

## Appendix D

### Local Government Policy and Program Threat Criteria

The local governments (cities, towns, counties, PUDs) in the Upper Columbia Region and Colville Tribes have a significant and substantial role in the development, adoption, implementation and enforcement of land use regulations. In Washington State, land use planning and a wide array of environmental protection programs are mandated at the state level, but developed, adopted and implemented at the local level (e.g. counties, cities and towns). The same is generally true with the Colville Tribes, although their statutory authority is derived from federal regulations and related obligations. This means that threats to recovery of listed species from future development, land uses and land and facilities management activities must be addressed by local governments and the Tribes including criteria regarding development, adoption, implementation, monitoring and enforcement of land use and environmental protection regulations that affect the habitat of listed species.

Programs and regulations that potentially effect listed species can be divided into the following categories:

- Comprehensive Plans (land use, water, wastewater, stormwater, solid waste etc...)
- Implementing Regulations (zoning, critical areas, shorelines, development standards, etc...)
- Permitting Processes (conditional use, substantial development, building, variance, exemption, etc...)
- Code Enforcement/Compliance
- Environmental Review (SEPA and NEPA)

The local governments in the Upper Columbia Region and Tribes have numerous policies, regulations, and programs that are designed to avoid or minimize impacts to the environment from activities associated with human land use and management activities. The decline in salmon habitat has resulted from numerous diverse human activities and natural processes over a biologically short period of time. Many of the activities that contributed to decline in salmon habitat conditions occurred before today's policies, regulations, and programs were enacted. Therefore, the existence of degraded salmon habitat does not necessarily mean that local government and Tribal policies, regulations, and programs are inadequate as most were non-existent during the period of decline. However, as part of the recovery planning process, a review of programs that are now in place was undertaken to determine if either compliance or implementation can be improved to aid in recovery. Thus, this Chapter identifies current policies, regulations, and programs that may affect the habitat for listed species, provides recommendations for

## Appendix D: Local Government Policy and Program Threat Criteria

review and revision of existing plans, programs and regulations where applicable, and provides threat criteria.

The first step in the review process was to generate a list of the specific plans, programs and activities under the purview of local government, describe their purpose and relationship to recovery of listed species, relationship to VSP parameters and finally a review for relationship to ESA threat criteria. Table X provides a summary of this step in the review.

The relationship of the plans and programs to VSP parameters and two of the ESA Threat Criteria are listed as either direct (those that may involve actions, e.g. wastewater discharge, critical areas regulation, etc..., that directly impact listed species) or indirect (those that entail primarily goals and policies that do not directly impact listed species). In general establishing the relationship based on a direct or indirect impact is relatively straightforward and is primarily based on whether the plan or program entails a physical action, however, a determination of the adequacy of existing regulations required more analysis.

Each of the plans and programs was evaluated regarding adequacy of existing regulatory programs to determine: whether any mechanism existed; whether a mechanism existed but needed work; and whether the existing mechanism was deemed adequate. The results provided in the following tables represent a general summary or average of the status of local government plans and programs in the Region.

An important assumption in the evaluation is that local compliance with state growth management planning (specifically critical areas) and shoreline master programming mandates is the benchmark for measurement of adequacy. This assumption is based on the fact that both the Growth Management Act and Shoreline Management Act have been revised in recent years as part of the State's efforts to recover listed species. Both Acts require local governments to plan and implement programs aimed at protection, restoration and enhancement of fish and wildlife habitat and related environmental attributes.

It is clear from Table 1 that local governments and the Colville Tribes have an important role to play in the recovery of listed species. The wide range of mandated planning and regulatory programs provide a solid foundation for local governments to implement and enforce actions needed to recover listed species. The table illustrates the relationship between local government land use permitting and management activities and recovery of listed species.

Appendix D: Local Government Policy and Program Threat Criteria

**Table 1 needs to be printed on 11" X 17" paper**

**Table 1** The relationship between local government permitting and management activities and recovery of listed species

Policy/ Program/ Regulation	Relationship to Recovery of Listed Species	Relationship to VSP Parameters		ESA Threat Criteria		
		Abundance/ Productivity	Spatial Structure/ Diversity	The present or threatened destruction, modification, or curtailment of its habitat or range and how these threats will be removed	The inadequacy of existing regulatory mechanisms	Other natural or manmade factors (with authorities under local government jurisdiction, such as grading permits, variance policy etc.) affecting its continued existence" and how these threats will be removed.
<b>Land Use Comprehensive Plans (Elements):</b>		Y - direct X - indirect		Y - direct X - indirect	1 - Little or no regulatory mechanism 2 - basic mechanism in place, needs revision/ update 3 - existing mechanism adequate	Y - direct X - indirect
Land Use Element	The Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan provides the vision and general goals and policies to direct where and how a community will grow. It is important that future planning acknowledge existing and desired future conditions for a wide range of issues that affect listed species.	X	X	Y	3	Y
Capital Facilities Element	The Capital Facilities Element of the Comprehensive Plan provides the basis and specific goals and policies for how capital facilities are operated, maintained and developed for the present and future. This element may consist of a stand alone Capital Facilities Plan or may only contain the goals and policies with reference to the CFP. It is important that present and future operations, maintenance and development of capital facilities acknowledge existing and desired future conditions for a wide range of issues that affect listed species.	X	X	X	3	X
Utilities Element	The Utilities Element of the Comprehensive Plan provides the specific goals and policies for the utilities required to serve the county, or community for the present and future. This element may consist of required individual utility plans (e.g. Water Comprehensive Plan) or may only contain the goals and policies with reference to the specific plans. It is important that present and future operations, maintenance and development of utilities facilities acknowledge existing and desired future conditions for a wide range of issues that affect listed species.	X	X	X	3	X

Appendix D: Local Government Policy and Program Threat Criteria

Policy/ Program/ Regulation	Relationship to Recovery of Listed Species	Relationship to VSP Parameters		ESA Threat Criteria		
		Abundance/ Productivity	Spatial Structure/ Diversity	The present or threatened destruction, modification, or curtailment of its habitat or range and how these threats will be removed	The inadequacy of existing regulatory mechanisms	Other natural or manmade factors (with authorities under local government jurisdiction, such as grading permits, variance policy etc.) affecting its continued existence” and how these threats will be removed.
Land Use Comprehensive Plans (Elements):		Y - direct X - indirect		Y - direct X - indirect	1 - Little or no regulatory mechanism 2 - basic mechanism in place, needs revision/ update 3 - existing mechanism adequate	Y - direct X - indirect
Rural Areas Element	The Rural Areas Element of the Comprehensive Plan provides specific goals and policies for development in identified rural areas. It is important that future planning for land uses and management in rural areas acknowledge existing and desired future conditions for a wide range of issues that affect listed species.	X	X	X	3	X
Transportation Element	The Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan provides specific goals, policies and recommendations for maintenance, operation and development of the transportation system. It is important that present and future operations, maintenance and development of utilities facilities acknowledge existing and desired future conditions for a wide range of issues that affect listed species.	X	X	Y	3	Y
Urban Growth Area Element	The Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan provides specific goals and policies for expansion of urban type development. It is important that future planning for expansion of the urban area acknowledge existing and desired future conditions for a wide range of issues that affect listed species.	X	X	Y	3	Y
Lands for Public Purpose and Open Space Corridors Element	The Lands for Public Purpose and Open Space Corridors Element of the Comprehensive Plan provides specific goals and policies to guide maintenance, acquisition, development and maintenance of public purpose and open space lands. It is important that future planning for maintenance, acquisition, development and maintenance of public purpose and open space lands acknowledge existing and desired future conditions for a wide range of issues that affect listed species.	X	X	Y	3	Y

Appendix D: Local Government Policy and Program Threat Criteria

Policy/ Program/ Regulation	Relationship to Recovery of Listed Species	Relationship to VSP Parameters		ESA Threat Criteria		
		Abundance/ Productivity	Spatial Structure/ Diversity	The present or threatened destruction, modification, or curtailment of its habitat or range and how these threats will be removed	The inadequacy of existing regulatory mechanisms	Other natural or manmade factors (with authorities under local government jurisdiction, such as grading permits, variance policy etc.) affecting its continued existence” and how these threats will be removed.
<b>Land Use Comprehensive Plans (Elements):</b>		Y - direct X - indirect		Y - direct X - indirect	1 - Little or no regulatory mechanism 2 - basic mechanism in place, needs revision/ update 3 - existing mechanism adequate	Y - direct X - indirect
Economic Development Element	The Economic Development Element of the Comprehensive Plan provides specific goals, policies and recommendations for economic development. It is important that future economic development planning acknowledge existing and desired future conditions for a wide range of issues that affect listed species.	X	X	X	3	X
Parks and Recreation Element	The Parks and Recreation Element of the Comprehensive Plan (often a stand alone Parks and Recreation Plan) provides the specific goals, policies and recommendations for maintenance, operation and development of parks and recreation facilities and opportunities. It is important that future planning for parks and recreation facilities and opportunities acknowledge existing and desired future conditions for a wide range of issues that affect listed species.	X	X	Y	3	Y
<b>Water Comp Plan</b>	The Water Comprehensive Plan provides the specific goals, policies and recommendations for maintenance, operation and development of the public water system. It is important that future planning for water supply, distribution and storage acknowledge existing and desired future conditions for a wide range of issues that affect listed species.	Y	Y	Y	3	Y
<b>Wastewater Comp Plan</b>	The WasteWater Comprehensive Plan (and related design reports) provides the specific goals, policies and recommendations for maintenance, operation and development of the public sewer system. It is important that future planning for wastewater collection, treatment and biosolids disposal acknowledge existing and desired future conditions for a wide range of issues that affect listed species.	Y	Y	Y	3	Y

