, a dock associated with a single <del>((family residence))</del> <u>detached home</u> is considered a water-dependent use. As an alternative to individual private moorage for residential development: mooring buoys are preferred over floats or docks and shared moorage facilities are preferred over single use moorage, where feasible or where water use conflicts exist or are predictable.	Technical change	Current terminology	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Planned implementation of proposal:</u> n/a</li> <li><u>Description of proposed regulations:</u> n/a</li> <li><u>Anticipated resource need:</u> n/a</li> <li><u>Anticipated timeline:</u> n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policies S-793 and S-796 concerns new piers and docks. These policies could be consolidated and clarified to distinguish between single-family development and non-single-family development.</li> </ul>
S-796 King County shall allow new pier or dock construction, excluding docks accessory to single <del>((family residences))</del> <u>single detached homes,</u> only when the applicant has demonstrated that a specific need exists to support the intended water-dependent uses.	Technical change	Current terminology	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Planned implementation of proposal:</u> n/a</li> <li><u>Description of proposed regulations:</u> n/a</li> <li><u>Anticipated resource need:</u> n/a</li> <li><u>Anticipated timeline:</u> n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policies S-793 and S-796 concerns new piers and docks. These policies could be consolidated and clarified to distinguish between single-family development and non-single-family development.</li> </ul>

Chapter 6 Shorelines

2/2/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
S-798 King County shall require piers and docks, including those accessory to single( <del>family residences</del> ) detached homes, to be designed and constructed to avoid and then minimize and mitigate the impacts to shoreline ecological processes and functions. King County shall ( <del>require piers and docks to be constructed of non-toxic materials. Where toxic materials, such as treated wood, are proposed, the proponent must show that no non-toxic alternative exists</del> ) prohibit the use of creosote or pentachlorophenol pilings.	Clarification of existing policy intent	To align with state law requirements, in response to comments from Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife and consistent with existing King County Code  Other changes to reflect current terminology	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>"Single detached" is not the terminology used in the Shoreline Management Act. References to "single detached residential uses" could be changed back to "single-family residential uses" or clarified elsewhere in this chapter.</li> </ul>
S-800 King County shall allow fill waterward of the ordinary high-water mark only when necessary to support: <del>((1-))</del> a. Water-dependent use; <del>((2-))</del> b. Public access; <del>((3-))</del> c. Cleanup and disposal of contaminated sediments as part of an interagency environmental clean-up plan; <del>((4-))</del> d. Disposal of dredged material considered suitable under, and conducted in accordance with, the dredged material management program of the Washington Department of Natural Resources; <del>((5-))</del> e. Expansion or alteration of transportation facilities of statewide significance currently located on the shoreline and then only upon a demonstration that alternatives to fill are not feasible; <del>((6-))</del> f. Mitigation actions, environmental restoration, beach nourishment, enhancement projects; or <del>((7-))</del> g. Flood risk reduction projects implemented consistent with the goals, policies and objectives of the King County Flood Hazard Management Plan where no reasonable alternative exists.	Technical change	Updated to standard Comprehensive Plan numbering and grammar	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>
S-805 Breakwaters, jetties, groins, and weirs shall be designed to protect critical areas and shall provide for mitigation according to the sequence in policy S-616 and defined in Washington Administrative Code 173-26-201 ( <del>((2)(e))</del> ).	Clarification of existing policy intent	Raised RCW reference up a level for more timelessness to help ensure accuracy over the next 10 years, with edits for grammar and corrections	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>
S-809 King County shall not allow disposal of dredge material on shorelands and in side channels within a river's channel migration zone. King County shall not allow disposal of dredge material in wetlands located within the shoreline jurisdiction. In the limited instances where it is allowed, such disposal shall require a shoreline conditional use permit.	Policy staff flag					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This policy internally conflicts. The language could be changed to reflect that disposal of dredge material is allowed only through a shoreline conditional use permit.</li> </ul>
S-810 King County shall require dredging to be conducted consistent with Policy RCM-3 of the <del>((2006))</del> King County Flood Hazard Management Plan, or successor policies or plans.	Clarification of existing policy intent	Updates for more timelessness to help ensure accuracy over the next 10 years	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>
S-901 <del>If the Department of Ecology recommends changes to any elements of the King County Shoreline Master Program, King County reserves the right to submit an alternate proposal to the Department for its review and approval.</del>	Clarification of existing policy intent	Redundant to state law; not necessary for Comprehensive Plan to state.	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>

**Chapter 6 Shorelines**

2/2/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
<p><del>S-902— If the Department of Ecology rejects part or all of King County's Shoreline Master Program, or if the Department of Ecology recommends changes that are unacceptable to King County, King County reserves the right to appeal the Department's decision to the Shoreline Management Hearings Board.</del></p>	<p>Clarification of existing policy intent</p>	<p>Redundant to state law; not necessary for Comprehensive Plan to state.</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Planned implementation of proposal:</u> n/a</li> <li>• <u>Description of proposed regulations:</u> n/a</li> <li>• <u>Anticipated resource need:</u> n/a</li> <li>• <u>Anticipated timeline:</u> n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No issues identified.</li> </ul>
<p><del>S-903— Upon receipt of the letter from the Department of Ecology approving the King County Shoreline Master Program or any amendments to the Shoreline Master Program, King County will promptly post on its web site a notice that the Department of Ecology has taken final action and approved the Shoreline Master Program or SMP amendments. The notice will indicate the effective date.</del></p>	<p>Clarification of existing policy intent</p>	<p>Redundant to state law; not necessary for Comprehensive Plan to state.</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Planned implementation of proposal:</u> n/a</li> <li>• <u>Description of proposed regulations:</u> n/a</li> <li>• <u>Anticipated resource need:</u> n/a</li> <li>• <u>Anticipated timeline:</u> n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No issues identified.</li> </ul>
<p>S-904 Nothing in the King County Shoreline Master Program nor in any action taken under the Shoreline Master Program shall be construed to affect any <u>Indian</u> treaty right to which the United States is a party.</p>	<p>Technical change</p>	<p>Current terminology</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Planned implementation of proposal:</u> n/a</li> <li>• <u>Description of proposed regulations:</u> n/a</li> <li>• <u>Anticipated resource need:</u> n/a</li> <li>• <u>Anticipated timeline:</u> n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No issues identified.</li> </ul>