



Planning Commission
Meeting:

First Wednesday of every
Month @ 7:00pm

Planning & Community

Development Department

1812 Main Street
Lake Stevens, WA 98258
(425) 622-9460

www.lakestevenswa.gov

Municipal Code

Available online:

[www.codepublishing.com/WA/Lake Stevens/](http://www.codepublishing.com/WA/Lake%20Stevens/)

*Items attached

**Items previously
distributed

Items to be
distributed

PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA

Regular Meeting Date: 1-16-2019

- A. **CALL TO ORDER: 7:00pm**
Pledge of Allegiance
- B. **ROLL CALL**
- C. **GUEST BUSINESS**
- D. **ACTION ITEMS**
 - 1. Approve minutes for 12/05/18 meeting
 - 2. Approve minutes for 01/09/2019 meeting
- E. **PUBLIC HEARING**
 - 1. Wireless facilities Amendments

Public hearing presentation will follow the public hearing format listed below:

PUBLIC HEARING FORMAT

- 2. PC Chair Opens Public Hearing
- 3. Staff Presentation
- 4. Commission's questions for staff
- 5. Proponent's comments
- 6. Comments from the audience
- 7. Proponent rebuttal comments
- 8. Close public comments portion of hearing by motion
- 9. Re-open public comment portion of hearing for additional comments (optional)
- 10. Close Hearing by motion
- 11. **COMMISSION ACTION BY MOTION—Recommendation to Council**

- A. Approve
- B. Deny
- C. Continue
- D.

F. DISCUSSION ITEMS

- 1. Briefing-Shoreline Management Program

Planning Manager Machen

G. COMMISIONER REPORTS-

H. PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT-

I. ADJOURN

SPECIAL NEEDS

The City of Lake Stevens strives to provide accessible opportunities for individuals with disabilities. Please contact Human Resources, City of Lake Stevens ADA Coordinator, at (425)622-9419 at least five business days prior to any City meeting or event if any accommodations are needed. For TDD users, please use the state's toll-free relay service.

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
Community Center
1808 Main Street, Lake Stevens
Wednesday, December 5, 2018

CALL TO ORDER: 7:00 pm by Chair Janice Huxford

MEMBERS PRESENT: Janice Huxford, Jennifer Davis, Tracey Trout, Linda Hoult, Steve Ewing and John Cronin

MEMBERS ABSENT: Vicki Oslund

STAFF PRESENT: Community Development Director Russ Wright, Planning Manager Wright and Clerk Jennie Fenrich

OTHERS PRESENT: Councilmember McDaniel

Excused Absence: Linda Hoult made a motion to excuse Vicki Oslund, Commissioner Ewing seconded. Motion passed 6-0-0-1.

Guest business: None

Action Items:

1. Commissioner Hoult made a motion Commissioner Trout seconded to approve the November 7, 2018 minutes as amended. Approved 6-0-0-1.

Discussion Items:

Staff Presentation:

Community Development Director Russ Wright gave the Long-Range Work Program for 2019. The Planning Commission will be continuing to work on Wireless Facilities, Fences/Retaining Walls, Road Standards. Zoning updates, Design Guidelines, Comprehensive Plan updates, Shoreline Master Plan and Buildable Lands will be addressed this year.

Planning Manager Josh Machen gave a briefing on LUA2018-0108 Wireless Communication code amendment. The Planning Commission asked to see the proposal after it has been reviewed by legal counsel.

Commissioner Reports:

Holiday wishes were shared by several commissioners.

Planning Director Report: Community Development Director Wright reminded the Commission that they will need to elect new officers at the January 9th meeting.

Future Agenda Items

Adjourn. Motion to adjourn by Commissioner Hoult, seconded by Commissioner Ewing. Motion carried 6-0-0-1. Meeting adjourned.

Janice Huxford, Chair

Jennie Fenrich, Clerk, Planning & Community Development

DRAFT

PLANNING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES
Community Center
1808 Main Street, Lake Stevens
Wednesday, January 9, 2019

CALL TO ORDER: 7:00 pm by Chair Janice Huxford

MEMBERS PRESENT: Janice Huxford, Jennifer Davis, Tracey Trout, Linda Hoult, Steve Ewing and John Cronin, Vicki Oslund

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Community Development Director Russ Wright, Planning Manager Wright and Clerk Jennie Fenrich

OTHERS PRESENT: None

Excused Absence: None

Guest business: None

Action Items: None

Discussion Items:

Staff Presentation:

Planning Manager Josh Machen gave a briefing on LUA2018-0108 Wireless Communication code amendment that will be having a Public Hearing next week. Commissioner Trout noted an error on the chart regarding macro facilities within the waterfront residential zone that will be corrected before the Hearing. Commissioner Ewing made a motion to send this to a Public Hearing on January 16, 2019. Vote passed 7-0-0-0.

Planning Manager Machen gave a Power Point presentation on the Shoreline Master Program. The City is required to update this plan periodically, every eight years. Dock and Dock Maintenance is one of the topics under review. Staff is proposing more flexibility in dock maintenance and reconstruction regulations. There are several other entities that govern what happens on the lake. Shoreline armoring is another set of regulations that are proposed to be changed to provide additional options. The State has guidelines for replacing bulkheads that make it nearly impossible to simply replace hard structures unless your house is in danger of being in the water within three years. Staff is proposing flexibility to allow for hybrid or soft shore armoring techniques that would use logs, individual rocks and beach nourishment to mitigate shoreline erosion, which often requires the replenishment of native material as needed for maintenance.

Commissioner Reports:

Commissioner Cronin announced he signed a new lease for a Restaurant Tenant at his property on 91st Ave SE. Commissioner Hoult thanked Commissioners Huxford and Davis for their willingness to serve as Chair and Vice. She stated she felt that this is a great group of commissioners and she is excited for the upcoming year. Commissioner Trout commented there is an increase in transient activities at the boat launch. Chair Huxford asked that the letter from Commissioner Hoult regarding the need for sidewalks be forwarded to City Council.

Planning Director Report: None

Future Agenda Items

Adjourn. Motion to adjourn by Commissioner Hoult, seconded by Commissioner Ewing. Motion carried 7-0-0-0. Meeting adjourned at 8:26.

Janice Huxford, Chair

Jennie Fenrich, Clerk, Planning & Community Development



Staff Report
City of Lake Stevens
Planning Commission
Public Hearing
Date: January 16, 2019

SUBJECT: LUA2018-0108- City initiated code amendment regarding Wireless Communications

CONTACT PERSON/DEPARTMENT: Joshua Machen, *Planning Manager* / Russ Wright, *Community Development Director*

SUMMARY:

The city has drafted new and revised regulations regarding wireless communication facilities. Planning Commission is holding a public hearing on the final draft, which was reviewed by the Planning Commission at their January 9, 2019 special meeting.

The attached draft regulations are contained in a new Chapter 14.62 -Wireless Communication Facilities.

ACTION REQUESTED OF PLANNING COMMISSION:

Take and consider public comment, review the following attachment and then make a recommendation to the City Council.

- A. New proposed chapter 14.62. - Wireless Communication Facilities

Background:

On January 9, 2019 the Planning Commission review the final draft, recommended corrections and set a public hearing date. The recommended corrections were made and the draft is now properly available to the public for review and comment in a public hearing.

Purpose of Code Amendment

Bring the city's codes and regulations into compliance with the Spectrum Act and the adopted FCC rules regarding the permitting and siting of wireless communication facilities. Modify the city regulations to recognize the changing technology related to small-wireless facility networks and put into place regulations defining small wireless facilities and permitting procedures to allow their development along with proper aesthetic and concealment regulations

The following are the key issues addressed by the proposed code amendments:

- **Definitions**-add or update definitions for macro and small wireless facilities
- **Shot Clocks**-provisions to ensure compliance with FCC permit processing timelines
- **Eligible Facility Modifications**-regulations in compliance with the "Spectrum Act" which provides for expedited review of wireless facilities replacing existing facilities, or when collocating on structures with existing wireless communication facilities.

- **Macro Facilities**- provisions to allow new antennas to be deployed on existing structures through an administrative conditional use permit, while requiring a full conditional use permit for new towers and structures. The new provisions also contain landscaping and screening requirements for new facilities.
- **Small Wireless Facilities**-small wireless facilities will now be allowed in all zones and within the rights-of-way with a franchise agreement. Drafted provisions contain special design considerations for our design and underground districts.
- **Concealment Standards**-the drafted regulations contain multiple standards for the concealment of small wireless facilities, to name a few, all wires are to be internal to the mounting pole if technologically feasible, antennas are to be shrouded and or painted to blend in with the light or utility pole upon which they are being deployed. There are also design provisions for when small wireless facilities are being attached to buildings.

Next steps

The Planning Commission should make a recommendation to the City Council.

Attachments

A Drafted new chapter LSMC 14.62

Chapter 14.08 BASIC DEFINITIONS AND INTERPRETATIONS

Sections:

14.08.010 Definitions of Basic Terms**14.08.020 Re-codified****14.08.010 Definitions of Basic Terms.**

The following definitions are being deleted from this chapter and are being integrated into a new chapter LSMS 14.62

~~Wireless Communication Tower.~~ A support structure to which is attached equipment used for the transmission and/or reception of wireless telecommunications services, usually consisting of an antenna array, connection cables, and equipment cabinet.

~~Wireless Communications.~~ Any personal wireless services as defined in the Telecommunications Act of 1996 or as may be subsequently amended. This includes FCC licensed commercial wireless telecommunications services including cellular, personal communication services (PCS), specialized mobile radio (SMR), enhanced specialized mobile radio (ESMR), paging and similar services that currently exist or that may in the future be developed.

Chapter 14.40 PERMISSIBLE USES

LSMC 14.40.090 "More Specific Use Controls" (Table 14.40-I: Table of Permissible Uses by Zones) is hereby amended to modify section "18.000 Towers and Structures" to "18.000 Wireless Communication Facilities" and to modify the listed uses under this section as shown below, all other uses shall remain in full force and effect, unchanged:

TABLE 14.40-I: TABLE OF PERMISSIBLE USES BY ZONES

A blank box indicates a use is not allowed in a specific zone. Note: Reference numbers within matrix indicate special conditions apply.

P - Permitted Use; A - Administrative Conditional Use; C - Conditional Use (See Section 14.40.020 for explanation of combinations)

USE DESCRIPTIONS		SR	WR	UR	HUR	MFR	LB	MU ¹	PBD ⁵	LI	GI	P/SP
18.000	<u>WIRELESS</u> <u>COMMUNICATION</u> <u>FACILITIES, TOWERS</u> AND RELATED STRUCTURES											
18.100 ¹²	<u>Small wireless</u> <u>Facilities¹²/ Towers</u> and Antennas 50 Feet Tall or Less	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
18.200 ¹²	<u>Macro Facilities (e.g.,</u> <u>new tower, pole or</u> <u>structure)¹² / Towers</u> and Antennas More Than 50 Feet Tall and Receive-Only Earth Stations	AC	A	AC	AC	A	A		A	A	A	

18.300	<u>Macro Facilities</u> <u>Collocation on</u> <u>existing</u> <u>buildings/structures</u> Wireless Communications Facilities ¹³	<u>CA</u>	<u>CA</u>	<u>CA</u>	<u>CA</u>	<u>CA</u>	A	A		A	A	A
<u>18.400</u>	<u>Eligible Facility</u> <u>Modifications</u>	P	P	P	P	P	P	P		P	P	P

12 Excludes wireless communication facilities. See Use Class 18.300 See regulations in Chapter 14.62 LSMC.

13 No land use permit is required in certain situations. See Sections 14.44.360(d) and (e). See specific regulations in LSMC 14.62.00?