Appendix D: Local Government Policy and Program Threat Criteria

Policy/ Program/ Regulation	Relationship to Recovery of Listed Species	Relationship to VSP Parameters		ESA Threat Criteria		
		Abundance/ Productivity	Spatial Structure/ Diversity	The present or threatened destruction, modification, or curtailment of its habitat or range and how these threats will be removed	The inadequacy of existing regulatory mechanisms	Other natural or manmade factors (with authorities under local government jurisdiction, such as grading permits, variance policy etc.) affecting its continued existence” and how these threats will be removed.
Land Use Comprehensive Plans (Elements):		Y - direct X - indirect		Y - direct X - indirect	1 - Little or no regulatory mechanism 2 - basic mechanism in place, needs revision/ update 3 - existing mechanism adequate	Y - direct X - indirect
Stormwater Management Plan	The Stormwater Management Plan provides the specific goals, policies and recommendations for maintenance, operation and development of the public storm drainage system. It is important that future planning for storm water collection, treatment and disposal acknowledge existing and desired future conditions for a wide range of issues that affect listed species.	Y	Y	Y	2	Y
Solid Waste Management Plan	The Solid Waste Management Plan provides the specific goals, policies and recommendations for maintenance, operation and development of the public solid waste disposal system. It is important that future planning for collection and disposal of solid waste acknowledge existing and desired future conditions for a wide range of issues that affect listed species.	X	X	X	3	X
Road Management and Abandonment Plan RCW 76.09.410 and 76.09.420	Road management plans are optional for local governments. Road management plans typically provide specific standards for the maintenance, operation and development of a jurisdiction's road system including best management practices geared to protect, restore and enhance water quality and riparian habitat.	Y	Y	Y	2	Y
Watershed Plans	Local watershed plans are authorized under the State's Watershed Planning Act (RCW 90.82) adopted in 1998. The state established a framework for developing local solutions to water issues on a watershed basis. The comprehensive watershed planning process is based on watersheds known as Water Resources Inventory Areas (WRIAs). This process is optional and allows local governments to collaborate and join with citizens and tribes to form watershed management planning units to develop watershed management plans.	Y	Y	Y	2	Y
<b>Implementing Regulations</b>						

Appendix D: Local Government Policy and Program Threat Criteria

Policy/ Program/ Regulation	Relationship to Recovery of Listed Species	Relationship to VSP Parameters		ESA Threat Criteria		
		Abundance/ Productivity	Spatial Structure/ Diversity	The present or threatened destruction, modification, or curtailment of its habitat or range and how these threats will be removed	The inadequacy of existing regulatory mechanisms	Other natural or manmade factors (with authorities under local government jurisdiction, such as grading permits, variance policy etc.) affecting its continued existence” and how these threats will be removed.
Land Use Comprehensive Plans (Elements):		Y - direct X - indirect		Y - direct X - indirect	1 - Little or no regulatory mechanism 2 - basic mechanism in place, needs revision/ update 3 - existing mechanism adequate	Y - direct X - indirect
Zoning	Zoning is the primary tool for regulation of land use at the local level. Such regulations typically divide a jurisdiction into zoning districts that limit uses, provide bulk, height, setback and lot size and coverage limitations, and specific other standards for development. Zoning regulations also contain provisions for variances from some of the standards and requirements of the regulation. It is important that zoning regulations acknowledge existing and desired future conditions for a wide range of issues that affect listed species.	Y	Y	Y	3	Y
Subdivision/Platting	Subdivision regulations are the primary means of managing how and where land is divided into smaller parcels. Such regulations typically provide regulations related to open space, required improvements, lot layout, access, etc... In addition, long plats, depending how their are defined at the local level, are subject to SEPA review. It is important that subdivision regulations acknowledge existing and desired future conditions for a wide range of issues that affect listed species.	Y	Y	Y	2	Y
Development Standards	Development standards typically provide minimum standards for utility, transportation and storm drainage improvements. It is important that development standards acknowledge existing and desired future conditions for a wide range of issues that affect listed species.	Y	Y	Y	2	Y
Planned Development	Planned Development regulations are an optional means for managing how and where land is divided into smaller parcels for development. Such regulations typically permit increased densities, require open space, required improvements, lot layout, access, etc... In addition planned developments are subject to SEPA review. It is important that planned development regulations acknowledge existing and desired future conditions for a wide range of issues that affect listed species.	Y	Y	Y	3	Y

Appendix D: Local Government Policy and Program Threat Criteria

Policy/ Program/ Regulation	Relationship to Recovery of Listed Species	Relationship to VSP Parameters		ESA Threat Criteria		
		Abundance/ Productivity	Spatial Structure/ Diversity	The present or threatened destruction, modification, or curtailment of its habitat or range and how these threats will be removed	The inadequacy of existing regulatory mechanisms	Other natural or manmade factors (with authorities under local government jurisdiction, such as grading permits, variance policy etc.) affecting its continued existence” and how these threats will be removed.
Land Use Comprehensive Plans (Elements):		Y - direct X - indirect		Y - direct X - indirect	1 - Little or no regulatory mechanism 2 - basic mechanism in place, needs revision/ update 3 - existing mechanism adequate	Y - direct X - indirect
Critical Areas	Critical Areas regulations are required under the state Growth Management Act (as amended) have become the primary tool for regulation of development in frequently flooded areas, wetlands, aquifer recharge areas, geologically hazardous areas and critical fish and wildlife habitat at the local level. The regulations are intended to protect, restore and enhance critical areas using best available science. Critical Areas regulations also must provide a "reasonable use" provision that may allow for the waiving of requirements if the strict application of the regulation would deny all use of a piece of property. In addition permits for development in critical areas are generally subject to SEPA review.	Y	Y	Y	2	Y
Flood Damage Prevention	Flood Damage Prevention regulations are required under the state and federal flood damage prevention statutes and regulate development in identified 100 year flood plain areas. The regulations are intended to reduce flood hazards to private property through requirements for flood proofing, elevation of structures and limitations on development in floodway and floodplains. In addition, floodplain development permits are subject to SEPA review. It is important that flood damage prevention regulations acknowledge existing and desired future conditions for a wide range of issues that affect listed species.	Y	Y	Y	2	Y
Clearing and Grading	Clearing and grading regulations, related to the Uniform Building Code, are an option available to local government to provide a means to review and mitigate impacts from clearing and grading of land. It is important that clearing and grading regulations are considered that acknowledge existing and desired future conditions for a wide range of issues that affect listed species.	Y	Y	Y	1	Y

Appendix D: Local Government Policy and Program Threat Criteria

Policy/ Program/ Regulation	Relationship to Recovery of Listed Species	Relationship to VSP Parameters		ESA Threat Criteria		
		Abundance/ Productivity	Spatial Structure/ Diversity	The present or threatened destruction, modification, or curtailment of its habitat or range and how these threats will be removed	The inadequacy of existing regulatory mechanisms	Other natural or manmade factors (with authorities under local government jurisdiction, such as grading permits, variance policy etc.) affecting its continued existence” and how these threats will be removed.
Land Use Comprehensive Plans (Elements):		Y - direct X - indirect		Y - direct X - indirect	1 - Little or no regulatory mechanism 2 - basic mechanism in place, needs revision/ update 3 - existing mechanism adequate	Y - direct X - indirect
International Building Code	The International Building Codes has been adopted by most local governments, in compliance with State law, to provide regulations to ensure protection of the public health, safety and welfare. These codes provide optional sections that address issues (clearing, grading, fill, etc....) that potentially could impact listed species. It is important that building codes are considered that acknowledge existing and desired future conditions for a wide range of issues that affect listed species.	X	X	X	3	X
Shoreline Master Program	Local Shoreline Master Programs (SMP) are required under the State Shoreline Management Act for those jurisdictions with rivers or streams with mean annual flow of 20 cfs or lake over 20 acres. The SMP provides goals, policies and regulations for development with shoreline jurisdiction which at a minimum includes that land lying 200 feet landward on a horizontal plane, from the ordinary-high-water-mark or the floodway boundary, whichever is greater. It is important that local SMPs acknowledge existing and desired future conditions for a wide range of issues that affect listed species. In addition permits for development in shoreline areas are generally subject to SEPA review.	Y	Y	Y	2	Y
Administrative Procedures	Administrative procedures for implementation and enforcement of local land use and environmental regulations are critical to the success of a local planning program. Timing of review processes, appeals and the number and type of public hearings are set forth in state statute with the local government have some limited options (e.g. hearing body, reviewing agencies, permit type, etc...). It is important that local SMPs acknowledge existing and desired future conditions for a wide range of issues that affect listed species.	X	X	X	2	X

Appendix D: Local Government Policy and Program Threat Criteria

Policy/ Program/ Regulation	Relationship to Recovery of Listed Species	Relationship to VSP Parameters		ESA Threat Criteria		
		Abundance/ Productivity	Spatial Structure/ Diversity	The present or threatened destruction, modification, or curtailment of its habitat or range and how these threats will be removed	The inadequacy of existing regulatory mechanisms	Other natural or manmade factors (with authorities under local government jurisdiction, such as grading permits, variance policy etc.) affecting its continued existence” and how these threats will be removed.
Land Use Comprehensive Plans (Elements):		Y - direct X - indirect		Y - direct X - indirect	1 - Little or no regulatory mechanism 2 - basic mechanism in place, needs revision/ update 3 - existing mechanism adequate	Y - direct X - indirect
Resource/Rural Lands	Resource/Rural lands regulations are required under the state Growth Management Act (as amended) have become the primary tool for regulation of development on timber, mineral and agricultural resource lands of long-term commercial significance. The regulations are intended to protect resource lands from incompatible land uses. It is important that local SMPs acknowledge existing and desired future conditions for a wide range of issues that affect listed species.	X	X	Y	2	Y
<b>Permit Processes</b>						
Conditional Uses	Conditional Use Permits are for permitted uses that due to the type of use or location require a public hearing and placement of conditions on the development in order to mitigate potential impacts. There are two types of CUPs, those required by zoning regulations and those required under local shoreline master programs (Shoreline CUPs require approval of Ecology). Both types of CUP's require SEPA review. The authority to develop conditions is fairly broad, but conditions are generally limited to those needed to address the direct impacts of the project. Since CUP's can occur in locations where development would potentially impact listed species, it is important that the CUP process acknowledge existing and desired future conditions for a wide range of issues that affect listed species.	X	X	X	2	Y

