

Merrill, Hannah

From: Katie Krueger [katie.krueger@quileutenation.org]
Sent: Thursday, June 02, 2011 2:39 PM
To: Merrill, Hannah; Gray, Steve; mwecker@u.washington.edu
Cc: frank.geyer@quileutenation.org; mel.moon@quileutenation.org;
kris.northcut@quileutenation.org; Osborne, Richard
Subject: Quileute comments to Consistency Report SMA Clallam County
Attachments: DRAFT_ConsistencyReview_3-30-11 Quil comments 060211.pdf

Overall the Consistency Report was a masterful job and my congratulations to the team that put it together. I do have some comments.

I have put things right onto the document, on sticky notes in yellow, which are minimized, and if you have Adobe Acrobat, you can right-click on these to see the entire comment, or apparently, just move mouse arrow there to read. But I tried to capture thoughts in this email, as well.

Generally, I am very concerned that the Critical Area Codes get integrated fully into the SMP, as when they were recently amended with Selinda's help, they added more protection for riparian zone trees (financial bite if you cut them).

Where discussing boathouses on page 4, maybe mention sewage dump sites for RVs and boats.

On page 6 where you discuss no net loss of ecological function, maybe have short legal explanation in the final draft, of why this does not constitute a taking (in light of some persons' emails about this concern). Ecology legal staff can probably assist you there.

Bottom of page 7 where you describe 5 shoreline designations: the glossary definitions as they stand now are circular and use the word to be defined, in the definition of Natural. Update glossary definitions.

Page 11, end of Chapter 4—need something about not interrupting water quantity regime, as well. Flow, siphoning off for some personal or corporate use, etc.

Page 24—you would permit mining in a channel migration zone? This is going to be hard to justify if no net loss is the rule. I would love to see the argument under SEPA for allowing it.

Page 25—caveat about allowing cutting of riparian trees under any circumstances, by homeowners. Leaving the roots is no solution. Once tree is down they rapidly decay, and you lose shade immediately. Also the LWD.

Pages 26 and 27 re utilities. Not just utilities have dams. Some people make their own tiny ones. Is this going to be regulated or monitored?

P. 31: Consider some statement as well about disposal of cut noxious/invasive weeds. That is one way they spread and the county is often the offender at dump sites!

P. 31-32 re dredge/fill: You need consistency with Army Corps of Engineers under CWA 404 as well, not just state, here.

Second bullet on page 35: Why is it OK to affect water quality over the short term (you only express concern re long term)? It could be acute, not just chronic harm. Also on page 35, not just state law about cultural resources of tribes. Also National Historic Preservation Act, and federal law has primacy.

Page 37 glossary: You really need to update a lot of the definitions so they are not defined by the same word listed in the glossary, which is circular. Also, in WRIA 20 watershed planning meeting of May, we noticed some definitions were extremely convoluted and technical. If the definitions for the words are not easy to read by the general public, and well defined, the glossary ceases to serve its function. Some work needed there.

Great job, over all.

Li/qtskal/ax2

Katie Krueger, staff attorney and policy analyst
Quileute Natural Resources
401 Main Street (deliveries); PO BOX 187 (mail)
La Push, WA 98350-0187
(360) 374-2265, FAX 374-9250, Cell 460-4842
Go to <http://www.quileutenation.org/natural-resources>
to check out our programs and more.