Chapter 14.44 SUPPLEMENTARY USE REGULATIONS

14.44.360 Wireless Communication Towers and Antennas.

- (a) No wireless communication tower may be located within 1,000 feet of an existing or previously approved tower.
- (b) No wireless tower may be located within 1,000 feet of the shoreline of Lake Stevens.
- (c) All new towers shall be designed to reasonably accommodate future installation of a second array.
- (d) A new antenna or array placed on a previously approved tower is exempt from further land use permit approvals, provided it does not add more than 25 feet to the height of the tower.
- (e) A new antenna or array placed on an existing structure such as a water tank or building is exempt from a land use permit, provided the new antenna or array extends no higher than 25 feet above the top of the structure to which it is being added.
- (f) Speculative wireless towers are prohibited. As part of the land use permit process, the applicant shall demonstrate that there is a licensed provider of telecommunication services contractually committed to using the proposed pole to provide wireless communication services.
- (g) Screening of the base of the pole, including any security fences and equipment cabinets, shall be done in a manner as to blend into the site so as the screening does not to call undue attention itself. Unless otherwise required by the Federal Aviation Administration, wireless facility support structures shall be of a neutral color to minimize visibility.
- (h) Should the communications element of a tower be abandoned and cease functioning for a period of one year, the tower shall be removed from the site. At the time of application, a notarized statement from the property owner shall be provided to the City and recorded against the property which affirms that:
 1. The signee is the owner; and
 2. He or she understands that if the use is abandoned the tower must be removed within one year; and
 3. If the City takes action to enforce this rule, the property owner, heirs or successors are ultimately responsible for the removal. (Ord. 608, Sec. 3, 1999)

New:

Chapter 14.62 Wireless Communication Facilities

Sections:

Part I. General Provisions

14.62.010 Purpose
14.62.020 Definitions
14.62.030 General Provisions
14.62.040 Permit required
14.62.050 Wireless Communication Facility Permit Process/Processing Timelines
14.62.060 Exclusions
14.62.070 Application Submittal Requirements
14.62.080 Small Wireless Facility General Permit Requirements

14.62.090 Electromagnetic Field (EMF) Standards Compliance
14.62.100 Permit Enforcement
14.62.110 Reservation of Authority
14.62.120 Federal Regulatory Requirements
14.62.130 SEPA Review Wireless Communication Facilities

Part II. Macro Wireless Communication Facilities-Towers and Antennas

14.62.140 Purpose
14.62.150 Procedure
14.62.160 Macro Wireless Communication Facility Regulations
14.62.170 Prioritized Locations
14.62.180 Development Standards

Part III. Eligible Facility Modifications (EFM)

14.62.190 Purpose
14.62.200 Applicability – Relationship to other Rules and Regulations
14.62.210 Substantial Change Criteria

Part IV. Small wireless Facilities

14.62.220 Purpose and Intent
14.62.230 Review Process
14.62.240 Design and Concealment Standards for Small Wireless Deployments
14.62.250 Design Zones for Small Wireless Facilities
14.62.260 New Poles in the Rights-of-way for Small Wireless Facilities and Installations
in a Design Zone
14.62.270 Franchise Application
14.62.280 Implementation—Right-of-way permits for small wireless deployment
14.62.290 Ground-Mounted Equipment
14.62.300 Underground Districts
14.62.310 Replacement Utility Pole — Street Lighting
14.62.320 Modifications to small wireless facilities
14.62.330 Consolidated Permit

Part I. General Provisions

14.62.010 Purpose

This chapter defines the regulations for placing, developing, permitting and removing all types of wireless communication facilities (“WCF”) including macro and small wireless facilities. It also provides adequate siting opportunities by identifying a range of locations and options that support wireless communications technology. This chapter encourages siting facilities on existing buildings or structures, collocating providers on single structures, maintaining neighborhood appearances and reducing visual clutter in the city. Specific purposes include:

- (a) Minimizing potential adverse visual, aesthetic, and safety impacts of wireless facilities;
- (b) Establishing objective standards for the placement of wireless facilities;
- (c) Allowing competition that does not unreasonably discriminate among providers of functionally equivalent services;
- (d) Encouraging the design of wireless facilities to be aesthetically and architecturally compatible with the surrounding built and natural environments; and
- (e) Encouraging the collocation or attachment of small wireless facilities on existing support structures to help minimize the total number and impact of such structures throughout the community.

14.62.020 Definitions

- (a) “Antenna” means any exterior apparatus designed for telephone, radio, data, internet or other communications through the sending and/or receiving of radio frequency signals including, but not limited to, equipment attached to a tower, utility pole, building or other structure to provide wireless services.
- (b) “Base Station” (this definition only applies to EFM) means a structure or equipment at a fixed location that enables FCC-licensed or authorized wireless communications between user equipment and a communications network. The term does not encompass a tower as defined herein or any equipment associated with a tower. Base Station includes, without limitation:
 - (1) Equipment associated with wireless communications services such as private, broadcast, and public safety services, as well as unlicensed wireless services and fixed wireless services such as microwave backhaul.
 - (2) Radio transceivers, antennas, coaxial or fiber-optic cable, regular and backup power supplies, and comparable equipment, regardless of technological configuration (including Distributed Antenna Systems (“DAS”) and small-cell networks).
 - (3) Any structure other than a tower that, at the time the relevant application is filed with the City of Lake Stevens under this section, supports or houses equipment described in paragraphs (b)(1)-(b)(2) that has been reviewed and approved under the applicable zoning or siting process, or under another state or local regulatory review process, even if the structure was not built for the sole or primary purpose of providing that support.

The term does not include any structure that, at the time the relevant application is filed with the City of Lake Stevens under this section, does not support or house equipment described in (b)(1)-(2) of this section.

- (c) “Collocation” means mounting or installing an antenna facility on a pre-existing structure, and/or modifying a structure for mounting or installing an antenna facility on that structure. Provided that, for purposes of Eligible Facilities Requests, “collocation” means the mounting or installation of

transmission equipment on an eligible support structure for the purpose of transmitting and/or receiving radio frequency signals for communications purposes.

- (d) "Electromagnetic field" or "EMF" means the field produced by the operation of equipment used in transmitting and receiving radio frequency signals.
- (e) "Eligible Facilities Request" means any request for modification of an existing tower or base station that does not substantially change the physical dimensions of such tower or base station, involving:
 - (1) Collocation of new transmission equipment;
 - (2) Removal of transmission equipment; or
 - (3) Replacement of transmission equipment.
- (f) "Eligible support structure" means any tower or base station as defined in this section, provided that it is existing at the time the relevant application is filed with the City of Lake Stevens under this section.
- (g) "Equipment facility" means any structure used to house electronic equipment, cooling systems and back-up power systems associated with a WCF, including shelters, enclosures, cabinets and other similar structures.
- (h) "Existing" (this definition only applies to EFM) means a constructed tower or base station is existing for purposes of this section if it has been reviewed and approved under the applicable zoning or siting process, or under another state or local regulatory review process, provided that a tower that has not been reviewed because it was not in a zoned area when it was built, but was lawfully constructed, is existing for purposes of this section.
- (i) "Macro facility" means is a large wireless communication facility that provides radio frequency coverage for a cellular telephone network. Generally, macro cell antennas are mounted on ground-based towers, rooftops and other existing structures, at a height that provides a clear view over the surrounding buildings and terrain. Macro cell facilities typically contain antennas that are greater than three cubic feet per antenna and typically cover large geographic areas with relatively high capacity and may be capable of hosting multiple wireless service providers.
- (j) "Site" for towers other than towers in the public rights-of-way, the current boundaries of the leased or owned property surrounding the tower and any access or utility easements currently related to the site, and, for other eligible support structures, further restricted that area in proximity to the structure and to other transmission equipment already deployed on the ground.
- (k) "Small wireless facilities" are wireless communication facilities that meet each of the following conditions:
 - (1) The facilities (i) are mounted on structures 50 feet or less in height including their antennas as defined in section 1.1320(d), (ii) are mounted on structures no more than 10 percent taller than other adjacent structures, or (iii) do not extend existing structures on which they are located to a height of more than 50 feet or by more than 10 percent, whichever is greater;
 - (2) Each antenna associated with the deployment, excluding associated antenna equipment (as defined above), is no more than three cubic feet in volume; and
 - (3) All other wireless equipment associated with the structure, including the wireless equipment associated with the antenna and any pre-existing associated equipment on the structure, is no more than 28 cubic feet in volume.

- (l) "Structure" means a pole, tower, base station, or other building, whether or not it has an existing antenna facility, that is used or to be used for the provision of personal wireless service (whether on its own or comingled with other types of services).
- (m) "Substantial Change" (this definition only applies to EFM) means a modification substantially changes the physical dimensions of an eligible support structure if it meets any of the following criteria:
 - (1) For towers, other than towers in the public rights-of-way, it increases the height of the tower by more than 10% or by the height of one additional antenna array with separation from the nearest existing antenna not to exceed twenty feet, whichever is greater; for other eligible support structures, it increases the height of the structure by more than 10% or more than 10 feet, whichever is greater;
 - (2) For towers, other than towers in the public rights-of-way, it involves adding an appurtenance to the body of the tower that would protrude from the edge of the tower more than 20 feet, or more than the width of the tower structure at the level of the appurtenance, whichever is greater; for other eligible support structures, it involves adding an appurtenance to the body of the structure that would protrude from the edge of the structure by more than six feet;
 - (3) For any eligible support structure, it involves installation of more than the standard number of new equipment cabinets for the technology involved, but not to exceed four cabinets; or, for towers in the public rights-of-way and base stations, it involves installation of any new equipment cabinets on the ground if there are no pre-existing ground cabinets associated with the structure, or else involves installation of ground cabinets that are more than 10% larger in height or overall volume than any other ground cabinets associated with the structure;
 - (4) It entails any excavation or deployment outside the current site;
 - (5) It would defeat the concealment elements of the eligible support structure; or
 - (6) It does not comply with conditions associated with the siting approval of the construction or modification of the eligible support structure or base station equipment, provided however that this limitation does not apply to any modification that is non-compliant only in a manner that would not exceed the thresholds identified under the definition of substantial change in this section.
- (n) "Tower" means any structure built for the sole or primary purpose of supporting any FCC-licensed or authorized antennas and their associated facilities, including structures that are constructed for wireless communications services including, but not limited to, private, broadcast, and public safety services, as well as unlicensed wireless services and fixed wireless services such as microwave backhaul, and the associated site.
- (o) "Transmission Equipment" means equipment that facilitates transmission for any FCC-licensed or authorized wireless communication service, including, but not limited to, radio transceivers, antennas, coaxial or fiber-optic cable, and regular and backup power supply. The term includes equipment associated with wireless communications services including, but not limited to, private, broadcast, and public safety services, as well as unlicensed wireless services and fixed wireless services such as microwave backhaul.
- (p) "Unified enclosure" means a small wireless facility providing concealment of antennas and equipment within a single enclosure.
- (q) "Utility pole" means a structure designed and used primarily for the support of electrical wires, telephone wires, television cable, traffic signals, or lighting for streets, parking areas, or pedestrian paths.

- (r) "Wireless communication facility" or "WCF" means an unstaffed facility for the transmission and/or reception of radio frequency, microwave or other signals for commercial communications purposes, including and typically consisting of antennas, equipment shelter or cabinet, transmission cables, a support structure required to achieve the necessary elevation, and reception and transmission devices and antennas.
- (s) "Wireless communication tower" see definition for "tower" in this chapter.
- (t) "Wireless communication services" means commercial mobile services, unlicensed wireless services, and common carrier wireless exchange access services, as defined by federal laws and regulations.

14.62.030 General provisions

- (a) Wireless communication facilities shall not be considered nor regulated as essential public facilities.
- (b) Small wireless facilities located outside of the public rights-of-way may be either a primary or a secondary use. A different use of an existing structure on the same lot shall not preclude the installation of a small wireless facility.
- (c) Small wireless facilities located within the public right-of-way pursuant to a valid franchise are outright permitted uses in every zone of the City but still require a land use and right-of-way permit.

14.62.040 Permit required

- (a) A land use permit per LSCM 14.40-1 Table of Permissible uses by Zones is required in addition to a building permit for the location, installation or construction of any wireless communication facility (WCF) and for any modification to an existing WCF.

14.62.050 Wireless Communication Facility Permit Process/Processing Timelines

The city shall make every reasonable effort consistent with state and federal law to comply with the requirements of 47 C.F.R. § 1.6003 and the presumptively reasonable time periods for review established therein and identified in the table below:

Table 14.62.050A Wireless Communication Facility Permit Process/Processing Timelines

<u>Facility Typeⁱ</u>	<u>Permit Type</u>	<u>Timeframe for Review: (tolled from submittal)</u>	<u>Days to Determine Application Completeness:</u>
Eligible Facility Modification (EFM)	Type I	60-days	30-days ⁱⁱ
Small Wireless Facility on Existing Structure	Type I	60-days	10-days ⁱⁱⁱ
Small Wireless Facility on New Structure	Type II	90-days	10-days
Macro Wireless Communication Facility -Collocation	Type II	90-days	30-days

Macro Wireless Communication Facility- non-collocation (e.g., new tower, pole, structure)	Type III	150-days	30-days
---	----------	----------	---------

- i. See definitions in this chapter for facility types (LSMC 14.62.020).
- ii. See LSMC 14.62.080
- iii. See LSMC 14.62.080

14.62.060 Exclusions

The following antennas and related facilities are expressly excluded from the provisions of this chapter.