Appendix D: Local Government Policy and Program Threat Criteria

Policy/ Program/ Regulation	Relationship to Recovery of Listed Species	Relationship to VSP Parameters		ESA Threat Criteria		
		Abundance/ Productivity	Spatial Structure/ Diversity	The present or threatened destruction, modification, or curtailment of its habitat or range and how these threats will be removed	The inadequacy of existing regulatory mechanisms	Other natural or manmade factors (with authorities under local government jurisdiction, such as grading permits, variance policy etc.) affecting its continued existence” and how these threats will be removed.
Land Use Comprehensive Plans (Elements):		Y - direct X - indirect		Y - direct X - indirect	1 - Little or no regulatory mechanism 2 - basic mechanism in place, needs revision/ update 3 - existing mechanism adequate	Y - direct X - indirect
Variations	Variations are generally limited to bulk, height and setback regulations contained in zoning and shoreline regulations (shoreline variations require approval of Ecology). With the exception of shoreline variations, such actions may be exempted from SEPA. Variations typically require a public hearing and approval must include findings that the variance meets standard criteria related to hardship, topography and existing development patterns. The authority to deny or approve variations is fairly broad and does provide opportunities to place conditions on the approval that address the direct impacts of the project. Since variations may be requested where development could potentially impact listed species, it is important that the approval process acknowledge existing and desired future conditions for a wide range of issues that affect listed species.	X	X	X	2	Y
Exemptions	Exemptions are available in specific circumstances to allow for the reasonable use of property when strict application of regulations would eliminate all use or, in the case of shorelines master programs, a specific list of exemptions set forth in the Shoreline Management Act. Exemptions are generally also exempt from SEPA review. The authority to deny or approve exemptions is fairly broad and provides opportunities to place conditions on the approval that address the direct impacts of the project. Since exemptions may be requested where development could potentially impact listed species, it is important that the approval process acknowledge existing and desired future conditions for a wide range of issues that affect listed species.	X	X	X	2	Y

Appendix D: Local Government Policy and Program Threat Criteria

Policy/ Program/ Regulation	Relationship to Recovery of Listed Species	Relationship to VSP Parameters		ESA Threat Criteria		
		Abundance/ Productivity	Spatial Structure/ Diversity	The present or threatened destruction, modification, or curtailment of its habitat or range and how these threats will be removed	The inadequacy of existing regulatory mechanisms	Other natural or manmade factors (with authorities under local government jurisdiction, such as grading permits, variance policy etc.) affecting its continued existence” and how these threats will be removed.
Land Use Comprehensive Plans (Elements):		Y - direct X - indirect		Y - direct X - indirect	1 - Little or no regulatory mechanism 2 - basic mechanism in place, needs revision/ update 3 - existing mechanism adequate	Y - direct X - indirect
Substantial Development	Substantial Development permits are a requirement of the Shoreline Management Act and are generally administratively approved at the local level. These permits are subject to SEPA review. The authority to deny or approve substantial development permits is fairly broad and provides opportunities to place conditions on the approval that address the direct impacts of the project. Since all SDPs will be for development that could potentially impact listed species, it is important that the approval process acknowledge existing and desired future conditions for a wide range of issues that affect listed species.	X	X	X	2	Y
Approach/Access	Approach permits are issued for new access points to County roads and city streets. Access permits are for new and or expanded access onto state highways. Approach permits are local decisions while access permits in unincorporated areas are administered by the Department of Transportation and by the local municipality within corporate limits. Approach and Access permits are generally exempt from SEPA review. The authority to deny or approve approaches or accesses provides opportunities to place conditions on the approval that address the direct impacts of the project. Since approaches or accesses may be requested where development could potentially impact listed species, it is important that the approval process acknowledge existing and desired future conditions for a wide range of issues that affect listed species.	X	X	X	2	Y

Appendix D: Local Government Policy and Program Threat Criteria

Policy/ Program/ Regulation	Relationship to Recovery of Listed Species	Relationship to VSP Parameters		ESA Threat Criteria		
		Abundance/ Productivity	Spatial Structure/ Diversity	The present or threatened destruction, modification, or curtailment of its habitat or range and how these threats will be removed	The inadequacy of existing regulatory mechanisms	Other natural or manmade factors (with authorities under local government jurisdiction, such as grading permits, variance policy etc.) affecting its continued existence” and how these threats will be removed.
Land Use Comprehensive Plans (Elements):		Y - direct X - indirect		Y - direct X - indirect	1 - Little or no regulatory mechanism 2 - basic mechanism in place, needs revision/ update 3 - existing mechanism adequate	Y - direct X - indirect
Septic	Septic permits are review and issues by local Health Districts under statutory authority of state and federal Clean Water Act and related laws. Septic approvals are generally exempted from local SEPA review. The authority to deny or approve septic permits provides opportunities to place conditions on the approval that address the direct impacts of the project. Since septic permits may be requested where development could potentially impact listed species, it is important that the approval process acknowledge existing and desired future conditions for a wide range of issues that affect listed species.	X	X	X	2	Y
Subdivision/Platting/Planned Development/ Binding Site Plans	Approval of long and short plats, planned developments and binding site plans are local decisions. Subdivisions and plats entail the division of property into 2 or more parcels while planned developments and binding site plans offer alternative to traditional platting. Generally short plats, which are administratively approved and exempt from SEPA, contain 9 or fewer lots, while long plats, planned developments and binding site plans are subject public hearing and SEPA review. The authority to deny or approve subdivisions is fairly broad and provides opportunities to place conditions on the approval that address the direct impacts of the project. Since such developments may be requested where construction could potentially impact listed species, it is important that the approval process acknowledge existing and desired future conditions for a wide range of issues that affect listed species.	X	X	X	2	Y

Appendix D: Local Government Policy and Program Threat Criteria

Policy/ Program/ Regulation	Relationship to Recovery of Listed Species	Relationship to VSP Parameters		ESA Threat Criteria		
		Abundance/ Productivity	Spatial Structure/ Diversity	The present or threatened destruction, modification, or curtailment of its habitat or range and how these threats will be removed	The inadequacy of existing regulatory mechanisms	Other natural or manmade factors (with authorities under local government jurisdiction, such as grading permits, variance policy etc.) affecting its continued existence” and how these threats will be removed.
Land Use Comprehensive Plans (Elements):		Y - direct X - indirect		Y - direct X - indirect	1 - Little or no regulatory mechanism 2 - basic mechanism in place, needs revision/ update 3 - existing mechanism adequate	Y - direct X - indirect
Utility Connections	Utility connections are approved by utility providers for water, wastewater and stormwater utilities. Such connections are typically exempt from SEPA. The authority to deny or approve connections provides opportunities to place conditions on the approval that address the direct impacts of the project. Since connections may be requested where development could potentially impact listed species, it is important that the approval process acknowledge existing and desired future conditions for a wide range of issues that affect listed species.	X	X	X	2	Y
R-O-W permits	Local and state governments may authorize a variety of uses within the public right-of-way. Such uses may have the potential to negatively affect listed species.	X	X	X	2	X
Hydraulics Permits*	Hydraulic permits, required by the State Hydraulics Code for all development below the ordinary-high-water-mark, are administered by the State Department of Fish and Wildlife. Local governments are usually involved as the first contact for a land owner inquiring about or making application for a local land use (variance, building, shoreline, floodplain development, conditional use, exemption, etc...) permit. The partnership between WDFW and local government has resulted in the Joint Aquatic Review Permit Application (JARPA), in common use by local governments for shoreline and floodplain development processes.	Y	Y	Y	2	Y
Water Quality Modification*	Water Quality Modification permits, required state and federal clean water laws, are administered by the State Department of Ecology. Local governments are usually involved as the first contact for a land owner inquiring about or making application for a local land use (variance, building, shoreline, floodplain development, conditional use, exemption, etc...) permit. Ecology is usually notified by the local government as a commenting agency.	Y	Y	Y	2	Y

Appendix D: Local Government Policy and Program Threat Criteria

Policy/ Program/ Regulation	Relationship to Recovery of Listed Species	Relationship to VSP Parameters		ESA Threat Criteria		
		Abundance/ Productivity	Spatial Structure/ Diversity	The present or threatened destruction, modification, or curtailment of its habitat or range and how these threats will be removed	The inadequacy of existing regulatory mechanisms	Other natural or manmade factors (with authorities under local government jurisdiction, such as grading permits, variance policy etc.) affecting its continued existence” and how these threats will be removed.
Land Use Comprehensive Plans (Elements):		Y - direct X - indirect		Y - direct X - indirect	1 - Little or no regulatory mechanism 2 - basic mechanism in place, needs revision/ update 3 - existing mechanism adequate	Y - direct X - indirect
Corps Permits*	Corps permits (Sections 10 and 404) required by the federal Clean Water Act when development takes place below the ordinary-high-water-mark and in wetlands, are administered by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Local governments are usually involved as the first contact for a land owner inquiring about or making application for a local land use (variance, building, shoreline, floodplain development, conditional use, exemption, etc...) permit. The JARPA, in common use by local governments for shoreline and floodplain development processes is the usual trigger for Corps Permits. Corps permits usually require a Biological Assessment and other stringent environmental review.	Y	Y	Y	2	Y
Water Rights*	The Department of Ecology is responsible for administration of state water law. Washington State law requires certain users of public waters to receive approval from the state prior to use of the water - in the form of a water right permit or certificate. Any use of surface of water (lakes, ponds, rivers, streams, or springs) which began after the state water code was enacted in 1917 requires a water-right permit or certificate. This rule establishes the framework under which the department can provide for the organization of its work, prioritize basins to be assessed, conduct basin assessments, prioritize investigations of water right applications by geographic areas, and establish criteria for priority processing of applications for new water rights and applications for change or transfer of existing water rights.	X	X	X	2	X
* - state or federal permit, local government may be initial point of contact or need review/action by state or federal agency prior to issuance of local government approvals.						
<b>Compliance Program</b>						

