



**Spokane County
SMP Periodic Update
Agency and Stakeholder Kickoff Meeting
April 1, 2021 from 2:30 PM – 4:00 PM**

Question & Answer

Question 1: Can you tell me if you have other participants or contacts from Fairchild Air Force Base (FAFB) for this?

Answer: The invitation was sent out to over 400 invitees; the list was created from the Spokane County master contact list. There were several contacts at Fairchild Air Force Base who received the invitation for the webinar. One of the updates that we've put into the first draft that is in the applicability section is that areas in uses to exclusive federal jurisdiction are not subject to the jurisdiction to the shoreline management act (SMA). FAFB would not fall under the jurisdiction of this program. Not to say they should not be contacted and allowed to comment. FAFB will remain on the master contact list.

Question 2: Will the HRDA high risk drainage areas be put into the documents?

Answer: This is not part of the checklist, nor is it in the rules and scope of this update. In speaking with the building staff about the HRDA high risk drainage areas it's overseen by the Spokane County Public Works Department, the engineering and roads do review for this. The review is primarily for large plats or grading projects. It's not something that is currently addressed in the Spokane County Shoreline Master Program or the County Critical Areas Ordinance.

Question 3: How does all this affect reflection lake? A private lake in north Spokane County.

Answer: Reflection Lake is covered under the existing Shoreline Master Program. The lake is privately owned and does have shoreline designation around the entirety of the Shoreline Master Program. Jurisdiction is dependent on the size of the water bodies and not the ownership, unless it is federal ownership in which case federally owned bodies of water are not subject to SMA.

Question 4: For lakes which have two or more counties facing the shore (i.e., Lake Spokane has both Spokane County on one side and Stevens County on the other shore), how does the coordination between counties take place with regard to shore management?

Answer: In the case of Lake Spokane and the two county jurisdictions of Spokane County and Stevens County, these two jurisdictions are on two different update schedules. Stevens County over the last 6-months just finished their periodic update while Spokane County has not been updated in the last 10-years. Ideally the two jurisdictions should work towards jointly planning for the management of this shoreline. Given the nature of the periodic update and the areas being updated for the Spokane County SMP, once the update is complete it will be comparable to Stevens County SMP. However, both Counties will have different rules and regulations that apply to them.

It's common to get questions about the shoreline in the area where Stevens County and Spokane County jurisdictions meet. The County does receive questions from property owners about others residing in the other county, there are different regulations for the two jurisdictions. There are noticeable differences in the development patterns between the two counties.

Question 5: SCC 9.14 & WAC 197 states discharge of unauthorized water is illegal. Yet we are dumping sump pump water to county-maintained roads.

Answer: This deals with stormwater and groundwater issues. WAC 197 is the water quality administrative codes; Ecology's Water Quality Program may have more to do with that. This is not a topic that is typically addressed in a Shoreline Master Program. It typically deals with new development in shorelines and may affect the shorelines directly. New development on shorelines is going to have stormwater provisions built into it. We cannot do anything about retrofitting existing development in the Shoreline Master Program.

Question 6: Is this an opportunity to review and possibly revise the requirement to provide a pedestrian access if a bridge has more than 50 ATD?

Answer: This would be a recreational purpose if it is within the shoreline jurisdiction. This question refers to bridge standards that if a bridge services a certain level of traffic then they are required to provide a clear pathway for pedestrians of at least three feet in width. There is no requirement under this periodic update to make any changes to bridges. This is an open public process and issues may be brought up during the public hearing at the Planning Commission.

Are there bridges in the shoreline jurisdiction that have this requirement with the 50 ADT? There are many bridges that have traffic going over them that exceed the 50 ADT. When the County Public Works Department replaces a bridge, the county revisits the regulations to address this standard and the bridge improvements.

Question: Will channel migration zones, delineations and maps be updated during the review period?

Answer: The intent is not to redesignate any of the shoreline areas. This update process does not include new delineations or updates to maps.

Question: Stricter development guidelines are being created by Osborne Consulting due to flooding in the West Plains in approximately one year from now. How will these guidelines affect the SMP and comprehensive plan? Area of significant risks are being given a determination of non-significance (DNS) not a mitigated determination of non-significance (MDNS) and why?

Answer: There are no shorelines in the West Plains area. This question sounds like it pertains to stormwater, permits for stormwater are reviewed by our County Public Works Department. Each project is reviewed against the development standards by the Public Works Department. Regarding flooding, this is reviewed under the flood plains division within the Public Works Department. The County is getting started on their Comprehensive Plan update per the Growth Management Act. The Comp Plan needs to be updated by 2026. During the update process we will update these regulations.