- (a) Ham or amateur radio vertical tower antennas and related facilities.
- (b) Television and satellite dish antennas.

14.62.070 Application submittal requirements

- (a) This section sets forth the submittal requirements for all Wireless Communication Facilities (WCF) including eligible facilities modifications (EFM) and small wireless facilities. The purpose of the submittal requirements is to ensure that the city has all information and documentation that is reasonably necessary to determine if the applicant's proposal will meet regulations or if a proposed facilities modification will substantially change the physical dimensions of an eligible support structure. The submittal requirements are not intended to require the applicant to establish the need for the proposed WCF or modifications or to justify the business decision to propose such modifications.
- (b) Submittal Requirements. No WCF or EFM application shall be deemed complete unless it is in writing; accompanied by the applicable application and review fee; includes the required submittals; and attested to by the authorized person certifying the truth and accuracy of the information provided in the application. The application shall include the following submittals, unless waived by the Director.
 - (1) Contact information for the authorized person;
 - (2) Contact information for the applicant;
 - (3) Ownership information (if the proposal is not within public right-of-way);
 - (4) Specific locational information including GIS coordinates of all proposed WCF;
 - (5) Whether and where wireless facilities are to be located on existing utility poles, towers, buildings or other structures;
 - (6) Whether the deployment will utilize replacement utility poles, new poles, towers, and/or other structures and where such replacement will take place;
 - (7) Detailed schematics and visual renderings of the facilities including engineering and design standards.
 - (8) Conduit and/or ground-mounted equipment necessary for and intended for use in the deployment shall also be specified regardless of whether these facilities are constructed by the applicant or leased from an infrastructure provider.
 - (9) A site/landscaping plan showing the specific placement of the WCF on the site; showing the location of existing structures, trees and other significant site features; and indicating type and locations of plant materials used to screen WCF components;
 - (10) Documentation verifying that the proposed WCF complies with any applicable regulations and specifications in accordance with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA);

(11) Documentation that demonstrates that there is a licensed provider of telecommunication services contractually committed to using the proposed pole to provide wireless communication services.

(12) Property owner signed notarized statement regarding abandonment-The statement shall affirm the following:

- (i) The signee is the owner; and
- (ii) He or she understands that if the use is abandoned the tower must be removed within one year; and
- (iii) If the City acts to enforce LSMC 14.62.170 (p), the property owner, heirs or successors are ultimately responsible for the removal.

(13) Certification of an RF Engineer- regarding FCC electromagnetic field compliance.

(14) Waiver of Submittal Requirement. The Director or designee may waive any submittal requirement upon determination that the required submittal, or part thereof, is not reasonably related to the proposed WCF or substantial change criteria related to an EFM. A waiver, to be effective, must be in writing and signed by the Director or designee.

(15) When Received. An WCF or EFM application, and any supplemental submittals, shall be deemed received by the city upon the date such application or supplemental submittal is filed with the planning and community development department. An application, and any supplemental submittals, must be filed in person during regular business hours of the city and must be accompanied by the applicable permit review fee(s). Any application received by the city without contemporaneous payment, or deposit, of the applicable permit review fees will be rejected.

Additional Submittal Requirements for EFM's

(16) An assertion that the proposed facilities modification is subject to review under Section 6409 of the Spectrum Act;

(17) If the applicant is not the owner or person in control of the eligible support structure and/or site: An attestation that the owner or person in control of the eligible support structure and/or site has consented to the proposed facilities modification. If the eligible support structure is located in a public right-of-way, the applicant must also attest that applicant has authorization to install, maintain and operate transmission equipment in, under and above the public right-of-way;

(18) If the applicant proposes a modification that will result in an increase in height of the eligible support structure: Record drawings, as-built plans, or the equivalent, showing the height of the eligible support structure (a) as originally constructed and granted approval by the city or other applicable local zoning or similar regulatory authority; or (b) as of the most recent modification received by the city, or other local zoning or regulatory approval, prior to the passage of the Spectrum Act, whichever height is greater;

(19) If the applicant proposes a modification to an eligible support structure, which structure, or proposed modification of the same, is subject to preexisting restrictions or requirements imposed by a reviewing official or decision-making body pursuant to authority granted under the city code, or an ordinance or a municipal code of another local government authority: A copy of the document (e.g., CUP) setting forth such preexisting restrictions or requirements together with a certification that the proposed facilities modification conforms to such restrictions or requirements; provided, that such certification shall have no application to the extent the proposed facilities modification relates solely to an increase in height, increase in width, addition of cabinets, or new excavation, that does not result in a substantial change in the physical dimensions of the eligible support structure;

(20) If the applicant proposes a modification to an eligible support structure, which structure, or proposed modification of the same, is subject to preexisting concealment restrictions or requirements, or was constructed with concealment elements: Applicant shall set forth the facts and circumstances demonstrating that the proposed modification would not defeat the existing concealment elements of the eligible support structure. If the proposed modification will alter the exterior dimensions or appearance of the eligible support structure, applicant shall include a detailed visual simulation depicting how the eligible support structure will appear after the proposed modification is complete. The visual simulation shall depict to scale the eligible support structure in relation to the trees, landscaping and other structures adjacent to, or in the immediate vicinity of, the eligible support structure;

(21) If the applicant proposes a modification that will protrude from the edge of a non-tower eligible support structure: Record drawings, as-built plans, or the equivalent, showing at a minimum the edge of the eligible support structure at the location of the proposed modification;

(22) If the applicant proposes a modification to an eligible support structure that will (a) include any excavation; (b) would result in a protrusion from the edge of a tower that exceeds an existing protrusion of any transmission equipment attached to a tower; or (c) would protrude from the edge of a non-tower eligible support structure: A description of the boundaries of the site together with a scale drawing based on an accurate traverse, with angular and lineal dimensions, depicting the boundaries of the site in relation to the tower or base station proposed to be modified and depicting the proposed location, elevation and dimensions of the new or replacement transmission equipment. The city may require a survey by a land surveyor licensed in the state of Washington when, in the judgment of the approval authority, a survey is reasonably necessary to verify the boundaries of the site to determine if the proposed facilities modification would result in a substantial change in the physical dimensions of the eligible support structure;

(23) If the applicant proposes a modification to the eligible support structure that includes hardening through structural enhancement: A technical report by a qualified engineer accredited by the state of Washington, demonstrating that the structural enhancement is performed in connection with and is necessary to support the proposed collocation, removal, or replacement of transmission equipment and conforms to applicable code requirements. The city may retain the services of an independent technical expert to review, evaluate, and provide an opinion regarding the applicant's demonstration of necessity;

(24) If the applicant proposes a modification to a tower: A stamped report by a Washington State-registered professional engineer demonstrating that the tower with the proposed modifications will comply with applicable structural, electrical and safety codes, including by way of example, and not limitation, EIA/TIA-222-Revision G, published by the American National Standards Institute (as amended), allowable wind speed for the applicable zone in which the tower is located, and describing the general structural capacity of the tower with the proposed modifications, including:

- (i) The number and type of antennas that can be accommodated;
- (ii) The basis for the calculation of capacity; and
- (iii) A written statement that the proposal complies with all federal guidelines regarding interference and ANSI standards as adopted by the FCC, including but not limited to nonionizing electromagnetic radiation (NIER) standards.
- (iv) The city may retain the services of an independent technical expert to review, evaluate, and provide an opinion regarding the applicant's demonstration of compliance;

- (25) If the applicant proposes a modification to a base station: A stamped report by a Washington State-registered professional engineer demonstrating that the base station, with the proposed modifications, will comply with applicable structural, electrical and safety codes;
- (26) If the applicant proposes a modification requiring alteration to the eligible support structure, excavation, installation of new equipment cabinets, or any other activities impacting or altering the land, existing structures, fencing, or landscaping on the site: A detailed site plan and drawings, showing the true north point, a graphic scale and, drawn to an appropriate decimal scale, indicating and depicting:
 - (i) The location, elevation and dimensions of the existing eligible support structure;
 - (ii) The location, elevation and dimensions of the existing transmission equipment;
 - (iii) The location, elevation and dimensions of the transmission equipment, if any, proposed to be co-located or that will replace existing transmission equipment;
 - (iv) The location, elevation and dimensions of any proposed new equipment cabinets and the intended use of each;
 - (v) Any proposed modification to the eligible support structure;
 - (vi) The location of existing structures on the site, including fencing, screening, trees, and other significant site features; and
 - (vii) The location of any areas where excavation is proposed showing the elevations, depths, and width of the proposed excavation and materials and dimensions of the equipment to be placed in the area excavated.

Additional Submittal Requirements for Small Wireless Facilities

- (a) The Small Wireless Facilities application shall have sufficient detail to identify:
 - (1) The location of overhead and underground public utility, telecommunication, cable, water, sewer drainage and other lines and equipment in the rights-of-way within 250 feet from the proposed site.
 - (2) The specific trees, structures, facilities, lines and equipment, and obstructions, if any, that applicant proposes to temporarily or permanently remove or relocate and a landscape plan for protecting, trimming, removing, replacing, and restoring any trees or areas to be disturbed during construction.
 - (3) All existing proposed improvements related to the proposed location, including but not limited to poles, driveways, ADA ramps, equipment cabinets, street trees and structures within 250 feet from the proposed site.
 - (4) The applicant's plan for electric and fiber utilities, all conduits, cables, wires, handholes, junctions, meters, disconnect switches and any other ancillary equipment or construction necessary to construct the small wireless facility.
 - (5) If the site location includes a replacement or new light pole, then the applicant must submit a photometric analysis of the roadway and sidewalk 150 feet upstream and downstream of the existing light.
 - (6) Compliance with the aesthetic requirements of Section 16.62.260.

14.62.080 Small Wireless Facility General Permit Requirements

- (a) The grantee of any permit shall comply with all the requirements within the small wireless permit.
- (b) Small wireless facilities installed pursuant to a small wireless facility permit may proceed to install the approved small wireless facilities without the need for an additional right-of-way use permit if construction is commenced within thirty (30) days of approval by providing email or written notice to the Director. Facilities approved in a small wireless permit in which installation has not commenced within thirty (30) days of the approval of a small wireless facility permit shall apply for and be issued a right-of-way use permit to install such small wireless facilities in accordance with the standard requirements of the City for use of the right-of-way.
- (c) Post-Construction As-Builts. Within thirty (30) days after construction of the small wireless facility, the grantee shall provide the City with as-builts of the small wireless facilities demonstrating compliance with the permit and site photographs.
- (d) Permit Time Limit. Construction of the small wireless facility must be completed within six (6) months after the approval date by the City. The grantee may request one (1) extension to be limited to three (3) months, if the applicant cannot construct the small wireless facility within the original six (6) month period.
- (e) Site Safety and Maintenance. The grantee must maintain the small wireless facilities in safe and working condition. The grantee shall be responsible for the removal of any graffiti or other vandalism and shall keep the site neat and orderly, including but not limited to following any maintenance or modifications on the site.

14.62.090 Electromagnetic field (EMF) standards compliance

- (a) All WCF shall be operated in compliance with federal standards for EMF emissions.
- (b) Radio Frequency (RF) Certification
 - (1) The applicant shall submit an RF certification signed by an RF engineer with knowledge of the proposed project affirming that the WCF deployment will be compliant with all FCC and other governmental regulations in connection with human exposure to radio frequency emissions for every frequency at which the WCF and associated wireless backhaul will operate.
 - (2) An existing franchisee applying for a right-of-way permit for small wireless deployment shall provide an RF certification for all facilities included in the deployment which are to be installed by the franchisee.
 - (3) If facilities which produce RF radiation are necessary to the WCF deployment and will be provided by another franchisee, then the WCF deployment in the initial franchise or in a subsequent right-of-way permit shall be conditioned on an RF certification showing that the cumulative impact of the RF emissions from the entire installation meets federal requirements.
 - (4) If on review of a registered complaint the city finds that the WCF interferes with FCC approved devices, the city may revoke or modify the permit. The applicant shall be given a reasonable time based on the nature of the problem to correct the interference. If the permit is revoked, then the facility shall be removed.

14.62.100 Permit enforcement

The planning and community development director, or designee, shall enforce the provisions of this chapter under the code enforcement provisions of the Lake Stevens Municipal Code.