Appendix D: Local Government Policy and Program Threat Criteria

Policy/ Program/ Regulation	Relationship to Recovery of Listed Species	Relationship to VSP Parameters		ESA Threat Criteria		
		Abundance/ Productivity	Spatial Structure/ Diversity	The present or threatened destruction, modification, or curtailment of its habitat or range and how these threats will be removed	The inadequacy of existing regulatory mechanisms	Other natural or manmade factors (with authorities under local government jurisdiction, such as grading permits, variance policy etc.) affecting its continued existence” and how these threats will be removed.
Land Use Comprehensive Plans (Elements):		Y - direct X - indirect		Y - direct X - indirect	1 - Little or no regulatory mechanism 2 - basic mechanism in place, needs revision/ update 3 - existing mechanism adequate	Y - direct X - indirect
Code Enforcement/Compliance Position	Fair and equitable code enforcement and inspection/monitoring of projects to ensure completion of required mitigation, conditions, etc.... is critical to enforcement of existing plans, regulations and codes that require protection, restoration or enhancement of critical and shoreline areas.	X	X	X	2	X
<b>Environmental Review</b>						
SEPA	SEPA regulations are required under the State Environmental Policy Act (as amended) and are the primary tool for identification and mitigation of negative environmental impacts. The types and level of development that require SEPA review are established in state statute and adopted and administered by local governments.	Y	Y	Y	2	Y
NEPA	While not a local government requirement, NEPA is required when federal funding is used in most projects (e.g. sewer treatment upgrades, road reconstruction, replacement bridges, food banks, etc...) and often times local government is the applicant.	Y	Y	Y	2	Y

## Appendix D: Local Government Policy and Program Threat Criteria

The next step in the review process was to determine the relative status of local government efforts to comply with state and federal requirements related to land use planning, regulation, management, compliance and environmental review. Tables 2, 3, 4 and 5 provide a summary of this exercise for the three counties, tribes and PUDs.

The first part of the review and analysis was to determine the status of comprehensive planning and implementation tools. Each jurisdiction was contacted and a determination made whether the various comprehensive planning and implementing documents were: adopted and compliant with current/pending requirements (e.g. comprehensive plan and critical areas regulations amended to include best available science, utility plans adopted within 6 year window); adopted but not in compliance with current/pending requirements (e.g. comprehensive plan and critical areas regulations have not been reviewed and revised based on best available science, utility plans adoption date outside of 6 year window); does not exist (e.g. no adopted plan or regulation exists); or the particular plan is not applicable (e.g. incorporated communities do not normally include a rural areas element). The date of the most recent amendments to the Comprehensive Plan was also determined and is included in the following tables.

It is important to note that Chelan and Douglas Counties and the incorporated municipalities within them are subject to Growth Management Act (GMA), which provides greater state oversight of planning activities within these counties. In general, nearly all of the local governments in the region are either in compliance with the requirements of the Growth Management Act or are presently working in that direction. The State has established a 2007 deadline for all local governments (including those in Okanogan County) to review and revise their Comprehensive Plans and Critical Areas regulations to ensure that the best available science is used to establish the goals, policies and regulations for protection of critical areas (fish and wildlife habitat, aquifer recharge areas, frequently flooded areas, geologically hazardous areas and wetlands).

The review and analysis found that none of the local governments in the region has a shoreline master program that complies with new State Shoreline Management Act (SMA) requirements. However, adoption of the new Shoreline Master Programs at the local level is not required until 2014. Okanogan and Douglas Counties have been awarded grant funds for the preparation of new compliant Shoreline Master Programs to be adopted in 2007. These new programs will be regional in scope and are intended to address shoreline protection, restoration and enhancement issues for each county and the municipalities within the counties.

In addition to GMA and SMA plans, programs and regulations, local governments also operate utilities (water, sewer and stormwater) and transportation and recreation systems (roads, parks, trails) that may affect listed species. The review and analysis found that with few exceptions, local governments in the region are compliant with Federal and State water and sewer planning and permitting. However, storm drainage has only recently become an important issue and therefore few local governments have adopted stormwater management plans. This is in large measure due to the lack, until recently, of adopted Eastern Washington Stormwater Management guidelines, which are considered inadequate.

## Appendix D: Local Government Policy and Program Threat Criteria

Management of transportation systems is another area where local governments are just beginning to develop and adopt best management practices and road abandonment plans. As a result only a few of the local governments in the region have adopted plans or programs recommended by the County Arterial Road Board (CRAB).

The review and analysis found that in general, most local governments (the exception being the vary small communities in Okanogan County) have a wide range of ordinances and regulations that require review and permitting of developments that may potentially impact listed species. The most significant omission in regards to VSP parameters and ESA Threat Criteria is the lack of specific clearing and grading regulations. While most jurisdictions have adopted the International Building Code, very few have adopted the appendices related to clearing and grading.

Another aspect of local government plans, programs and regulations included in the analysis was a review of permitting processes. The review was very simple in that it identified whether a process existed or not and did not include a qualitative analysis of the adequacy of the existing program. In general nearly all local governments in the region have a wide array of processes that most development must go through prior to construction.

A fourth area included in the review was a determination of whether jurisdictions have a mechanism in place for code compliance and enforcement. The review found that very few local governments have a specific land use code compliance/enforcement position. Most jurisdictions either have the duties and responsibilities spread among planners and building officials or do not have such a position clearly delineated.

The final piece of the local government review was a determination of local environmental review processes. All local governments have some lead agency responsibilities under SEPA and use NEPA as required for specific projects. In general most jurisdictions have SEPA rules that are in need of updating.

Another aspect of local government plans, programs and regulations not included in the review was budget, personnel and expertise. The struggling economy in the region and general lack of public support for such programs means that funding for many planning and regulatory functions is driven by the availability of state and/or federal grant funding. The enforcement, compliance and monitoring of development related permits requires not only personnel, but a budget for legal action, scientific review, and the political will to implement the wide range of plans, programs and regulations under the jurisdiction of local governments.

A related issue is the availability of technical assistance, project review and comments and enforcement support from state and federal agencies resource agencies. Since most local governments in the region do not have the budget to support a science staff, there is a significant reliance on state and federal resource agencies to review and provide comments on plans, programs and regulations as there are developed, implemented and enforced. Unfortunately, the focus of many of the agencies is on planning rather than working closely with local government's on implementation and enforcement.

Appendix D: Local Government Policy and Program Threat Criteria

**Table 2 needs to be printed on 11" X 17" paper**

**Table 2** Status of Chelan County efforts to comply with state and federal requirements related to land use planning, regulation, management, compliance and environmental review

Policy/Program/Regulation	CURRENT STATUS					
	Y - adopted and compliant with current/pending requirements		X - adopted but not compliant with current/pending requirements			blank - does not exist
	Chelan County (municipalities on waters with listed species are in italics)					
		<i>Chelan</i>	<i>Entiat</i>	<i>Wenatchee</i>	<i>Cashmere</i>	<i>Leavenworth</i>
Land Use Comprehensive Plans (Elements):	2004	1998	2004	2004	2004	1997
Land Use Element	Y, subject to annual update	X, 1998, amended 2000, update required for Critical Areas in 2006		X, subject to annual update and critical areas update 2007	Y	X, critical areas/ BAS adopted 2003
Capital Facilities Element	Y, subject to annual update	"		Y, subject to annual update	Y	X
Utilities Element	n/a, does not have traditional utilities	"		Y, subject to annual update	Y	X
Rural Areas Element	Y, subject to annual update	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Transportation Element	Y, subject to annual update	"		Y, subject to annual update	Y	X
Urban Growth Area Element	Y, subject to annual update			Y, subject to annual update		X
Lands for Public Purpose and Open Space Corridors Element	Y, subject to annual update	n/a		Y, subject to annual update	Part of zoning code related to some residential developments 2004	n/a
Economic Development Element	Y, subject to annual update	2003		Y, subject to annual update	Y	draft element
Parks and Recreation Element	Y, subject to annual update	2003		Y, subject to annual update	Y	Y, separate plan
<b>Water Comp Plan</b>	n/a, does not have traditional utilities	1999 presently being updated	2003	Y, 2004	Y May 2003	Y 2001
<b>Wastewater Comp Plan</b>	n/a, does not have traditional utilities	Permit 2004	2004	No current plan, under order to have plan by 2007	Y 2005	Y
<b>Stormwater Management Plan</b>	planned adoption 2005	none, within development standards	none, within development standards	have unadopted plan that is being implemented, need to update and adopt		Y, Adopted EW Stormwater manual 2005

