

# Merrill, Hannah

---

**From:** Darlene Schanfald [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 21, 2012 11:58 AM  
**To:** zSMP; mclancy@esassoc.com; Gray, Steve; htrim@pugetsound.org; Dean Patterson; Lear@userservices.net; Lear, Cathy  
**Subject:** Add'l OEC SMP comments - Sections 3, 4 & 5  
**Attachments:** OECC - Postcard FRONT NEW.pdf; OECC - Postcard BACK NEW.pdf

I included comments for more sections than you asked for. Since I read them and wanted to give input, I include them here.

Section 3:

P. 3-3 3.1.1.2 Freshwater Resource (FRSC) 2. Purpose, line 4  
Change "should" to "shall" ,,,,culverts, and bridges shall be conducted using best practices....

P. 4-3 4.2.3 Shoreline setbacks 2. Sideyard Setbacks  
5 yards doesn't seem enough of a set back

P. 4-8 4.2.4 Regulations - Shoreline Buffers  
4. d Needs this language: Herbicides (cides of any kind) will not be used.

Figure 4-2 : Freshwater Residential Shoreline/CA Buffers  
Again, this setback seems too shallow.

P. 4-20 - 21 4.3.2 Critical Areas Policies  
4.3.2.2 a-n I don't know if the arrangement of these steps are in rank order or just listed, but I'm sorry to see the protection of the CA so far down on the list. For instance, I would change h. to b. In fact, I would put all the CA protections first.

P.4-23 4.3.3 Regulations - General Regulations for all CAs  
10.a Can you give an example of a seismic hazard area in Cl. Co. where bldg would be allowed?

On the subject of seismic areas, one of the problems with siting bldgs too close to a shoreline is that liquefaction can occur and certainly impact adjoining soils.

P. 4-25 4.3.5 Regulations -- Wetland Buffers  
I couldn't tell from you maps if you included in wetlands the two large ones on the beach at Diamond Point. These are east of the home sites, under bluffs. They are seal haul outs.

P. 26 4.5.a Like 4.2.4, this is way too much allowances.

P. 4-29 Buffer averaging is of concern. It seems that rising water levels are not being taken seriously; certainly not being considered when calculating buffers. WA State is one of 3 in the U.S. that "wants to know how insurance companies are planning for weather extremes that come with climate change." <http://www.sj-r.com/top-stories/x1907517357/Insurance-industry-grappling-with-weather-extremes>

Also:

[http://www.nytimes.com/2012/03/14/science/earth/study-rising-sea-levels-a-risk-to-coastal-states.html?\\_r=1](http://www.nytimes.com/2012/03/14/science/earth/study-rising-sea-levels-a-risk-to-coastal-states.html?_r=1)  
[Asia and its floods: Save our cities.](#) A recent World Bank report says that land subsidence from compaction and increased groundwater extraction mean that Jakarta is sinking ten times faster than the Java Sea is rising, because of climate change. All across Asia, megacities face similar problems. [Economist](#)

We already see these along our coast lines. Remember, the Quinault Tribe was just given ONP land to move its members and buildings further upland. We must build into the Clallam Co. SMP credible language that acknowledges and protects from predicted coastal changes. This takes me to the another passage, which seems unthinkable in the face of the science.

P. 4-34 4.3.14 REGULATIONS - Geologically Hazardous Areas protection Standards.

2. ...new uses and developments may be allowed in geologically hazardous areas and/or their buffers....

Would there be "reasonable measures" that can insure "adverse effects on slope stability...human health and safety"? This put decision makers in a precarious spot and will result in "variances," and "C.U.P.s."

P. 4-36 4.3.15 'qualified professional'

It is what money buys. I would suggest 3 opinions.

P. 4-39 4.4.3

3. Change "may" to "shall" The Administrator *shall* require compensatory mitigation for development proposals..."

P. 4-43 4.4.5 Regulations - Wetland Mitigation Plans

Wetland restoration had seldom worked. Therefore,

2. change "may" to "shall" The Administrator *shall* increase the rations by twenty-five percent..."

P. 4-44 4.4.7 Regulations - Geologically Hazardous Areas Mitigation Plans

Here, again, it seems senseless to "mitigate" in danger zones!

4.4.8 Same in frequently floods areas.

P. 4-46 4.5.3 Regulations

f. We are trying to move away from shoreline armoring.

P. 4-47 There needs to be specific language addressing replacement soils, sand, etc.

It is insufficient language to just say, "The use of contaminated material or construction debris shall be prohibited." This is good strong language. But what is the oversight mechanism and enforcement?

P.4-52 4.7.3 Regulations

4. Clearing invasive....There should be language which PROHIBITS herbicides (any cides) from being used in/near water bodies to control/remove noxious weeds.

8. What BMPs? these are often avoided. Best to PROHIBIT there use.

4.9.2 Water Quality and Water Management - Applicability

1.a POLICIES Replace "should" with "shall" Shoreline uses and developments *shall* incorporated best management practices...

P. 4-53 1.h "Encourage removal" should be replaced with "Wood structures (etc.) *shall be* removed.

4.9.3 Regulations

2.a. Tier 1 Developments...."All new, replaced, and disturbed topsoil must be amended with organic matter, *which shall not include biosolids -- industrial, human and/or hospital wastes. The organic matter shall also be tested for toxicity and contaminants of concern.*"

This should be so for 2.b & c., and 5 on p. 4-54 as well. Biosolids are treated, but for few things. They remain highly toxic even after treatment. (See attachment. Let me know if you cannot open them.)

## CHAPTER 5

### P. 5.1

#### 5.2 Agriculture

5.2.2.2 replace "should" with "shall"

5.2.2.3 replace "encouraged" with "shall"

#### 5.3. AQUACULTURE

A few months ago, some of us already commented on aquaculture.

We certainly favor Jefferson County's SMP language being included in Clallam County's, regardless of Ecology's position.

#### P. 5-3 5.3.2 Policies

3. replace "should" with "shall"

4. Why use our waters for untested 'experiments'? They can do this in a lab.

I may have more comments on this section later.

#### P. 5-10 Marinas

5.5.3.8 replace "may" with "shall"

#### P. 5-13 Regulations

Somewhere it should say that staircases shall not be built from bluffs to shore, as this will destabilize bluffs.

#### Section 5-13 Recreation

Recommend that language be inserted re: responsibility of dog and horse owners to clean up poop from their animals.

#### 5.5.3.9

"constructed to avoid and, where avoidance is not possible, minimize impacts..."

delete "and, where avoidance is not possible, minimize impacts" This is another loophole.

9.b is also a loophole

On forest issues, I've had to reach out to knowledgeable parties.

I've received these comments:

-- DNR is not adequately dealing with sediment issues.

-- National Park needs to address shoreline development, regarding logging and cavalier private property use, especially Lake Crescent. Chief Ranger, Colin Smith, has said he intends to work with the new regulations to better declare a national park shoreline policy.

I will add that according to Futurewise, inholders do come under the County SMP.

-- National Forest is cooperating with clean water and good habitat, by currently doing watershed studies in the Dungeness and Calawah rivers; ONF has completed and implemented a watershed for the South Fork Skokomish River (the one that floods Highway 101 regularly, down the Canal).

-- Wild Olympic Campaign is encouraging water quality and additional habitat.

-- There are "summer homes" along rivers that have armaments too close to rivers.