14.62.110 Reservation of Authority

Nothing herein is intended or shall operate to waive or limit the city's right to enforce, or condition approval on, compliance with generally applicable building, structural, electrical, and safety codes and with other laws codifying objective standards reasonably related to health and safety.

14.62.120 Federal Regulatory Requirements

(a) These provisions shall be interpreted and applied in order to comply with the provisions of federal law. By way of illustration and not limitation, any small wireless facility which has been certified as compliant with all FCC and other government regulations regarding the human exposure to radio frequency emissions will not be denied on the basis of RF radiation concerns.

(b) Wireless communication facilities shall be subject to the requirements of this chapter to the extent that such requirements (i) do not unreasonably discriminate among providers of functionally equivalent services, and (ii) do not have the effect of prohibiting personal wireless services within the City.

14.62.130 SEPA Review Wireless Communication Facilities

SEPA Review is required for new or replacement WCF unless exempt per WAC 197-11-800 (25).

Part II. Macro Wireless Communication Facilities-Towers and Antennas

14.62.140 Purpose

The purpose of this section is to set out regulations related to the deployment of Macro Wireless Communication Facilities (WCF), including new towers and antennas throughout the City.

14.62.150 Procedure

New macro WCF that are placed on a new tower or new structure shall be processed as a Type II or III Review/Conditional Use Permit consistent with Table 14.40-I and the procedures in Chapter 14.16B LSMC. Collocation of new macro WCF that do not qualify as an eligible facility modification under Chapter 14.62 Part III LSMC, shall be processed as a Type II Review/Administrative Conditional Use Permit consistent with the procedures in Chapter 14.16B LSMC.

14.62.0160 Macro Wireless Communication Facility Regulations

- (a) Construction or installation of the WCF must commence within one year from the date of the permit, with opportunity for a one-year extension; otherwise, the permit shall be revoked without further action of the city and the rights and privileges appurtenant to the permit shall be void;
- (b) Permittee shall allow collocation of proposed WCF on the permittee's site, unless the permittee establishes to the city's satisfaction that collocation will technically impair the existing permitted use(s) to a substantial degree;
- (c) Permittee shall maintain the WCF in a state of good repair and to maintain or replace, if necessary, vegetation and landscaping required as a condition of approving the permit;
- (d) Permittee shall notify the city of any sale, transfer, assignment of a site or WCF within 60 days of such event; and

- (e) Permittee shall comply with the provisions of this title and all other applicable city ordinances and rules and regulations.

14.62.170 Prioritized locations

The following sites are prioritized in order of preference for locating proposed macro WCF and permits shall be issued so that WCF will be located on the highest priority site feasible:

- (a) Collocation on a tower or structure with other existing WCF.
- (b) Collocation on public buildings and structures located in nonresidential zones.
- (c) Collocation on buildings and structures in industrial, commercial and business zones.
- (d) Collocation on buildings and structures in residential zones not used entirely for residential uses; provided, that WCF will not be sited on vacant residential lots.
- (e) New tower or structure built for the WCF.

14.62.180 Development standards

All WCF shall be constructed or installed per the following development standards:

- (a) WCF must comply with applicable Federal Communications Commission (FCC), Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), state, and city regulations and standards;
- (b) A freestanding WCF shall not be allowed whenever an existing structure can meet technical and network location requirements;
- (c) No WCF tower may be located within 1,000 feet of an existing or previously approved tower.
- (d) No WCF tower may be located within 1,000 feet of the shoreline of Lake Stevens.
- (e) All new WCF towers shall be designed to reasonably accommodate future installation of a second array.
- (f) Speculative WCF are prohibited. As part of the land use permit process, the applicant shall demonstrate that there is a licensed provider of wireless communications services contractually committed to using the proposed WCF to provide wireless communication services.
- (g) Antennas shall be located, mounted and designed so that visual and aesthetic impacts upon surrounding land uses and structures are minimized, and so that they blend into the existing environment;
- (h) WCF must be screened or camouflaged employing the best available technology, such as compatible materials, location, color, and hollow flagpoles, and other tactics to minimize visibility of the facility from public streets and residential properties.
- (i) A freestanding WCF shall comply with all required setbacks of the zoning district in which it is located, unless it is located within the public right-of-way;
- (j) WCF shall be designed and placed or installed on the site in a manner that takes maximum advantage of existing trees, mature vegetation, and structures by:
 - (1) Using existing site features to screen the WCF from prevalent views; and
 - (2) Using existing site features as a background in a way that the WCF blends into the background;
- (l) Screening of the base of the WCF, including any security fences and equipment cabinets, shall be done in a manner as to blend into the site so as the screening does not call undue attention itself.

- (m) A WCF shall be painted either in a nonreflective color or in a color scheme appropriate to the background against which the WCF would be viewed from most points within its viewshed, and in either case the color must be approved by the city as part of permit approval;
- (n) Equipment facilities shall be placed underground if applicable, or, if above ground, shall:
 - (1) Be screened from any street and adjacent property with fencing, walls, landscaping, structures or topography or a combination thereof.
- (o) As a condition of permit approval, the city may require the applicant to supplement existing trees and mature vegetation to screen the facility;
- (p) Should the WCF be abandoned or cease functioning for a period of one year, the tower shall be removed from the site. At the time of application, a signed statement from the property owner shall be provided to the city and recorded against the property which affirms that:
 - (1) The signee is the property owner; and
 - (2) He or she understands that if the use is abandoned the WCF must be removed within one year; and
 - (3) If the city acts to enforce this rule, the property owner, heirs or successors are ultimately responsible for the removal.
- (q) Security fencing shall:
 - (1) Not exceed eight feet in height;
 - (2) Be screened from view using appropriate landscaping materials; and
 - (3) If it is a chain-link fence, be camouflaged with appropriate techniques and painted or coated with a nonreflective color.

Part III Eligible Facility Modifications (EFM's)

14.62.190 Purpose

This section implements Section 6409(a) of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 (“Spectrum Act”), as interpreted by the Federal Communications Commission’s (“FCC” or “Commission”) Acceleration of Broadband Deployment Report & Order, which requires a state or local government to approve any Eligible Facilities Request for a modification of an existing tower or base station that does not result in a substantial change to the physical dimensions of such tower or base station.

14.62.200 Applicability – Relationship to other rules and regulations

- (a) Sole and Exclusive Procedure. The provisions in this Section 14.62.200 and 14.62.210 shall be the sole and exclusive procedure for review and approval of a proposed facilities modification which the applicant asserts are subject to review under Section 6409 (Spectrum Act). To the extent that other provisions of the city code establish a parallel process for review and approval of a project permit application for a proposed facilities modification, the provisions of this chapter shall control. If any part of an application for project permit approval includes a proposed facilities modification, the proposed facilities modification portion of the application shall be reviewed under the provisions of this chapter. If an application for project permit approval includes a proposal to modify an eligible support structure, and the applicant does not assert in the application that the proposal is subject to review under Section 6409, such proposal shall not be subject to review under this section and may be subject to review under other applicable provisions of the city code.

- (b) Illegal Structures. EFM's do not apply to structures that were never permitted.
- (c) Replacement of Eligible Support Structure. This chapter shall not apply to a proposed facility modification to an eligible support structure that will involve replacement of a tower or base station.
- (d) First Deployment – Base Station. This chapter shall not apply to a proposed facility modification to a structure, other than a tower, that does not, at the time of submittal of the application, already house or support a WCF lawfully installed within or upon, or attached to, the structure.
- (e) Interpretation. Interpretations of this chapter shall be guided by Section 6409; the FCC eligible facilities request rules, the FCC's Report and Order, regarding Acceleration of Broadband Deployment by Improving Wireless Facilities Siting Policies, WT Docket Nos. 13-238, 13-32; WC Docket No. 11-59; FCC 14-153.

14.62.210 Substantial change criteria

A proposed eligible facilities modification will substantially change the physical dimensions of an eligible support structure if it meets any of the criteria listed in the definition of Substantial Change.

Part IV. Small wireless Facilities

14.62.220 Purpose and Intent

To manage its right-of-way in a thoughtful manner, the City of Lake Stevens has adopted this process for the deployment of small wireless facilities. Sections 14.62.130 through 14.62.210 shall not apply to the deployment of small wireless facilities. The process balances the need to accommodate new and evolving technologies with the preservation of the natural and aesthetic environment of the city while complying with the requirements of state and federal law. Service providers who seek to utilize the public right-of-way for small wireless deployment to provide wireless communication, data transmission or other related services to the citizens of the city must have a valid franchise to provide the specific service seeking to utilize the right-of-way and a right-of-way permit to deploy the technology. Entities with franchises who wish to utilize a small wireless deployment to upgrade or expand their existing services shall utilize the processes set forth in this chapter to deploy their technology and obtain design approval of specific installations. A right-of-way permit in addition to Land use permit is required for small wireless deployment under the franchise. An entity without a franchise shall apply for a consolidated permit which shall be processed concurrently as one master permit within the meaning of RCW 35.99.010(3) and 35.99.030. For entities with a valid franchise, see Section 14.62.240.

- (a) Nothing in this chapter revises or diminishes the rights and obligations of an existing franchise.
- (b) The term "small wireless deployment" shall include the deployment of small wireless facilities and small wireless networks as those terms are defined by this chapter.
- (c) Existing franchisees with franchises that do not specifically permit small wireless deployment shall be required to either amend their existing franchise or enter a new franchise with the city.

14.62.230 Review process

The following provisions relate to applications for a franchise or right-of-way permit for small wireless deployments:

- (a) Review of Facilities. Review of the site locations proposed by the applicant shall be governed by the provisions of 47 USC Section 253 and 47 USC Section 332 and applicable case law. Applicants for franchises and the right-of-way permits which implement the franchise shall be treated in a competitively neutral and nondiscriminatory manner with other service providers utilizing supporting infrastructure which is

functionally equivalent, that is, service providers whose facilities are similarly situated in terms of structure, placement or cumulative impacts. Franchise and right-of-way permit review under this chapter shall neither prohibit nor have the effect of prohibiting the ability of an applicant to provide telecommunications services.

(b) Third Party Requirements.

- (1) All installations of small wireless facilities must have permission from the pole/structure owner to install facilities on such structure.
- (2) Governing Construction or Electrical Code. All installations of small wireless facilities shall comply with any governing construction or electrical code such as the National Electrical Safety Code, the National Electric Code or state electrical code, as applicable. All installations of ground-mounted or replacement structures shall comply with the city's adopted standards for construction in the right-of-way.
- (3) Electrical Connection. The city is not responsible for providing electricity to small wireless facilities. Any third-party utility providing such electricity must obtain a franchise from the city prior to operating in the rights-of-way.
- (4) Transport/Telecommunications Connection. The city is not responsible for providing transport connectivity (i.e., fiber) to small wireless facilities. Any third-party utility providing such transport connectivity must obtain a franchise from the city prior to operating in the rights-of-way.

14.62.240 Design and concealment standards for small wireless deployments

Small wireless facility deployments permitted in the right-of way in accordance with this chapter shall conform to the following design standards:

(a) Small wireless facilities attached to existing or replacement non-wooden light poles and other non-wooden poles in the right-of-way or non-wooden poles outside of the right-of-way shall conform to the following design criteria:

- (1) Antennas and the associated equipment enclosures (including disconnect switches and other appurtenant devices) shall be fully concealed within the pole, unless such concealment is otherwise technically infeasible, or is incompatible with the pole design, then the antennas and associated equipment enclosures must be camouflaged to appear as an integral part of the pole or flush mounted to the pole, meaning no more than six (6) inches off of the pole, and must be the minimum size necessary for the intended purpose, not to exceed the volumetric dimensions of small wireless facilities. If the equipment enclosure is permitted on the exterior of the pole, the applicant is required to place the equipment enclosure behind any banners or road signs that may be on the pole, provided that such location does not interfere with the operation of the banners or signs.
- (2) The furthest point of any antenna or equipment enclosure may not extend more than twenty (20) inches from the face of the pole.
- (3) All conduit, cables, wires and fiber must be routed internally in the light pole. Full concealment of all conduit, cables, wires and fiber is required within mounting brackets, shrouds, canisters or sleeves if attaching to exterior antennas or equipment.
- (4) An antenna on top of an existing pole may not extend more than six (6) feet above the height of the existing pole and the diameter may not exceed sixteen (16) inches, measured at the top of the pole, unless the applicant can demonstrate that more space is needed. The antennas shall be integrated into the pole design so that it appears as a continuation of the original pole, including colored or painted to match the pole, and shall be shrouded or screened to blend with the pole except for canister antennas which shall not require screening. All cabling and mounting hardware/brackets from the bottom of the antenna to the top of the pole shall be fully concealed and integrated with the pole.