Appendix D: Local Government Policy and Program Threat Criteria

Policy/Program/Regulation	CURRENT STATUS					
	Y - adopted and compliant with current/pending requirements	X - adopted but not compliant with current/pending requirements			blank - does not exist	
	Chelan County (municipalities on waters with listed species are in italics)					
		<i>Chelan</i>	<i>Entiat</i>	<i>Wenatchee</i>	<i>Cashmere</i>	<i>Leavenworth</i>
Land Use Comprehensive Plans (Elements):	2004	1998	2004	2004	2004	1997
Solid Waste Management Plan	DATE?	County Plan	County Plan	County Plan	County Plan	County Plan
Road Management and Abandonment Plan RCW 76.09.410 and 76.09.420	procedures	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Watershed Plans	Chelan County has three WRIA's (40A, 45 and 46) involved in Watershed Planning.	Lake Chelan Water Quality Committee	2005, part of Entiat River Planning Unit	Part of Wenatchee Watershed effort	Part of Wenatchee Watershed effort	Part of Wenatchee Watershed effort
<b>Implementing Regulations</b>						
Zoning	Y, annual review	Y, 1962 with periodic amendments	Y, 2004	Y, updated consistent with comp plan amendments, other amendments as needed	2004	Y
Subdivision/Platting	Y, annual review	X mid 70's		Y, updated as needed	2002	Y
Development Standards	for roads only, rest in individual codes	X 1998	part of subdivision and zoning	integrated into zoning, subdivision and utilities plans	Part of the zoning code adopted 2004	Y
Planned Development	Y, annual review	part of zoning	part of zoning	Y, part of zoning regulation	Part of the zoning code adopted 2004	Y
Critical Areas	X, 2000, reviewing geohazards 2005, ca in 2006	1998, update by 2006	Y, 2004	X, update by 2007	Y 2002	Y
Flood Damage	Y, 2004	N FEMA model 1980's?	n/a	Y, 2004	Y, 2004	Y, 2003 Updated
Clearing and Grading	UBC only	Use standards in International Building Code	Use standards in International Building Code	Use standards in International Building Code	UBC, 1996	2004
International Building Code	IBC	adopted International Building Code 7/04	adopted International Building Code 7/04	adopted International Building Code 7/04	adopted International Building Code 2005	International Building Code 2004

Appendix D: Local Government Policy and Program Threat Criteria

Policy/Program/Regulation	CURRENT STATUS					
	Y - adopted and compliant with current/pending requirements		X - adopted but not compliant with current/pending requirements			blank - does not exist
	Chelan County (municipalities on waters with listed species are in italics)					
		<i>Chelan</i>	<i>Entiat</i>	<i>Wenatchee</i>	<i>Cashmere</i>	<i>Leavenworth</i>
<b>Land Use Comprehensive Plans (Elements):</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>1997</b>
Shoreline Master Program	X, late 70's	X, mid 70's, no updates, update required by 2014	X, mid 90's, update required by 2014	X, early 70's update required by 2014	X, 1975	X, 1975, update required by 2014
Administrative Procedures	Y, 2000	1998		Y, integrated into zoning, subdivision	2000	Y
Resource/Rural Lands	Y, 2000 annual; review	n/a	N/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>Permit Processes</b>	<b>X - denotes that permit process exists, no assumption made on compliance</b>					
Conditional Uses	X	X	X	X	X	X
Variances	X	X	X	X	X	X
Exemptions	X	X	X	X	X	X
Substantial Development	X	X	X	X	X	X
Approach/Access	X	X	X	X	X	X
Septic	X	X	X	X	X	X
Subdivision/Platting/Planned Development/Binding Site Plans	X	X	X	X	X	X
Utility Connections	X	X	X	X	X	X
R-O-W permits	X	X	X	X	X	X
Hydraulics Permits*	JARPA	JARPA	JARPA	JARPA	JARPA	JARPA
Water Quality Modification*	As per comments on permits	As per comments on permits	As per comments on permits	As per comments on permits	As per comments on permits	As per comments on permits
Corps Permits*	As per comments on permits	As per comments on permits	As per comments on permits	As per comments on permits	As per comments on permits	As per comments on permits
Water Rights*	As per comments on permits	As per comments on permits	As per comments on permits	As per comments on permits	As per comments on permits	As per comments on permits

Appendix D: Local Government Policy and Program Threat Criteria

Policy/Program/Regulation	CURRENT STATUS					
	Y - adopted and compliant with current/pending requirements	X - adopted but not compliant with current/pending requirements			blank - does not exist	
	Chelan County (municipalities on waters with listed species are in italics)					
		<i>Chelan</i>	<i>Entiat</i>	<i>Wenatchee</i>	<i>Cashmere</i>	<i>Leavenworth</i>
Land Use Comprehensive Plans (Elements):	2004	1998	2004	2004	2004	1997
* - state or federal permit, local government may be initial point of contact or need review/action by state or federal agency prior to issuance of local government approvals.						
Compliance Program	Y - position with clear land use authority exists, X - position exists, no clear land use authority, blank - no position					
Code Enforcement/Compliance Position		Y	X Building Inspector/Planner	Y	Y public works coordinator	Y Code Administrator
<b>Environmental Review</b>						
SEPA	X, mid 80's	X - mid 70's	Y, 2003	Y, 2002	1999	as required SEPA ORD DATE
NEPA	as required	as required	as required	as required	as required	as required

Appendix D: Local Government Policy and Program Threat Criteria

**Table 3 needs to be printed on 11" X 17" paper**

**Table 3** Status of Douglas County efforts to comply with state and federal requirements related to land use planning, regulation, management, compliance and environmental review

Policy/Program/Regulation	CURRENT STATUS					
	Y - adopted and compliant with current/pending requirements		X - adopted but not compliant with current/pending requirements		blank - does not exist	
	Douglas County (municipalities on waters with listed species are in italics)					
		<i>E. Wenatchee</i>	Waterville	Mansfield	<i>Rock Island</i>	<i>Bridgeport</i>
	1995	1998	2003	2003	2004	2004
<b>Land Use Comprehensive Plans (Elements):</b>						
Land Use Element	Y, subject to annual update	Y, subject to annual update	Y, subject to annual update	Y, subject to annual update	Y, subject to annual update	Y, subject to annual update
Capital Facilities Element	Y, subject to annual update	Y, subject to annual update	Y, subject to annual update	Y, subject to annual update	Y, subject to annual update	Y, subject to annual update
Utilities Element	Y, subject to annual update	Y, subject to annual update	Y, subject to annual update	Y, subject to annual update	Y, subject to annual update	Y, subject to annual update
Rural Areas Element	Y, subject to annual update	n/a	n/a	n/a	Y	n/a
Transportation Element	Y, subject to annual update	Y, subject to annual update	Y, subject to annual update	Y, subject to annual update	Y, subject to annual update	Y, subject to annual update
Urban Growth Area Element (gma?)	Y, subject to annual update	Y, subject to annual update		Y, subject to annual update	Y, subject to annual update	Y, subject to annual update
Lands for Public Purpose and Open Space Corridors Element	n/a	Y, subject to annual update				
Economic Development Element	Y, subject to annual update	Y, subject to annual update	Y, subject to annual update	Y, subject to annual update		Y, subject to annual update
Parks and Recreation Element	Y, subject to annual update. Also Park and Rec District with separate plans	Open space and Recreation Element, also Park and Rec District with separate plans	Y	Y		Y
<b>Water Comp Plan</b>	East Wenatchee Water District	East Wenatchee Water District			X, most recent plan circa 1997	2000
<b>Wastewater Comp Plan</b>	Douglas Co. Sewer Dist.	Douglas Co. Sewer Dist.	Permit 2004			2001
<b>Stormwater Management Plan</b>	Y, Adopted EW Stormwater manual 2005	Y, Adopted Do. Co Flood Hazard Mgmt Plan, currently under way to include stormwater				1991
<b>Solid Waste Management Plan</b>	Y, 2002	Do Co Solid Waste Plan	Do Co Solid Waste Plan	Do Co Solid Waste Plan	Do Co Solid Waste Plan	Do Co Solid Waste Plan
<b>Road Management and Abandonment Plan</b>	X, one page	n/a				

Appendix D: Local Government Policy and Program Threat Criteria

Policy/Program/Regulation	CURRENT STATUS					
	Y - adopted and compliant with current/pending requirements		X - adopted but not compliant with current/pending requirements		blank - does not exist	
	Douglas County (municipalities on waters with listed species are in italics)					
		<i>E. Wenatchee</i>	<i>Waterville</i>	<i>Mansfield</i>	<i>Rock Island</i>	<i>Bridgeport</i>
<b>Watershed Plans</b>	Y, WRIA 44 and 50 plans adopted in 2004	n/a	Y	n/a	n/a	2004
<b>Implementing Regulations</b>						
Zoning	Y	Y	Y, 2003	Y, 2003	Y, 2004	Y, 2001
Subdivision/Platting	Y	Y	Y, 2001	Y, 2001	Y, 2001	Y, 2005
Development Standards	integrated into zoning, subdivision and utilities plans	in process of adopting a revised set of street standards; also developing stormwater standards	Y, 2001	Y, 2001	Y, 2001	
Planned Development	Y, part of zoning regulation	Y, currently revising	part of the zoning code adopted 2003			
Critical Areas	X, 2002, update required by 2007	Y, needs work	Y, 2003			Y, 2002
Flood Damage Prevention	Have a Hazard Mitigation Plan that includes flood measures	Y, DATE				X, 1987
International Building Code	International Building Code 2004	International Building Code 2004	International Building Code 2005			1997
Shoreline Master Program	X, 1973 update required by 2014, has applied for funding to adopt 2007	Do Co Shoreline Master Program				X, 1991
Administrative Procedures	Y, some stand alone, others integrated into zoning, subdivision	Y	1998	2000	1999	1996
Resource/Rural Lands	Y	n/a				
<b>Permit Processes</b>						
<b>X - denotes that permit process exists, no assumption made on compliance</b>						
Conditional Uses	X	X	X	X	X	X
Variances	X	X	X	X	X	X
Exemptions	X	X	X	X	X	X
Substantial Development	X	X	n/a	n/a	X	X

Appendix D: Local Government Policy and Program Threat Criteria

Policy/Program/Regulation	CURRENT STATUS					
	Y - adopted and compliant with current/pending requirements		X - adopted but not compliant with current/pending requirements			blank - does not exist
	<b>Douglas County (municipalities on waters with listed species are in italics)</b>					
		<i>E. Wenatchee</i>	<i>Waterville</i>	<i>Mansfield</i>	<i>Rock Island</i>	<i>Bridgeport</i>
Approach/Access	X	X	X	X	X	X
Septic	Chelan/Douglas Health District	X	X	X	X	X
Subdivision/Platting/Planned Development/Binding Site Plans	X	X	X	X	X	X
Utility Connections	n/a	n/a	X	X	X	X
R-O-W permits	X	X	X	X	X	X
Hydraulics Permits*	JARPA	JARPA	JARPA	JARPA	JARPA	JARPA
Water Quality Modification*	As per comments on permits	As per comments on permits	As per comments on permits	As per comments on permits	As per comments on permits	As per comments on permits
Corps Permits*	As per comments on permits	As per comments on permits	As per comments on permits	As per comments on permits	As per comments on permits	As per comments on permits
Water Rights*	As per comments on permits	As per comments on permits	As per comments on permits	As per comments on permits	As per comments on permits	As per comments on permits
* - state or federal permit, local government may be initial point of contact or need review/action by state or federal agency prior to issuance of local government approvals.						
<b>Compliance Program</b>	<b>Y - position with clear land use authority exists, X - position exists, no clear land use authority, blank - no position</b>					
Code Enforcement/Compliance Position	Y, code compliance officer	Y, code compliance officer	Y	?	X, Clerk/Treasurer along with Alliance Consulting	Y, zoning administrator
<b>Environmental Review</b>						
SEPA	Y, DATE	Y, DATE	2001		1999	1999
NEPA	as required	as required	as required	as required	as required	as required

Appendix D: Local Government Policy and Program Threat Criteria

**Table 4 needs to be printed on 11" X 17" paper**

**Table 4 Status of Okanogan County efforts to comply with state and federal requirements related to land use planning, regulation, management, compliance and environmental review**

Policy/Program/Regulation	CURRENT STATUS													
	Y - adopted and compliant with current/pending requirements				X - adopted but not compliant with current requirements				blank - does not exist					
	Okanogan County (municipalities on waters with listed species are in italics)													
		<i>Oroville</i>	<i>Tonasket</i>	<i>Riverside</i>	<i>Conconully</i>	<i>Omak</i>	<i>Okanogan</i>	<i>Brewster</i>	<i>Pateros</i>	<i>Twisp</i>	<i>Winthrop</i>	<i>Nespelem</i>	<i>Elmer City</i>	<i>Coulee Dam</i>
1964	1995	1995	None	2000	2004	1995	1995	1992	1991	1996	1994		2000	
<b>Land Use Comprehensive Plan (Elements):</b>														
Land Use Element	X, Okanogan County is currently updating the Comp Plan and various elements on a sub area basis. Plans in the Methow Valley have been updated in 1979, the mid 1980's and the Mazama Area in 2000	X, adopted 1995, in need of review and revision	X, adopted 1995, in need of review and revision	Riverside does not have a comp plan	X, The Town has adopted a "Community" Plan	Y, updated 2004 including critical areas	X, adopted in 1995 currently being reviewed for update	X, presently being updated	Y 2003 update	X, adopted 1991	X, adopted in 1996	X		X, needs to be updated
Capital Facilities Element	Y 2004 interim	Y, 2004	X, adopted 1995, in need of review and revision		X, original early 1990's plan needs to be updated	Y, Under review, updated CFP adopted in 2004	X, adopted in 1995 currently being reviewed for update	Y, Under review, updated CFP adopted in 2005	X, Under review, CFP presently being updated	CFP year?	X, adopted in 1996			X, needs to be updated
Utilities Element	X, 1964 Comp Plan	X, adopted 1995, in need of review and revision	X, adopted 1995, in need of review and revision		X, needs to be updated	Under review	X, adopted in 1995 currently being reviewed for update	X, presently being updated	Y	X, adopted 1991	X, adopted in 1996	x		X, needs to be updated
Rural Areas Element	X, no rural element in existing plans	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Appendix D: Local Government Policy and Program Threat Criteria

Policy/Program/Regulation	CURRENT STATUS													
	Y - adopted and compliant with current/pending requirements				X - adopted but not compliant with current requirements				blank - does not exist					
	Okanogan County (municipalities on waters with listed species are in italics)													
		<i>Oroville</i>	<i>Tonasket</i>	<i>Riverside</i>	<i>Conconully</i>	<i>Omak</i>	<i>Okanogan</i>	<i>Brewster</i>	<i>Pateros</i>	<i>Twisp</i>	<i>Winthrop</i>	<i>Nespelem</i>	<i>Elmer City</i>	<i>Coulee Dam</i>
1964	1995	1995	None	2000	2004	1995	1995	1992	1991	1996	1994		2000	
Transportation Element	X, 1995, Central Okanogan Valley being updated, Corridor Management Plan being prepared for SR 97 Scenic Byway		X, adopted 1995, in need of review and revision		X, needs to be updated	X, Updated 2004	X, adopted in 1995 currently being reviewed for update	X, presently being updated	Y	X, adopted 1991	X, adopted in 1996	x		X, needs to be updated
Urban Growth Area Element (gma?)	Current plans do not address UGAs	X, adopted 1995, in need of review and revision	X, adopted 1995, in need of review and revision		n/a	Updated 2004	X, adopted in 1995 currently being reviewed for update	X, presently being updated	Y		X, adopted in 1996			X, needs to be updated
Lands for Public Purpose and Open Space Corridors Element	X, current plans do not specifically address	n/a	n/a		X, Community Plan does address to a small extent			X, presently being updated	Y		n/a			X, needs to be updated
Economic Development Element	Y, County adopts Economic Alliance Strategy Plan as economic development element	X, adopted 1995, in need of review and revision	X, adopted 1995, in need of review and revision		X, needs to be updated	Under review	X, adopted in 1995 currently being reviewed for update	X, presently being updated	Y, presently being updated		X, adopted in 1996	X		X, needs to be updated
Parks and Recreation Element	Y, Outdoor Rec Plan adopted in 2004	2004, current plan	2004, current plan		X, needs to be updated	Under review	X, adopted in 1995 currently being reviewed for update	X, presently being updated	Y	X, adopted 1991	X, adopted in 1996			X, needs to be updated

Appendix D: Local Government Policy and Program Threat Criteria

Policy/Program/Regulation	CURRENT STATUS													
	Y - adopted and compliant with current/pending requirements				X - adopted but not compliant with current requirements				blank - does not exist					
	Okanogan County (municipalities on waters with listed species are in italics)													
		<i>Oroville</i>	<i>Tonasket</i>	<i>Riverside</i>	<i>Conconully</i>	<i>Omak</i>	<i>Okanogan</i>	<i>Brewster</i>	<i>Pateros</i>	<i>Twisp</i>	<i>Winthrop</i>	Nespelem	Elmer City	Coulee Dam
1964	1995	1995	None	2000	2004	1995	1995	1992	1991	1996	1994		2000	
<b>Water Comp Plan</b>	N/a	Y, 2001	Y, 2003	N, 2000-01?, needs updated	n/a - no public water system, it is being developed	X, updated 2004	Y, updated 2004	Y		X, needs updated	X, adopted in 1996	N	N	N
<b>Wastewater Comp Plan</b>	N/a	X, 1978 wastewater plan with update under way, NPDES Permit 2003	Y, 1998, needs update, NPDES permit to be renewed	n/a	Permit 2004	Permit 2003, plant upgraded in 2000	Permit 2003, plant upgraded in 2001	Permit 2004, plant upgrade to be completed in 2005	Permit 2004, plant rebuilt in 2002	Permit 2004, plant upgraded in 1999	Y			
<b>Stormwater Management Plan</b>		comp plan policies and BMPs used to regulate, no stand alone plan	comp plan policies and BMPs used to regulate, no stand alone plan			Y, needs to be updated	Y, needs to be updated				n/a			
<b>Solid Waste Management Plan</b>	1993 currently updating	Ok. Co. Solid Waste Plan	Ok. Co. Solid Waste Plan	Ok. Co. Solid Waste Plan	Ok. Co. Solid Waste Plan	Ok. Co. Solid Waste Plan	Ok. Co. Solid Waste Plan	Ok. Co. Solid Waste Plan	Ok. Co. Solid Waste Plan	Ok. Co. Solid Waste Plan	Ok. Co. Solid Waste Plan	X, Tribe 1997	X, Tribe 1997	X, Tribe 1997
<b>Road Management and Abandonment Plan</b>		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a			n/a		n/a	n/a
<b>Watershed Plans</b>	Planning Unit formed for Okanogan Basin in 2004, work will focus on quantity, then habitat. Water quality plan prepared for Okanogan in 2003, completed but not approved by Ecology. Methow Basin Planning Unit has prepared plan approved by the Okanogan County Commissioners on _____.										Not part of any active watershed planning effort			
<b>Implementing Regulations</b>														
Zoning	Y, 1994 most recent update	Y, 1995 most recent update	X, 1994 working on full update		X	X	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Land use regulations implemented by CCT		Y

Appendix D: Local Government Policy and Program Threat Criteria

Policy/Program/Regulation	CURRENT STATUS													
	Y - adopted and compliant with current/pending requirements				X - adopted but not compliant with current requirements				blank - does not exist					
	Okanogan County (municipalities on waters with listed species are in italics)													
		<i>Oroville</i>	<i>Tonasket</i>	<i>Riverside</i>	<i>Conconully</i>	<i>Omak</i>	<i>Okanogan</i>	<i>Brewster</i>	<i>Pateros</i>	<i>Twisp</i>	<i>Winthrop</i>	Nespelem	Elmer City	Coulee Dam
1964	1995	1995	None	2000	2004	1995	1995	1992	1991	1996	1994		2000	
Subdivision/Platting	Y, adopted early 1970;s minor revisions in 1980's	Y, 1996	X, 1987		X	X	Y			Y	Y			Y
Development Standards	integrated into other ordinances, state statute	integrated into other ordinances, state statute	integrated into other ordinances, state statute			no stand alone development standards	no stand alone development standards, currently under review			to some degree part of zoning and subdiv PD	to some degree, part of zoning and subdiv PD			Y
Planned Development	Y, adopted in 1980's	Within zoning code				X	Y		Y	to some degree part of zoning and subdiv PD	Y			Y
Critical Areas	X, 1994, update required by 2007	X, update required by 2007	X, update required by 2007			Y, adopted 2005	X, adopted as element of 1995 comp plan, update required by 2007	Y, 2004	Y, 2004	In Comp Plan, currently to DOE for update	Y			Y
Flood Damage Prevention <i>RCW 86.12.200 Comprehensive flood control management plan -- Elements. The county legislative authority of any county may adopt a comprehensive flood control management plan for any drainage basin that is located wholly or partially within the county.</i>	X, 1987 update needed to reflect recent statutory changes	X, 1991	X, 1996	use FEMA 100 yr.	X, needs to be updated	Y	Y			Y, updated 2004	Y			