- (5) Any replacement pole shall substantially conform to the design of the pole it is replacing or the neighboring pole design standards utilized within the contiguous right-of-way.
- (6) The height of any replacement pole may not extend more than ten (10) feet above the height of the existing pole or the minimum additional height necessary for adequate clearance from electrical wires, whichever is greater.
- (7) The diameter of a replacement pole shall comply with the City's setback and sidewalk clearance requirements and shall, to the extent technically feasible, not be more than a 25% increase of the existing non-wooden pole measured at the base of the pole, unless additional diameter is needed in order to conceal equipment within the base of the pole.
- (8) The use of the pole for the siting of a small wireless facility shall be considered secondary to the primary function of the pole. If the primary function of a pole serving as the host site for a small wireless facility becomes unnecessary, the pole shall not be retained for the sole purpose of accommodating the small wireless facility and the small wireless facility and all associated equipment shall be removed.

(b) Wooden pole design standards. Small wireless facilities located on wooden poles shall conform to the following design criteria:

- (1) The wooden pole at the proposed location may be replaced with a taller pole for the purpose of accommodating a small wireless facility; provided, that the replacement pole shall not exceed a height that is a maximum of ten (10) feet taller than the existing pole, unless a further height increase is required and confirmed in writing by the pole owner and that such height extension is the minimum extension possible to provide sufficient separation and/or clearance from electrical and wireline facilities.
- (2) A pole extender may be used instead of replacing an existing pole but may not increase the height of the existing pole by more than ten (10) feet, unless a further height increase is required and confirmed in writing by the pole owner and that such height increase is the minimum extension possible to provide sufficient separation and/or clearance from electrical and wireline facilities. A "pole extender" as used herein is an object affixed between the pole and the antenna for the purpose of increasing the height of the antenna above the pole. The pole extender shall be painted to approximately match the color of the pole and shall substantially match the diameter of the pole measured at the top of the pole.
- (3) Replacement wooden poles must either match the approximate color and materials of the replaced pole or shall be the standard new wooden pole used by the pole owner in the City.
- (4) Antennas, equipment enclosures, and all ancillary equipment, boxes and conduit shall be colored or painted to match the approximate color of the surface of the wooden pole on which they are attached.
- (5) Antennas shall not be mounted more than twelve (12) inches from the surface of the wooden pole.
- (6) Antennas should be placed to minimize visual clutter and obtrusiveness. Multiple antennas are permitted on a wooden pole provided that each antenna enclosure shall not be more than three (3) cubic feet in volume, not to exceed a maximum of nine (9) cubic feet.
- (7) A canister antenna may be mounted on top of an existing wooden pole, which may not exceed the height requirements described in subsection (b)(1) above. A canister antenna mounted on the top of a wooden pole shall not exceed sixteen (16) inches, measured at the top of the pole, and shall be colored or painted to match the pole. The canister antenna must be placed to look as if it is an extension of the pole. In the alternative, the applicant may propose a side mounted canister antenna, so long as the inside edge of the antenna is no more than twelve (12) inches from the surface of the wooden pole. All cables shall be concealed either within the canister

antenna or within a sleeve between the antenna and the wooden pole.

- (8) The furthest point of any antenna or equipment enclosure may not extend more than twenty (20) inches from the face of the pole.
- (9) An omni-directional antenna may be mounted on the top of an existing wooden pole, provided such antenna is no more than four (4) feet in height and is mounted directly on the top of a pole or attached to a sleeve made to look like the exterior of the pole as close to the top of the pole as technically feasible. All cables shall be concealed within the sleeve between the bottom of the antenna and the mounting bracket.
- (10) All related equipment, including but not limited to ancillary equipment, radios, cables, associated shrouding, microwaves, and conduit which are mounted on wooden poles shall not be mounted more than six (6) inches from the surface of the pole, unless a further distance is technically required, and is confirmed in writing by the pole owner.
- (11) Equipment for small wireless facilities must be attached to the wooden pole, unless otherwise permitted to be ground mounted pursuant to subsection (e)(2) below. The applicant is encouraged to place the equipment enclosure behind any banners or road signs that may be on the pole, provided that such location does not interfere with the operation of the banners or signs.
- (12) An applicant who desires to enclose both its antennas and equipment within one unified enclosure may do so, provided that such enclosure is the minimum size necessary for its intended purpose and the enclosure and all other wireless equipment associated with the pole, including wireless equipment associated with the antenna and any pre-existing associated equipment on the pole does not exceed twenty-eight (28) cubic feet. The unified enclosure may not be placed more than six (6) inches from the surface of the pole, unless a further distance is required and confirmed in writing by the pole owner. To the extent possible, the unified enclosure shall be placed to appear as an integrated part of the pole or behind banners or signs, provided that such location does not interfere with the operation of the banners or signs.
- (13) The visual effect of the small wireless facility on all other aspects of the appearance of the wooden pole shall be minimized to the greatest extent possible.
- (14) The use of the wooden pole for the siting of a small wireless facility shall be considered secondary to the primary function of the pole. If the primary function of a pole serving as the host site for a small wireless facility becomes unnecessary, the pole shall not be retained for the sole purpose of accommodating the small wireless facility and the small wireless facility and all associated equipment shall be removed.
- (15) The diameter of a replacement pole shall comply with the City's setback and sidewalk clearance requirements and shall not be more than a 25% increase of the existing utility pole measured at the base of the pole.
- (16) All cables and wires shall be routed through conduit along the outside of the pole. The outside conduit shall be colored or painted to match the pole. The number of conduit shall be minimized to the number technically necessary to accommodate the small wireless.

(c) Small wireless facilities attached to existing buildings, shall conform to the following design criteria:

- (1) Small wireless facilities may be mounted to the sides of a building if the antennas do not interrupt the building's architectural theme.
- (2) The interruption of architectural lines or horizontal or vertical reveals is discouraged.
- (3) New architectural features such as columns, pilasters, corbels, or other ornamentation that conceal antennas may be used if it complements the architecture of the existing building.

- (4) Small wireless facilities shall utilize the smallest mounting brackets necessary to provide the smallest offset from the building.
- (5) Skirts or shrouds shall be utilized on the sides and bottoms of antennas to conceal mounting hardware, create a cleaner appearance, and minimize the visual impact of the antennas. Exposed cabling/wiring is prohibited.
- (6) Small wireless facilities shall be painted and textured to match the adjacent building surfaces.

(d) Small wireless facilities mounted on cables (strand mounted) strung between existing utility poles shall conform to the following standards.

- (1) Each strand mounted facility shall not exceed three (3) cubic feet in volume;
- (2) Only one strand mounted facility is permitted per cable between any two existing poles;
- (3) The strand mounted devices shall be placed as close as possible to the nearest utility pole, in no event more than five (5) feet from the pole unless a greater instance technically necessary or is required by the pole owner for safety clearance;
- (4) No strand mounted device shall be in or above the portion of the roadway open to vehicular traffic;
- (5) Ground mounted equipment to accommodate a shared mounted facility is not permitted except when placed in pre-existing equipment cabinets; and
- (6) Pole mounted equipment shall comply with the requirements of subsections A and B above.
- (7) Such strand mounted devices must be installed to cause the least visual impact and without excess exterior cabling or wires (other than the original strand).
- (8) Strand mounted facilities are prohibited on non-wooden poles.

(e) General requirements.

- (1) Single-Facility Installation. Each utility pole may not contain more than one small wireless facility.
- (2) Ground mounted equipment in the rights of way is prohibited, unless such facilities are placed under ground or the applicant can demonstrate that pole mounted, or undergrounded equipment is technically infeasible. If ground mounted equipment is necessary, then the applicant shall submit a concealment element plan. Generators located in the rights of way are prohibited.
- (3) Equipment Enclosure Location and Dimensions. The applicant shall minimize the primary equipment enclosure space and use the smallest amount of enclosure possible to fit the necessary equipment. The primary equipment enclosure shall be located using the following methods in priority order:
 - (i) Concealed completely within the pole or pole base. If within the pole base, the base shall meet the ADA requirements and not impact the pedestrian access route.
 - (ii) Located on a pole. If located on a pole, the equipment enclosure and all other wireless equipment associated with the pole, shall be the minimum amount necessary and shall not exceed twenty-eight cubic feet. Multiple equipment enclosures may be acceptable if designed to more closely integrate with the pole design and does not cumulatively exceed twenty-eight (28) cubic feet.
 - (iii) Underground in a utility vault. If located underground, the access lid to the primary equipment enclosure shall be located outside the footprint of any pedestrian curb ramp and shall have a nonskid surface meeting ADA requirement if located within an existing pedestrian access route. No vault lids will be allowed in the sidewalk areas within the Downtown Lake Stevens subarea.
 - (iv) On private property. If located on private property, the applicant shall submit a copy of an executed easement or lease agreement with the private property owner prior to the right-of-

way permit issuance. In addition, if the private property is zoned residential, the applicant shall comply with the permit requirements for WCF in this chapter.

- (4) No equipment shall be operated to produce noise in violation of Chapter 9.56 LSCM.
- (5) Replacement poles and new poles along with all support structures shall comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), City construction and sidewalk clearance standards, city ordinance, and state and federal laws and regulations to provide a clear and safe passage within the rights-of-way. Further, the location of any replacement or new pole must: be physically possible, comply with applicable traffic warrants, not interfere with utility or safety fixtures (e.g., fire hydrants, traffic control devices), and not adversely affect the public welfare, health or safety.
- (6) Replacement poles shall be located as near as possible to the existing pole with the requirement to remove the abandoned pole.
- (7) No signage, message or identification other than the manufacturer's identification or identification required by governing law can be portrayed on any antenna or equipment enclosure. Any permitted signage shall be located on the equipment enclosures and be of the minimum amount possible to achieve the intended purpose (no larger than 4x6 inches); provided that, signs are permitted as concealment element techniques where appropriate.
- (8) Antennas and related equipment shall not be illuminated except for security reasons, required by a federal or state authority, or unless approved as part of a concealment element plan.
- (9) Side arm mounts for antennas or equipment must be the minimum extension necessary and for wooden poles may be no more than twelve (12) inches off the pole and for non-wooden poles no more than six (6) inches off the pole.
- (10) The preferred location of a small wireless facility on a pole is the location with the least visible impact.
- (11) Antennas, equipment enclosures, and ancillary equipment, conduit and cable, shall not dominate the structure or pole upon which they are attached.
- (12) Except for locations in the right-of-way, small wireless facilities are not permitted on any property containing a residential use in the residential zones.
- (13) The City may consider the cumulative visual effects of small wireless facilities mounted on poles within the rights-of-way in when assessing proposed siting locations so as to not adversely affect the visual character of the City. This provision shall not be applied to limit the number of permits issued when no alternative sites are reasonably available nor to impose a technological requirement on the applicant.
- (14) These design standards are intended to be used solely for concealment and siting. Nothing herein shall be interpreted or applied in a manner which dictates the use of a particular technology. When strict application of these requirements would unreasonably impair the function of the technology chosen by the applicant, alternative forms of concealment or deployment may be permitted which provide similar or greater protections from negative visual impacts to the streetscape.

Examples of a well-designed small wireless facility



Examples of a poorly designed small wireless facility



14.62.250 Design Zones for Small Wireless Facilities

(a) The following areas are hereby designated "Design Zones" for this chapter. Design Zones shall include the following districts:

- (1) All zones within Lake Stevens Subarea.
- (2) All zones within the 20th Street SE Corridor Subarea.
- (3) All zones within the Downtown Lake Stevens Subarea.

(b) Any applicant who desires to place a small wireless facility in a Design Zone must first establish that the applicant cannot locate the small wireless facility outside of the Design Zone. Applications for small wireless facilities in a Design Zone may be approved if the applicant demonstrates that due to technical infeasibility the applicant cannot locate the proposed small wireless facility on an existing or replacement pole within 500 feet of the proposed site and outside of the Design Zone.

(c) Small wireless facilities within the Downtown Lake Stevens Subarea shall not be placed on new decorative light standards unless technologically infeasible to locate on structures outside of the right-of-way and provide sufficient coverage.