Appendix D: Local Government Policy and Program Threat Criteria

Policy/Program/Regulation	CURRENT STATUS													
	Y - adopted and compliant with current/pending requirements				X - adopted but not compliant with current requirements				blank - does not exist					
	Okanogan County (municipalities on waters with listed species are in italics)													
		<i>Oroville</i>	<i>Tonasket</i>	<i>Riverside</i>	<i>Conconully</i>	<i>Omak</i>	<i>Okanogan</i>	<i>Brewster</i>	<i>Pateros</i>	<i>Twisp</i>	<i>Winthrop</i>	Nespelem	Elmer City	Coulee Dam
1964	1995	1995	None	2000	2004	1995	1995	1992	1991	1996	1994		2000	
Clearing and Grading			Has adopted section of IBC				U				N, but need it			
International Building Code	International Building Code 2004	Uniform Building Code, expect to adopt IBC 2005	International Building Code 2004	City of Omak code	?	International Building Code 2004	International Building Code 2004	International Building Code 2004	Building Code enforced by CCT		Y			
Shoreline Master Program	X, needs to be updated by 2014, County has applied for funding to update program by 2007	X, needs to be updated by 2014	X, needs to be updated by 2014		Okanogan County	X, needs to be updated by 2014, City has applied for funding to update program by 2007	X, needs to be updated by 2014, City has applied for funding to update program by 2007	X, needs to be updated by 2014, City has applied for funding to update program by 2007	X, needs to be updated by 2014, City has applied for funding to update program by 2007	X, 1991 needs to be updated	Y 1991			N
Administrative Procedures	Y,integrated into zoning, subdivision	Y, 1999 integrated into zoning, subdivision	Y,integrated into zoning, subdivision			Y,integrated into zoning, subdivision	Y,integrated into zoning, subdivision	Y, stand alone ordinance	Y, stand alone ordinance	Y, stand alone ordinance	Y, stand alone ordinance			
Resource/Rural Lands		n/a	n/a		n/a	n/a	n/a				N, but need it			n/a
<b>Permit Processes</b>	<b>X - denotes that permit process exists, no assumption made on compliance</b>													
Conditional Uses	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Variances	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Exemptions	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Substantial Development	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	n/a	n/a	n/a
Approach/Access	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Appendix D: Local Government Policy and Program Threat Criteria

Policy/Program/Regulation	CURRENT STATUS													
	Y - adopted and compliant with current/pending requirements				X - adopted but not compliant with current requirements				blank - does not exist					
	Okanogan County (municipalities on waters with listed species are in italics)													
		<i>Oroville</i>	<i>Tonasket</i>	<i>Riverside</i>	<i>Conconully</i>	<i>Omak</i>	<i>Okanogan</i>	<i>Brewster</i>	<i>Pateros</i>	<i>Twisp</i>	<i>Winthrop</i>	Nespelem	Elmer City	Coulee Dam
1964	1995	1995	None	2000	2004	1995	1995	1992	1991	1996	1994		2000	
Septic	Okanogan County Health District	If permitted - approval by Okanogan County Health District	X	If permitted - approval by Okanogan County Health District	If permitted - approval by Okanogan County Health District	If permitted - approval by Okanogan County Health District	If permitted - approval by Okanogan County Health District	If permitted - approval by Okanogan County Health District	If permitted - approval by Okanogan County Health District	If permitted - approval by Okanogan County Health District	If permitted - approval by Okanogan County Health District	X	X	X
Subdivision/Platting/Planned Development/Binding Site Plans	X	X	If permitted - approval by Okanogan County Health District	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X
Utility Connections		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
R-O-W permits	X	X	X											
Hydraulics Permits*	JARPA	JARPA	JARPA		?	JARPA	JARPA	JARPA	JARPA	JARPA	JARPA			
Water Quality Modification*	As per comments on permits	As per comments on permits	As per comments on permits		?	As per comments on permits								
Corps Permits*	As per comments on permits	As per comments on permits	As per comments on permits		?	As per comments on permits								
Water Rights*	As per comments on permits	As per comments on permits	As per comments on permits		?	As per comments on permits								
* - state or federal permit, local government may be initial point of contact or need review/action by state or federal agency prior to issuance of local government approvals.														
Compliance Program	Y - position with clear land use authority exists, X - position exists, no clear land use authority, blank - no position													

Appendix D: Local Government Policy and Program Threat Criteria

Policy/Program/Regulation	CURRENT STATUS													
	Y - adopted and compliant with current/pending requirements				X - adopted but not compliant with current requirements				blank - does not exist					
	Okanogan County (municipalities on waters with listed species are in italics)													
		<i>Oroville</i>	<i>Tonasket</i>	<i>Riverside</i>	<i>Conconully</i>	<i>Omak</i>	<i>Okanogan</i>	<i>Brewster</i>	<i>Pateros</i>	<i>Twisp</i>	<i>Winthrop</i>	Nespelem	Elmer City	Coulee Dam
1964	1995	1995	None	2000	2004	1995	1995	1992	1991	1996	1994		2000	
Code Enforcement/Compliance Position		Y Building Official/permit admin	Y Building Official/permit admin	N	X Town Superintendent	Y Building Inspector	X Building Inspector	Y Building Inspector	Y Building Inspector	X Planning dept/Sheriff	X Planning dept/police	?	?	X Building Dept./Planner
			Y Building Official/permit admin											
<b>Environmental Review</b>														
SEPA	X, 1995	Y, 2001	X, 1985	?		?	Updated in ordinance 2001							
NEPA	as required	as required	as required	as required	as required	as required	as required	as required	as required	as required	as required	as required	as required	as required

## Appendix D: Local Government Policy and Program Threat Criteria

The review and analysis also included a limited review of the Colville Tribes and PUD's in the region. These entities also having plans, programs and regulations that closely relate to those of the other local governments in the region. Table 5 provides a summary of the review.

**Table 5** Status of the Colville Tribe's and PUD's efforts to comply with state and federal requirements related to land use planning, regulation, management, compliance and environmental review

Policy/Program/Regulation	Entity/Status			
	Colville Tribes	Douglas PUD	Chelan PUD	Okanogan PUD
	The Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation are not subject to the same planning requirements as the local governments in the Upper Columbia Region. As a sovereign nation, the CCT have developed policies, programs and regulations, based in part on federal law.	While PUDs are not required to prepare comprehensive plans in the same manner as other units of local government, all three utilities engage in forms of planning similar to those listed below. Chelan and Douglas PUDs have more developed comprehensive planning programs due to Federal Energy Regulatory Commission licenses and re-licensing processes and the Mid-Columbia Habitat Conversation Plan.		
<b>Land Use Comprehensive Plan (Elements):</b>				
Land Use Element	The Tribes are presently working on a strategy to develop comprehensive plans for each of the four Business Council Districts. The first District subject to the planning process will be the Omak District. A team of Eastern Washington University Students conducted background research several years ago.	n/a*	n/a*	n/a*
Capital Facilities Element		n/a*	n/a*	n/a*
Utilities Element		n/a*	n/a*	n/a*
Rural Areas Element		n/a	n/a	n/a
Transportation Element		n/a	n/a	n/a
Urban Growth Area Element (gma?)	n/a	n/a*	n/a*	n/a*
Lands for Public Purpose and Open Space Corridors Element	n/a	n/a*	n/a*	n/a*
Economic Development Element	The Tribes have a Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDs) document that is updated annually	n/a*	n/a*	n/a*

Appendix D: Local Government Policy and Program Threat Criteria

Policy/Program/Regulation	Entity/Status			
	Colville Tribes	Douglas PUD	Chelan PUD	Okanogon PUD
Parks and Recreation Element		n/a*	n/a*	n/a*
<b>Water Comp Plan</b>	n/a	?	?	n/a
<b>Wastewater Comp Plan</b>	n/a	?	?	n/a
<b>Stormwater Management Plan</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>Solid Waste Management Plan</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>Road Management and Abandonment Plan</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>Watershed Plans</b>	The CCT has an array of management plans for timber, wildlife, ater resources etc... which together provide policy and management strategies for lands within the reservation	n/a	n/a	n/a
Implementing Regulations				
Zoning	The CCT has a land use code adopted in 1993	n/a	n/a	n/a
Subdivision/Platting		n/a	n/a	n/a
Development Standards		n/a*	n/a*	n/a*
Planned Development		n/a	n/a	n/a
Critical Areas	The CCT is not subject to requirements of RCW 36.70A regarding classification, designation and protection of critical areas.	n/a	n/a	n/a