(d) Applications for small wireless facilities within Design Zones must receive a land use approval and comply with a concealment element design described in section 14.62.260 b, in addition to the requirements in section 14.62.280 LSMC below.

14.62.260 New poles in the rights-of-way for small wireless facilities and installations in a Design Zone.

(a) New poles within the rights-of-way are only permitted if the applicant can establish that:

- (1) The proposed small wireless facility cannot be located on an existing utility pole or light pole, electrical transmission tower or on a site outside of the public rights of way such as on existing structures or poles in a public park, public property, building, transmission tower or in or on a non-residential use in a residential zone whether by roof or panel-mount or separate structure;
- (2) The proposed small wireless facility receives approval for a concealment element design, as described in subsection (b) below;
- (3) The proposed small wireless facility also complies with Shoreline Management Act, and SEPA, if applicable; and
- (4) No new poles shall be in a critical area or associated buffer required by the City's Critical Areas Management ordinance (Chapter 14.88 LSMC), except when determined to be exempt pursuant to said ordinance.

(b) The concealment element design shall include the design of the screening, fencing or other concealment technology for a tower, pole, or equipment structure, and all related transmission equipment or facilities associated with the proposed small wireless facility, including but not limited to fiber and power connections.

- (1) The concealment element design should seek to minimize the visual obtrusiveness of the small wireless facility. The proposed pole or structure should have similar designs to existing neighboring poles in the rights of way, including similar height to the extent technically feasible. If the proposed small wireless facility is placed on a replacement pole in a Design Zone, then the replacement pole shall be of the same general design as the pole it is replacing, unless the development services department otherwise approves a variation due to aesthetic or safety concerns. Any concealment element design for a small wireless facility on a decorative pole should attempt to mimic the design of such pole and integrate the small wireless facility into the design of the decorative pole. Other concealment methods include, but are not limited to, integrating the installation with architectural features or building design components, utilization of coverings or concealment devices of similar material, color, and texture - or the appearance thereof - as the surface against which the installation will be seen or on which it will be installed, landscape design, or other camouflage strategies appropriate for the type of installation. Applicants are required to utilize designs in which all conduit and wirelines are installed internally in the structure. Further, applicant designs should, to the extent technically possible, comply with the generally applicable design standards adopted pursuant to section 14.62.260 LSMC.
- (2) If the Director has already approved a concealment element design either for the applicant or another small wireless facility along the same public right-of-way or for the same pole type, then the applicant shall utilize a substantially similar concealment element design, unless it can show that such concealment element design is not physically or technologically feasible, or that such deployment would undermine the generally applicable design standards.

(c) Even if an alternative location is established pursuant to section 14.62.270 (b) & (c) LSMC or 14.62.280(a)(1) the Director may determine that a new pole in the right-of-way is in fact a superior alternative based on the impact to the City, the concealment element design, the City's Comprehensive Plan and the added benefits to the community.

(d) Prior to the issuance of a permit to construct a new pole or ground mounted equipment in the right-of-way, the applicant must obtain a site-specific agreement from the City to locate such new pole or ground mounted equipment. This requirement also applies to replacement poles that are higher than the replaced pole, and the overall height of the replacement pole and the proposed small wireless facility is more than sixty (60) feet.

(e) These design standards are intended to be used solely for the purpose of concealment and siting. Nothing herein shall be interpreted or applied in a manner which dictates the use of a particular technology. When strict application of these requirements would unreasonably impair the function of the technology chosen by the applicant, alternative forms of concealment or deployment may be permitted which provide similar or greater protections of the streetscape.

14.62.270 Franchise application.

Applicants for small wireless facilities shall apply using the city's franchise application form and submit a fee per the city's fee schedule to process an application for a franchise. The director of Planning and Community Development "director" is charged with administration of small wireless deployments and other wireless communication review processes established under this title. All franchise applications shall designate the entire city right-of-way as the franchise boundary.

14.62.280 Implementation—Right-of-way permits for small wireless deployment.

The rights granted under the franchise are implemented through the issuance of right-of-way permits. The franchise application may be accompanied by one or more applications for a right-of-way permit to deploy small wireless. An initial franchise and all related right-of-way permit applications shall be processed concurrently as one master permit under Chapter 35.99 RCW.

(a) The applicant can batch multiple small wireless facility sites in one application. The applicant is encouraged to batch the small wireless facility sites within an application in a contiguous service area.

(b) Issuance of a right-of-way permit to install a small wireless deployment shall be contingent upon approval of a franchise or the possession of a valid franchise.

(c) The director may approve, deny or conditionally approve all or any portion of the sites proposed in the right-of-way permit application.

(d) Any application for a small wireless deployment which contains an element which is not exempt from SEPA review shall simultaneously apply under Chapter 43.21C RCW and Chapter 16.04.

14.62.290 Ground-mounted equipment.

In areas of the city where overhead utility lines have been undergrounded (undergrounded areas), in designated design zones (see Section 14.62.170), and in other areas where necessary to permit full use of the public right-of-way by pedestrians, bicycles and other users, all ground-mounted equipment shall be undergrounded in a vault meeting the city's construction standards. The location of ground-mounted equipment (to the extent undergrounding such equipment is not technologically feasible), a replacement pole or street light shall comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), city development standards, and state and federal regulations to provide a clear and safe passage within the public right-of-way. Ground-mounted equipment is also permitted on private property adjacent to the public right-of-way with a recorded easement or lease agreement and permit in accordance with requirements of this chapter.

14.62.300 Underground Districts.

(a) Underground Districts. The city requires the undergrounding of new utilities, which would include all support equipment including, but not limited to any backhaul or electricity, for small wireless facilities in all areas of the City except within the rights-of-way along the following roads:

- (1) State Route 9;
- (2) State Route 92;
- (3) State Route 204;
- (4) Lundein Parkway from SR 9 to Callow Road;
- (5) 20th Street NE except between 118th Avenue NE and 127th Avenue NE;
- (6) 20th Street SE.

(b) In areas designated as underground districts and where other utilities are located underground, a service provider or infrastructure company desiring to locate any above-ground infrastructure in support of a small wireless deployment shall demonstrate that it is technologically infeasible to incorporate support facilities within proposed or existing light poles or in a vault underground. In such cases the applicant shall submit a concealment element plan in accordance with the provisions of section 14.62.280 LSMC.

(c) In areas designated as underground districts where existing utilities are currently located above ground, small wireless facilities may be located above ground with the submission of a concealment element plan in accordance with the provisions of section 14.62.280 LSMC. Such facilities may remain until such time that other utility lines and poles are placed underground, at which time an applicant may request that a small wireless facility be installed on a new street light consistent with the requirements of 14.62.280 LSMC and if no existing street light exists to host the SWF.

14.62.310 Replacement Utility Pole — Street Lighting.

With the express permission of the City, a replacement utility pole or a new utility pole may be permitted in the form of a new street light standard. The design of the street light standard shall be in accordance with adopted City construction standards when located outside of a Design Zone or underground district. Replacement utility poles/street light standards located within a Design Zone shall conform to the adopted streetscape design standard for the Design Zone. Wherever technologically feasible, all equipment and cabling shall be internal to the replacement street lighting standard.

14.62.320 Modifications to small wireless facilities

(a) If a grantee desires to make a modification to an existing small wireless facility, including but not limited to expanding or changing the antenna type, increasing the equipment enclosure, placing additional pole-mounted or ground-mounted equipment, or modifying the concealment elements, then the applicant shall apply for a small wireless facility permit.

(b) A small wireless facility permit shall not be required for routine maintenance and repair of a small wireless facility within the rights-of-way, or the replacement of an antenna or equipment of similar size, weight, and height, provided that such replacement does not defeat the concealment elements used in the original deployment of the small wireless facility, does not impact the structural integrity of the pole, and does not require pole replacement. Further, a small wireless facility permit shall not be

required for replacing equipment within the equipment enclosure or reconfiguration of fiber or power to the small wireless facility. Right-of-way use permits may be required for such routine maintenance, repair or replacement consistent with LSMC 14.56.250.

14.62.330 Consolidated Permit

(a) The issuance of a small wireless permit grants authority to construct small wireless facilities in the rights-of-way in a consolidated manner to allow the applicant, in most situations, to avoid the need to seek duplicative approval by both the public works and the development services department. If the applicant requires a new franchise to utilize the right-of-way, the franchise approval may be consolidated with the small wireless facility permit review if requested by the applicant. As an exercise of police powers pursuant to RCW 35.99.040(2), the small wireless facility permit is not a right-of-way use permit, but instead a consolidated public works and land use permit and the issuance of a small wireless facility permit shall be governed by the time limits established by federal law for small wireless facilities.

(b) The general standards applicable to the use of the rights-of-way described in LSMC 14.60.040 shall apply to all small wireless facility permits.



Staff Report
City of Lake Stevens
Planning Commission
Briefing
Date: January 16, 2019

SUBJECT: LUA2018-0157- City of Lake Stevens Shoreline Master Program - Periodic Review Update

CONTACT PERSON/DEPARTMENT: Joshua Machen, *Planning Manager* / Russ Wright, *Community Development Director*

SUMMARY:

The city is working with a consultant to update our Shoreline Master Program (SMP). This briefing provides the Planning Commission with a report prepared by the consultants providing an outline of the proposed changes to the SMP.

ACTION REQUESTED OF PLANNING COMMISSION:

Review the following attachment providing any comment or concern regarding the proposed topics to be addressed in the update:

- A. Lake Stevens SMP Update Report prepared by The Watershed Company

Background:

Washington State law requires that jurisdictions develop and administer Shoreline Master Programs for shorelines within their jurisdictions. State law further requires that those master programs be periodically reviewed for compliance with new state laws and consistency with adopted comprehensive plans and regulations. Periodic reviews are to occur every 8-years. Since the Lake Stevens is within Snohomish County, the Lake Stevens Shoreline Master Program is to be reviewed and updated as necessary on or before June 30, 2019.

Proposed Changes to the Lake Stevens SMP:

- 1) Amendments to ensure the Lake Stevens SMP is consistent with rule changes in State Law. The following are a few examples:
 - a. Cost threshold for substantial development-now \$7,047.
 - b. Ecology has changed the definition of "development", no longer includes dismantling or removing structures.
 - c. Ecology adopted rule amendments to clarify the scope and process for conducting periodic reviews.
 - d. Ecology added new shoreline exemption for retrofitting existing structures to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act.
- 2). Update SMP to be consistent with adopted Comprehensive Plan and Critical Areas Ordinance

- 4). Revise our SMP regulations to allow for nonconforming docks/boathouses to become more conforming without having to stay in same footprint, if no increase in overwater coverage.
- 5). Modify the regulations for single-family homes to explicitly allow for a pervious pedestrian path to the shoreline from the primary residence.
- 6). Modify the regulations for single-family homes to explicitly allow for minor grading/landscaping and the installation of landscaping walls (less than 4-feet high measured from the footing) occurring landward of ordinary high water but within the 50-foot shoreline setback with a caveat of native vegetation replanting.
- 7). General clean-up of code, correcting inconsistencies and clarifying regulations that required written interpretations.

Next steps

Staff working with The Watershed Company will bring draft SMP amendments to the Planning Commission to review on February 6, 2019.

Attachments

- A. Lake Stevens SMP Update Report prepared by The Watershed Company

City of Lake Stevens SMP Periodic Update

DRAFT SMP Update Report

Prepared on behalf of:



City of Lake Stevens
Planning and Community Development Department
1812 Main Street
Lake Stevens, WA 98258

Prepared by:



750 Sixth Street South
Kirkland . WA 98033
p 425.822.5242
f 425.827.8136
watershedco.com

January 2019

The Watershed Company Reference Number:
180713

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Consistency with Recent State Amendments.....	2
3. Consistency with Critical Areas Ordinance	2
4. Consistency with Comprehensive Plan and Other Development Regulations.....	5
5. Staff-recommended Amendments	7

List of Tables

Table 1-1. Abbreviations used in this document.	2
Table 3-1. Summary of gaps in consistency with the updated CAO and SMA implementation....	3
Table 4-1. Summary of gaps in consistency with LSMC Title 14, Land Use Code, and the Lake Stevens Comprehensive Plan.	5
Table 5-1. Staff recommendations.....	7

Attachments

Attachment A: Periodic Review Checklist

1. Introduction

In accordance with the Washington State Shoreline Management Act (SMA), local jurisdictions with “Shorelines of the State” are required to conduct a periodic review of their Shoreline Master Programs (SMPs) (WAC 173-26-090). The periodic review is intended to keep SMPs current with amendments to state laws, changes to local plans and regulations, changes in local circumstances, and new or improved data and information.

Shorelines of the State in the City of Lake Stevens (City) include Lake Stevens, Catherine Creek, and Little Pilchuck Creek. The City adopted its current SMP in 2013 (Ordinances No. 856 & 889). The SMP includes goals and policies, shoreline environment designations, and development regulations that guide the development and protection of these shorelines.

As a first step in the periodic review process, the current SMP was reviewed to better understand what aspects may require updates. The purpose of this SMP Update Report is to provide a summary of the review and inform updates to the SMP. The report is organized into the below sections according to the content of the review.

- **Section 2** identifies gaps in consistency with state laws, rules and implementation guidance. This analysis is based on the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) Periodic Review Checklist.
- **Section 3** addresses critical areas regulations in shoreline jurisdiction. The City is in the process of updating its Critical Areas Ordinance (CAO), which applies to critical areas outside of shoreline jurisdiction, and expects to adopt an updated CAO later this year. The SMP, in Appendix B, contains its own distinct set of regulations that apply to critical areas within shoreline jurisdiction. Section 3 identifies gaps in consistency between the draft CAO (dated November 20, 2018) and SMA implementation.
- **Section 4** identifies gaps in consistency with the City’s Comprehensive Plan (adopted 2015) and with implementing City development regulations other than those in the CAO. Specifically, the review includes Lake Stevens Municipal Code (LSMC) Title 14, Land Use Code.
- **Section 5** identifies City staff-recommended amendments to consider as part of the SMP update.

Each section of this report presents findings in a table. Where potential revision actions are identified, they are classified as follows:

- “**Mandatory**” indicates revisions that are required for consistency with state laws.

- “**Recommended**” indicates revisions that would improve consistency with state laws, but are not strictly required.
- “**Optional**” indicates revisions that represent ways in which the City could elect to amend its SMP in accordance with state laws, but that are not required or recommended for consistency with state laws.

This document attempts to minimize the use of abbreviations; however, a select few are used to keep the document concise. These abbreviations are compiled below in Table 1-1.

Table 1-1. Abbreviations used in this document.

Abbreviation	Meaning
CAO	Critical Areas Ordinance
City	City of Lake Stevens
Ecology	Washington State Department of Ecology
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
LSMC	Lake Stevens Municipal Code
RCW	Revised Code of Washington
SMA	Shoreline Management Act
SMP	Shoreline Master Program
WAC	Washington Administrative Code

2. Consistency with Recent State Amendments

As noted above, this section identifies gaps in consistency with state laws, rules and implementation guidance. This analysis is based on a list of recent amendments as summarized by Ecology in its Periodic Review Checklist. A completed version of the Periodic Review Checklist is appended to this report (Attachment A).

Overall, few mandatory amendments are identified, with several more indicated as recommended or optional amendments. In general, the potential amendments identified in the Periodic Review Checklist are minor in nature. They primarily concern amendments to exemptions, definitions, and administrative procedures.

3. Consistency with Critical Areas Ordinance

The City is currently working towards adoption of an updated Critical Areas Ordinance later this year. The SMP currently contains a distinct set of critical areas regulations in Appendix B,

and does not adopt the City's CAO by reference. The City would like to retain this approach, using the updated CAO as the basis for developing an updated SMP Appendix B.

However, the updated CAO contains several provisions that are inconsistent with the SMA and require modification or elimination when developing the updated SMP Appendix B. Table 3-1 identifies the gaps in consistency between the updated CAO and SMA implementation that will need to be addressed when developing the updated Appendix B. For purposes of this SMP Update Report, the most recent version of the draft CAO (dated November 20, 2018) is reviewed.

Table 3-1. Summary of gaps in consistency with the updated CAO and SMA implementation.

No.	Topic	Review and Relevant Location(s)	Action
1	Code sections inconsistent with the SMA or Ecology guidance	<p>Review: The updated CAO includes several code provisions that are inconsistent with the SMA or Ecology guidance and should be excluded from SMP Appendix B.</p> <p>Relevant Location(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updated CAO <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ LSMC 14.88.210(a)(1) & (3) (references to exemptions and reasonable use) ◦ LSMC 14.88.310 (reasonable use) ◦ LSMC 14.88.320 (reasonable use) ◦ LSMC 14.88.330 (nonconforming activities) ◦ LSMC 14.88.330(f) (wetland buffer reduction) 	<p>Mandatory: Exclude the following provisions of the updated CAO from SMP Appendix B:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LSMC 14.88.210(a)(1) & (3) (references to exemptions and reasonable use) • LSMC 14.88.310 (reasonable use) • LSMC 14.88.320 (reasonable use) • LSMC 14.88.330 (nonconforming activities) • LSMC 14.88.330(f) (wetland buffer reduction)
2	Definition of "Qualified Professional"	<p>Review: The proposed update includes the addition of a definition for "Qualified Professional" in LSMC 14.08, as LSMC 14.88 does not include a distinct set of definitions.</p> <p>Relevant Location(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updated CAO <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ LSMC 14.88.100 Definitions (reference to LSMC 14.08 Definitions) • SMP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Chapter 6 Definitions 	<p>Recommended: Add the new definition for "Qualified Professional" to SMP Chapter 6 Definitions to carry this definition over to the SMP.</p>
3	Formatting and consistency	<p>Review: The updated CAO includes internal references to other sections in LSMC 14.88, makes several references to the "Planning and Community Development Director," and</p>	<p>Recommended: Replace internal code references with appropriate references within the SMP and/or Appendix B. Replace references to the "Planning and Community Development Director" with references to the "Shoreline</p>

No.	Topic	Review and Relevant Location(s)	Action
		<p>makes references to zones/zoning. In many cases these references should be changed in order to adopt the updated CAO as the updated SMP Appendix B.</p> <p>Relevant Location(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updated CAO <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Various locations 	Administrator.” Replace references to zones or zoning with references to environment designations, where appropriate.
4	Applicability to critical areas within shoreline jurisdiction	<p>Review: The updated CAO properly asserts its applicability to critical areas in Lake Stevens. In order to amend this document for adoption as SMP Appendix B, the sections on purpose and intent and applicability should be modified to clearly establish that the provisions of Appendix B apply to critical areas within shoreline jurisdiction.</p> <p>Relevant Location(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updated CAO <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ LSMC 14.88.010 ○ LSMC 14.88.200 	<p>Recommended: Modify the text in LSMC 14.88.010 to clearly establish the goal of no net loss of acreage or function of shoreline critical areas. Modify the text in LSMC 14.88.200 to clarify that the provisions of SMP Appendix B apply to shoreline critical areas within Lake Stevens.</p>
5	Geologically hazardous areas	<p>Review: The updated CAO does not include certain SMA provisions for geologically hazardous areas in WAC 173-26-221. These provisions are included in Appendix B of the existing SMP.</p> <p>Relevant Location(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing SMP Appendix B <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 5.C(c) ○ 5.C(d) • Updated CAO <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ LSMC 14.88.620 	<p>Mandatory: Carry over existing SMP Appendix B regulations 5.C(c) and 5.C(d) to the updated CAO for consistency with WAC 173-26-221.</p>
6	Wetland mitigation requirements	<p>Review: The updated CAO does not include language requiring the submittal of a watershed plan if off-site wetland mitigation is proposed as indicated by WAC 173-26-201(2)(e)(ii)(B). This</p>	<p>Recommended: Add language from current SMP Appendix B (at 6.E(a)(1)) that states “A watershed plan must be submitted if off-site mitigation is proposed;” to the updated SMP Appendix B.</p>

No.	Topic	Review and Relevant Location(s)	Action
		<p>language is included in the existing SMP Appendix B.</p> <p>Relevant Location(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing SMP Appendix B <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 6.E(a)(1) • Updated CAO <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ LSMC 14.88.840(a)(1) 	
7	Buffers for Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas	<p>Review:</p> <p>The updated CAO does not include a preamble that exists in the existing SMP Appendix B that clarifies the applicability of shoreline buffers and Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas buffers.</p> <p>Relevant Location(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing SMP Appendix B <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Part 3 • Updated CAO <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ LSMC 14.88 Part IV 	<p>Recommended: Add preamble from existing SMP Appendix B Part 3 to updated CAO for clarity in SMP implementation.</p>

4. Consistency with Comprehensive Plan and Other Development Regulations

Table 4-1 identifies gaps in consistency with the City's Comprehensive Plan and development regulations, including LSMC Title 14, Land Use Code. In general, cross-references and consistency between these documents could be strengthened to improve clarity and application of the SMP.

Table 4-1. Summary of gaps in consistency with LSMC Title 14, Land Use Code, and the Lake Stevens Comprehensive Plan.

No.	Topic	Review and Relevant Location(s)	Action
Comprehensive Plan			
1	Shoreline Element	<p>Review:</p> <p>Under state law, the goals and policies of an SMP are considered an element of a jurisdiction's Comprehensive Plan. The Lake Stevens SMP indicates that its</p>	<p>Recommended: Consider explicitly indicating in the Comprehensive Plan that the policies in the SMP constitute the Shoreline Element of the City's Comprehensive Plan, perhaps during the next update of</p>

No.	Topic	Review and Relevant Location(s)	Action
		<p>policies constitute the Shoreline Element of the City's Comprehensive Plan. While the Environmental and Natural Resources Element of the Comprehensive Plan includes a discussion of the SMP, as well as a goal (4.2) and associated policies related to implementing the SMA; it does not explicitly establish the policies of the SMP as an element of the plan.</p> <p>Relevant Location(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chapter 4 • SMP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 3.B.1.c 	<p>the Comprehensive Plan. Alternatively, consider incorporating the policies of the SMP into a new Shoreline Element of the Comprehensive Plan, perhaps during the next update of the Comprehensive Plan.</p>
Development Regulations			
2	Permit filing procedures	<p>Review: Title 14 Land Use Code, indicates that the shoreline permit appeal comment period is 21 days from the date of receipt, as defined in RCW 90.58.180. Section 2 of this report recommends updating the SMP to reference the date of filing, as defined by RCW 90.58.140(6), in accordance with legislative updates made since adoption of the SMP. The associated language in Title 14 should also be updated.</p> <p>Relevant Location(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LSMC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 14.16B.710(h) ○ 14.16B.720(b) 	<p>Mandatory: Update LSMC 14.16B for consistency with legislative amendments.</p>
3	Definitions	<p>Review: The relationship between the definitions in LSMC 14.08.010 and SMP Chapter 6 could be made more explicit.</p> <p>Relevant Location(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LSMC 	<p>Recommended: Consider introducing SMP Chapter 6 with the following text or similar: "Unless otherwise defined in this chapter, the definitions provided in LSMC 14.08.010 shall apply. If there is a conflict, the definitions in this chapter shall govern."</p>

No.	Topic	Review and Relevant Location(s)	Action
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 14.08.010 Definitions • SMP ○ Chapter 6 Definitions 	

5. Staff-recommended Amendments

City planning staff have proposed several amendments to the SMP. Table 5-1 discusses the more significant amendments. Other minor staff-recommended amendments are not included in the table.

Table 5-1. Staff recommendations.