Appendix D: Local Government Policy and Program Threat Criteria

Policy/Program/Regulation	Entity/Status			
	Colville Tribes	Douglas PUD	Chelan PUD	Okanogon PUD
Flood Damage Prevention		n/a	n/a	n/a
Clearing and Grading		n/a	n/a	n/a
International Building Code	Y, Adopted 2004	n/a	n/a	n/a
Shoreline Master Program	The CCT adopted a Shoreline Management Plan in 199_. The Plan is modeled after the State Shoreline Management Act but includes all rivers, lakes and streams on the Reservation.	n/a	n/a	n/a
Administrative Procedures	Y	n/a*	n/a*	n/a*
Resource/Rural Lands		n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>Permit Processes</b>				
Conditional Uses	The Tribes have a provision for Special Property Uses that is similar to Conditional uses as well as a variety of other permit processes that closely mirror those found in off-reservation jurisdictions.	n/a	n/a	n/a
Variances		n/a	n/a	n/a
Exemptions		n/a	n/a	n/a
Substantial Development		n/a	n/a	n/a
Approach/Access		n/a	n/a	n/a
Septic		n/a	n/a	n/a
Subdivision/Platting/Planned Development/Binding Site Plans		n/a	n/a	n/a

Appendix D: Local Government Policy and Program Threat Criteria

Policy/Program/Regulation	Entity/Status			
	Colville Tribes	Douglas PUD	Chelan PUD	Okanogan PUD
Utility Connections	The Tribes have their own hydraulics, water quantity and water quality programs.	X	X	X
R-O-W permits				
Hydraulics Permits*		n/a	n/a	n/a
Water Quality Modification*		n/a	n/a	n/a
Corps Permits*		n/a	n/a	n/a
Water Rights*				
* - state or federal permit, local government may be initial point of contact or need review/action by state or federal agency prior to issuance of local government approvals.				
<b>Compliance Program</b>				
Code Enforcement/Compliance Position	Y	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>Environmental Review</b>				
SEPA	The Tribes have their own environmental review process modeled after NEPA	As required	As required	As required
NEPA		As required	As required	As required

## Appendix D: Local Government Policy and Program Threat Criteria

### Recommendations:

**Table 6 A summary of the recommendations resulting from this review**

Policy/Program/Regulation		
	General Actions	General Timelines
<b>Land Use Comprehensive Plans (Elements):</b>	The Growth Management Act (36.70A.130 as amended) requires Comprehensive Plans to be reviewed and revised every 10 Years. Otherwise, amendments to the Plan are limited to once each year and are subject to a proscribed process and potential appeal to the Eastern Washington Growth Management Hearings Board (except Okanogan County and communities which are not required to fully plan under GMA).	
Land Use Element	Review and revise goals, policies and planned land uses as appropriate to be compliant with applicable State and/or Federal statutes	These Elements are subject to annual review.
Capital Facilities Element	Review and revise goals and policies for construction of capital facilities as appropriate to ensure protection of identified critical areas	
Utilities Element	Review and revise goals and policies for construction of utilities as appropriate to ensure protection of identified critical areas	
Rural Areas Element	Review and revise goals, policies for rural development as appropriate to ensure protection of identified critical areas	
Transportation Element	Review and revise goals, policies and planned transportation projects as appropriate to ensure protection of identified critical areas	
Urban Growth Area Element (gma?)	Review and revise goals, policies and planned growth areas as appropriate to ensure protection of identified critical areas	
Lands for Public Purpose and Open Space Corridors Element	Review and revise goals, policies and planned public and open space lands as appropriate to ensure protection, restoration or enhancement of identified critical areas	
Economic Development Element	Review and revise goals, policies and planned economic development efforts as appropriate to ensure protection of identified critical areas	

Appendix D: Local Government Policy and Program Threat Criteria

<b>Policy/Program/Regulation</b>		
	<b>General Actions</b>	<b>General Timelines</b>
Parks and Recreation Element	Review and revise goals, policies and planned recreation facilities as appropriate to ensure protection of identified critical areas	
<b>Water Comp Plan</b>	Review and revise goals, policies and system operations to be compliant with applicable State and/or Federal statutes	Water Comprehensive Plans are required to updated every 6 years (RCW 70.119A RCW) for systems with over 1,000 service connections, or in conformance with the cycle of updates required by the state Department of Health or Department of Ecology, whichever is sooner.
<b>Wastewater Comp Plan</b>	Review and revise goals, policies and system operations as appropriate to be compliant with NPDES permit and other applicable State and/or Federal statutes	Wastewater Comprehensive Plans are required to updated every 6 years - RCW 90.48
<b>Stormwater Management Plan</b>	Review and revise goals, policies and system operations as appropriate to be compliant with applicable State and/or Federal statutes	Stormwater Management Plans are required to updated every 6 years - RCW 90.48.40
<b>Solid Waste Management Plan</b>	Review and revise goals, policies and system operations as appropriate to be compliant with applicable State and/or Federal statutes	Solid Waste Management Plans are required to updated every 5 years - RCW 70.95 .110
<b>Road Management and Abandonment Plan</b>	Counties should consider development of local plans as well as implementation of best management practices in their road maintenance operations	Local Governments may review and revise or prepare new regulations at any time.

Appendix D: Local Government Policy and Program Threat Criteria

Policy/Program/Regulation		
	General Actions	General Timelines
<b>Watershed Plans</b>	Each Water Resource Inventory Area has the option of pursuing preparation of a Watershed Plan. The Wenatchee, Entiat, Methow and Okanogan watersheds are all involved with Watershed planning and all but the Okanogan (initiated in 2004) are well along in the planning process.	Preparation of Watershed Plans under state statute involves a four phase process that can consume up to a half dozen years or longer. Since the process is locally driven with timelines established through grant contracts, and the differences in approach result in no firm timeline for plans within the Upper Columbia Region.
<b>Implementing Regulations</b>		
Zoning	Review and revise regulations as appropriate to ensure protection of identified critical areas	Local Governments may review and revise local land use regulations as required to address citizen petitions for amendments or as directed by resolution of elected bodies or appointed planning commissions.
Subdivision/Platting	Review and revise regulations as appropriate to ensure protection of identified critical areas	
Development Standards	Review and revise regulations as appropriate to ensure protection of identified critical areas	
Planned Development	Review and revise regulations as appropriate to ensure protection of identified critical areas	
Critical Areas	Review and revise regulations as appropriate to be compliant with applicable State and/or Federal statutes - State law requires critical areas regulations to be reviewed and revised using best available science by September 2006.	Local Governments have until 2007 to review and revise Critical Areas regulations to include Best Available Science
Flood Damage Prevention	Review and revise regulations as appropriate to be compliant with applicable State and/or Federal statutes	Changes to Federal and State flood hazard statutes over the past few years has resulted in the need for local governments to update their programs to reflect such changes.

Appendix D: Local Government Policy and Program Threat Criteria

<b>Policy/Program/Regulation</b>		
	<b>General Actions</b>	<b>General Timelines</b>
Clearing and Grading	Review and revise, adopt regulations to ensure protection of identified critical areas	Local Governments may initiate public review and adoption procedures for establishing stand alone clearing and grading regulations or adopt appropriate sections of the IBC at anytime.
International Building Code	Review and revise regulations as appropriate to be compliant with applicable State and/or Federal statutes	Most local governments in the region have adopted the IBC.
Shoreline Master Program	Review and revise regulations as appropriate to be compliant with applicable State and/or Federal statutes	All local governments with shoreline areas within their jurisdiction are required to update their Shoreline Master Program to reflect new state requirements by 2014. Okanogan and Douglas Counties have been approved for funding to create regional programs in cooperation with incorporated municipalities. These new programs will be completed in 2007.
Administrative Procedures	Review and revise regulations as appropriate to be compliant with applicable State and/or Federal statutes and to ensure all developments are reviewed for potential impacts to critical areas	Local Governments may initiate public review and adoption of administrative procedures at anytime.
Resource/Rural Lands	Review and revise regulations to ensure protection of identified critical areas	Subject to annual review
<b>Permit Processes</b>		
Conditional Uses	Review and revise regulations as appropriate to be compliant with applicable State and/or Federal statutes and to ensure all developments are reviewed for potential impacts to critical areas	Local governments generally conduct an annual review of ordinances timelines and number of hearings set by State statute, local governments may amend local codes as often as needed and codes that provide a basis for permit processes. Beyond limitations on
Variances		
Exemptions		
Substantial Development		
Approach/Access		
Septic		

## Appendix D: Local Government Policy and Program Threat Criteria

Policy/Program/Regulation		
	General Actions	General Timelines
Subdivision/Platting/Planned Development/Binding Site Plans		
Utility Connections		
R-O-W permits		
Hydraulics Permits*	Review and revise application review procedures as appropriate to ensure that WDFW is notified and their concerns addressed for projects that require work near or below the ordinary-high-water-mark	State process, subject to legislative action and agency rule-making.
Water Quality Modification*	Review and revise application and review procedures as appropriate to ensure that Ecology is notified and their concerns addressed for projects that require work near or below the ordinary-high-water-mark	
Corps Permits*	Review and revise application and review procedures as appropriate to ensure that the Corps is notified and their concerns addressed for projects that require work near or below the ordinary-high-water-mark	Federal process, subject to congressional action and agency rule-making.
Water Rights*		State process, subject to legislative action and agency rule-making.
* - state or federal permit, local government may be initial point of contact or need review/action by state or federal agency prior to issuance of local government approvals.		
<b>Compliance Program</b>		
Code Enforcement/Compliance Position	If no such position and budget exists or if position exists, seek long term funding to ensure ongoing enforcement of existing plans, regulations and codes.	Local governments can create such a position at anytime, however the primary issue is budgetary. A code enforcement/compliance program not only requires staff to function as code enforcement/compliance officers, but also budget for prosecution of cases if necessary.
<b>Environmental Review</b>		
SEPA	Review and revise regulations as appropriate to be compliant with	Local governments may amend their SEPA regulations

Appendix D: Local Government Policy and Program Threat Criteria

Policy/Program/Regulation		
	General Actions	General Timelines
	applicable State statutes	at any time.
NEPA	NEPA is a federal statute that local government must follow depending on the project and funding source. No local government action needed.	n/a