No.	Topic	Review and Relevant Location(s)	Action
1	Shoreline environment designations	<p>Review: The SMP includes tables of parcel numbers to indicate the extents of shoreline environment designations. These tables are not required. The City can rely solely on maps to indicate shoreline environment designation boundaries. City staff have also noted that the shoreline environment designation maps will need to be updated based on the Downtown Plan and pending Rhodora annexation.</p> <p>Relevant Location(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SMP ○ Chapter 2 ○ Appendix A 	<p>Recommended: Remove parcel number tables from the SMP. Update shoreline environment designation maps to address the Downtown Plan and pending Rhodora annexation.</p>
2	Shoreline stabilization	<p>Review: Shoreline stabilization section could better distinguish maintenance versus replacement of shoreline stabilization and related regulations. Additional flexibility for replacing bulkheads should be considered if consistent with the SMA. Section should be reviewed for overall consistency with WAC 173-26-231.</p> <p>Relevant Location(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SMP 	<p>Recommended: Revise shoreline stabilization provisions to clarify what constitutes maintenance and what constitutes replacement, and what regulations are applicable. Provide more flexible approaches for replacing bulkheads if consistent with the SMA. Review the shoreline stabilization section for overall consistency with WAC 173-26-231 and revise as needed.</p>

No.	Topic	Review and Relevant Location(s)	Action
		○ 4.C.2	
3	Development standards for new docks	<p>Review: City staff have noted inconsistencies between the text and the figures that are included in the SMP Chapter 4.</p> <p>Relevant Location(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>SMP</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 4.C.3.c.24.c ○ 4.C.3.d.24.i 	Recommended: Update the text and figures in SMP Chapter 4 for consistency with each other.
4	Stormwater manual	<p>Review: Chapter 5 of the SMP contains a reference to the 2005 Stormwater Manual, as amended. This manual has been updated since the adoption of the SMP.</p> <p>Relevant Location(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>SMP</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 5.C.8.c.3.b 	Recommended: Update section to reference the 2012 Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington, as amended in 2014.
5	Waterfront deck or patio provisions	<p>Review: SMP could be simpler if sections related to residential decks and patios were combined.</p> <p>Relevant Location(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>SMP</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 5.C.8.c.3.d & e 	Recommended: Combine sections 5.C.8.c.3.d and 5.C.8.c.3.e for increased simplicity and clarity.
6	Nonconforming overwater structures	<p>Review: Current regulations tend to preserve the existing configurations of nonconforming structures, even when alternative configurations might be preferable for both the applicant and the environment. Consider opportunities for more flexibility with regards to nonconforming overwater structures if consistent with the SMA.</p> <p>Relevant Location(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>SMP</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 4.C.3 	Recommended: Amend overwater structures regulations to provide more flexibility as applied to nonconforming structures if consistent with the SMA.

No.	Topic	Review and Relevant Location(s)	Action
7	Repair and replacement of piers/docks	<p>Review: SMP currently has separate sections for replacement or repair of existing piers/docks.</p> <p>Relevant Location(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SMP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 4.C.3.c.25 & 28-32 	<p>Recommended: Consider integrating pier/dock repair and replacement sections for consistency and clarity.</p>
8	Existing uses	<p>Review: Existing Structures and Development section of Chapter 7 includes provisions related to existing uses, which would be more appropriately located in the Nonconforming Uses and Lots section.</p> <p>Relevant Location(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SMP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 7.G & H 	<p>Recommended: Relocate provisions related to existing uses from the Existing Structures and Development section of Chapter 7 to the Nonconforming Uses and Lots section.</p>
9	Residential shoreline access	<p>Review: SMP lacks specifics regarding access paths for shoreline residences.</p> <p>Relevant Location(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SMP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 5.C.8. 	<p>Recommended: In the Residential Development section of Chapter 5, add language specifying the allowance for access paths for shoreline residences and associated standards. Ensure the standards allow for ADA access when needed.</p>
10	Residential landscaping	<p>Review: SMP lacks specificity regarding allowances for common types of residential landscaping work.</p> <p>Relevant Location(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SMP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 5.C.8. 	<p>Recommended: In the Residential Development section of Chapter 5, add language clarifying allowed landscaping work, such as grading and landscape walls.</p>
11	Maintenance of residential development	<p>Review: Management policies for the Shoreline Residential environment do not currently mention maintenance.</p> <p>Relevant Location(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SMP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2.C.4.c 	<p>Recommended: Clarify the allowance for maintenance in the management policies for the Shoreline Residential environment.</p>

SHORELINE MASTER PROGRAM PERIODIC REVIEW

Periodic Review Checklist

Introduction

This document is intended for use by counties, cities and towns conducting the “periodic review” of their Shoreline Master Programs (SMPs). This review is intended to keep SMPs current with amendments to state laws or rules, changes to local plans and regulations, and changes to address local circumstances, new information or improved data. The review is required under the Shoreline Management Act (SMA) at [RCW 90.58.080\(4\)](#). Ecology’s rule outlining procedures for conducting these reviews is at [WAC 173-26-090](#).

This checklist summarizes amendments to state law, rules and applicable updated guidance adopted between 2007 and 2017 that may trigger the need for local SMP amendments during periodic reviews.

How to use this checklist

See Section 2 of Ecology’s *Periodic Review Checklist Guidance* document for a description of each item, relevant links, review considerations, and example language.

At the beginning: Use the review column to document review considerations and determine if local amendments are needed to maintain compliance. See WAC 173-26-090(3)(b)(i).

At the end: Use the checklist as a final summary identifying your final action, indicating where the SMP addresses applicable amended laws, or indicate where no action is needed. See WAC 173-26-090(3)(d)(ii)(D), and WAC 173-26-110(9)(b).

Local governments should coordinate with their assigned [Ecology regional planner](#) for more information on how to use this checklist and conduct the periodic review.

Row	Summary of change	Review	Action
2017			
a.	OFM adjusted the cost threshold for substantial development to \$7,047.	SMP includes references to previous cost thresholds of \$5,000 (at 7.C.1.a.) and \$5,718 (at 1.E.1).	Mandatory: Update cost thresholds. Recommended: Consider indicating that cost thresholds are periodically amended if not already indicated.
b.	Ecology amended rules to clarify that the definition of “development” does not include dismantling or removing structures.	Definitions of “Development” (at 1.E.1 and SMP Chapter 6) do not clarify that removing structures does not constitute “development.”	Recommended: Modify the definitions of “Development” to be consistent with Ecology’s example definition .
c.	Ecology adopted rules that clarify exceptions to local review under the SMA .	SMP does not address these exceptions.	Recommended: Add these exceptions to SMP Chapter 7.
d.	Ecology amended rules that clarify permit filing procedures consistent with a 2011 statute.	Filing with Ecology generally addressed in SMP (at 7.B.6 and 7.B.7). SMP includes obsolete reference to “date of receipt” rather than “date of filing” (at 7.C.4).	Mandatory: Update filing procedures language for consistency with current requirements. Recommended: Use Ecology example language to ensure consistency and clarity.
e.	Ecology amended forestry use regulations to clarify that forest practices that only involves timber cutting are not SMA “developments” and do not require SDPs.	The City does not have extensive forestry within its shoreline jurisdiction.	No changes needed.
f.	Ecology clarified the SMA does not apply to lands under exclusive federal jurisdiction	The City does not have any lands within its shoreline exclusively under federal jurisdiction.	No changes needed.
g.	Ecology clarified “default” provisions for nonconforming uses and development .	The SMP contains its own provisions regarding nonconforming uses and development. Chapter 6 includes a definition of “Nonconforming development,” but does not include definitions of	No changes needed. Recommended: Update definition for “nonconforming development,” and add definitons for “nonconforming use” and “nonconforming lot” according to Ecology’s example language.

Row	Summary of change	Review	Action
		“Nonconforming use” and “Nonconforming lot.”	
h.	Ecology adopted rule amendments to clarify the scope and process for conducting periodic reviews .	SMP does not describe the scope and process for conducting periodic reviews.	No changes needed. Scope and process for conducting periodic reviews not required to be included in SMP. Optional: Modify the language in SMP Chapter 1 regarding periodic review of the SMP.
i.	Ecology adopted a new rule creating an optional SMP amendment process that allows for a shared local/state public comment period.	Neither the SMP (at 7.J) nor the Lake Stevens Municipal Code contain specific amendment process requirements.	No changes needed. SMP amendments process not required to be included in SMP.
j.	Submittal to Ecology of proposed SMP amendments.	The SMP (at 7.J) does not contain specific amendment process requirements.	No changes needed. SMP amendments submittal process not required to be included in SMP.

2016

a.	The Legislature created a new shoreline permit exemption for retrofitting existing structures to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act .	SMP (at 7.C.1.) refers to WAC 173-27-040 for exemptions and includes a description (in whole or in part) of the exemptions. This exemption is not listed.	Recommended: Amend the SMP (at 7.C.1) to list this exemption.
b.	Ecology updated wetlands critical areas guidance including implementation guidance for the 2014 wetlands rating system.	Draft CAO to be included as SMP Appendix B contains this requirement (at LSMC 14.88.805(b)).	Mandatory: Include draft CAO as SMP Appendix B, modified as necessary for SMA compatibility.

2015

a.	The Legislature adopted a 90-day target for local review of Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) projects.	City not likely to have any WSDOT projects subject to the SMP.	No changes needed.
----	--	--	--------------------

2014

a.	The Legislature raised the cost threshold for requiring a Substantial Development Permit (SDP) for replacement docks on lakes and rivers to \$20,000 (from \$10,000).	SMP (at 1.E.1. and 7.C.1.h.) does not include the raised cost threshold for replacement docks.	Mandatory: Update the language in SMP (at 1.E.1. and 7.C.1.h.) to reflect the pertinent WAC (173-27-040(2)(h)).
----	--	--	--

Row	Summary of change	Review	Action
b.	The Legislature created a new definition and policy for floating on-water residences legally established before 7/1/2014.	Not applicable. The City does not have any floating on-water residences, nor does the SMP allow them.	No changes needed.
2012			
a.	The Legislature amended the SMA to clarify SMP appeal procedures .	SMP does not contain specific steps or language for appealing amendments.	No changes needed. SMP appeals procedures are not required to be included in SMP.
2011			
a.	Ecology adopted a rule requiring that wetlands be delineated in accordance with the approved federal wetland delineation manual .	Draft CAO to be included as SMP Appendix B contains this requirement (at LSMC 14.88.805(a)). Definitions of "Hydric soil" and "Wetland or wetlands" in SMP Chapter 6 refer to outdated delineation manual.	Mandatory: Include draft CAO as SMP Appendix B, modified as necessary for SMA compatibility. Update the Definitions of "Hydric soil" and "Wetland or wetlands" in SMP Chapter 6.
b.	Ecology adopted rules for new commercial geoduck aquaculture .	Not applicable. The City has no saltwater shorelines.	No changes needed.
c.	The Legislature created a new definition and policy for floating homes permitted or legally established prior to January 1, 2011.	Not applicable. The City does not have any floating on-water residences, nor does the SMP allow them.	No changes needed.
d.	The Legislature authorized a new option to classify existing structures as conforming .	The SMP (at 7.G.) classifies existing structures as conforming.	No changes needed.
2010			
a.	The Legislature adopted Growth Management Act – Shoreline Management Act clarifications .	The SMP does not address the effective date of SMP amendments. The SMP contains a distinct set of critical areas regulations in Appendix B, eliminating the issue of overlapping critical areas regulations. Further related review is provided in Section 3 of this SMP Update Report.	Mandatory: Include draft CAO as SMP Appendix B, modified as necessary for SMA compatibility.
2009			
a.	The Legislature created new "relief" procedures for instances	The SMP (at 3.B.1.c.6.) references relief procedures	Recommended: Consider updating SMP using Ecology's

Row	Summary of change	Review	Action
	in which a shoreline restoration project within a UGA creates a shift in Ordinary High Water Mark.	for shifts in the OHWM due to shoreline restoration projects via reference to HB 2199.	example language, which includes reference to the criteria and procedures in WAC 173-27-215.
b.	Ecology adopted a rule for certifying wetland mitigation banks .	Use of certified mitigation banks is allowed in the SMP (at 3.B.4.c.5.) and the draft CAO to be included as SMP Appendix B (at LSMC 14.88.840(a)(5)).	No changes needed (pertinent language in draft CAO is essentially the same as existing CAO).
c.	The Legislature added moratoria authority and procedures to the SMA.	The SMP does not address moratoria authority and procedures.	No changes needed. City can rely on statute for moratoria authority and procedures.

2007

a.	The Legislature clarified options for defining "floodway" as either the area that has been established in FEMA maps, or the floodway criteria set in the SMA.	The definition of "Floodway" in SMP Chapter 6 is not fully consistent with Ecology guidance.	<p>Mandatory: Update "Floodway" definition to be consistent with one of the two options set forth by the Legislature.</p> <p>Recommended: Update definition with Ecology's suggested definition for using FEMA maps to establish the floodway.</p>
b.	Ecology amended rules to clarify that comprehensively updated SMPs shall include a list and map of streams and lakes that are in shoreline jurisdiction.	List included in SMP (at 1.D.1.). Map included in SMP (Appendix A).	No changes needed.
c.	Ecology's rule listing statutory exemptions from the requirement for an SDP was amended to include fish habitat enhancement projects that conform to the provisions of RCW 77.55.181.	SMP (at 7.C.1.) refers to WAC 173-27-040 for exemptions and includes a description (in whole or in part) of the exemptions. The exemption for fish habitat enhancement projects is included (at 7.C.1.p.).	<p>No changes needed.</p> <p>Recommended: Consider updating the exemption language in SMP (at 7.C.1.p.) with Ecology's example language, which includes reference to the criteria in RCW 77.55.181.</p>