

# Merrill, Hannah

---

**Subject:** RE: Comment on Planning Commission SMP Work Session

---

**From:** pearl hewett [REDACTED]

**Sent:** Thursday, June 20, 2013 1:30 PM

**To:** zSMP

**Cc:** yellowbanks [REDACTED]; robertc [REDACTED]; Stuart McColl; Karl Spees; connie beuvias; Jo Anne Estes; Jay Petersen; info@justwateralliance.org; Randy Dutton; Vi; Windy Boulden; Misty Rains; harry bell; marv chastain; Lois Perry; Sue Forde; Rick Forschler -; Jim Boyer; randy simmins; Sandy Rains; judymiller [REDACTED]; Don; Dawn Rains; Delane Hewett; joni howard; Tristin Hewett; Norman MacLeod; Keith Olson; Brian and Brooke

**Subject:** Comment on Planning Commission SMP Work Session

Pearl Rains Hewett

Public SMP comment

June 19, 2013 Planning Commission SMP Work Session.

It was a new experience, putting names and faces on the nine individuals that are next in line, to represent the 3300 vested shoreline property owners of Clallam County.

I enjoyed being surrounded by Ed Bowen(WRIA 20) Harry Bell (SMP- Green Crow)  
Dr. Robert Crittenden (biologist, expert witness and paid *consultant* ) , faith full observer, Charles Weller

AND, the new kid on the block

**Stu McColl, contributor of a very significant SMP public comment**

[http://www.clallam.net/LandUse/documents/417\\_SMP040813\\_000.pdf](http://www.clallam.net/LandUse/documents/417_SMP040813_000.pdf)

(excerpt) building an existing permitted Single Family Home is not new development  
No evidence has ever been presented, nor exists, showing that rebuilding a damaged single family home creates a "new net loss"

(the full text is available on the SMP Public Comment website)

**Indeed, Stu 's research, documentation and comment corrected one of the most restrictive elements in the SMP Update.**

-----

**Ed Bowen WRIA 20, a dedicated volunteer that drives from Forks to represent the beleaguered vested property owners located at the West end of Clallam County.**

**Ed made Public Comment twice during the meeting.**

**Previously neglected, valid points of concern.**

**Ed's comment (1)**

**SMP RESTORATION opportunities , as outlined in the SMP Update is mostly about restoring for FISH!**

**The POINT is, that PUBLIC ACCESS TO PUBLIC LAND (is a really big deal on the SMP Update) and yet, there is not a single reference in the entire SMP Update of RESTORATION opportunities of PUBLIC ACCESS TO PUBLIC LAND.**

The Public SHORELINES belong to "WE THE PEOPLE", there are documented SMP reports on public access provided by Steve, these public access reports should be reviewed and incorporated into the SMP Draft as additional RESTORATION opportunities

WA State already has a judgment for \$2.4 **BILLION DOLLAR** fish culvert restoration?  
(on appeal)

---

Ed's comment (2)

VESTED shoreline private property owners stuck in the middle of and included in the most restrictive CONSERVATION DESIGNATION?

Hardly the place for the full use and enjoyment of a private home?

Can the SMP responsible parties find some solution to this minority problem?

---

Valid SMP points and questions asked, THE affected UNIFORMED, with regard to NON-notification, availability, location, accessibility, phones, dial-up, not computer users, hard copies availability?

Perish the thought, PAY PER PAGE? for SMP hard copies of information and documents, for THE affected UNIFORMED?

Or they can go on a wild goose chase at the library?

---

WHAT IS A SUBSTANTIAL DEVELOPMENT?

As of September 15, 2012 any development the total cost or fair market value exceeds \$6,416,

IS THIS A JOKE? **NOTHING SUBSTANTIAL COSTS UNDER \$6416.00**

---

THIS IS VITAL PLEASE PAY ATTENTION

Shoreline conditional use Permits CUP

**Dept. of Ecology Must Approve**, Deny or Condition following local permit and appeal process.

FOLLOWING WHAT ? LOCAL EXPENSE TO THE PROPERTY OWNER? LOCAL permits, survey, engineering fees, mitigation, appeals?

Valid questions asked, Where is the property owner if the **DEPT. OF ECOLOGY DENIES THE PERMIT?**

---

Valid SMP points and questions asked

THE ECONOMIC IMPACT ON SMP RESTRICTED DEVELOPMENT?

---

Valid SMP points and questions asked

**REQUEST FOR QUANTATIVE REAL NUMBERS?**

(will this require somebody skilled in computing and the analysis of quantitative data?)

significant adverse

DEFINITION OF **SIGNIFICANT?**

- (1) having or expressing a meaning
  - (2) having a hidden or implied meaning
  - (3) having a major or important effect
  - (4) substantial relatively large in amount
- 

not produce substantial  
substantial number  
substantial detrimental

DEFINITION OF **SUBSTANTIAL?**

considerable in amount, extent, value, or importance

---

**Catch 22 EXEMPT BUT MAY REQUIRE?**

---

I am requesting a copy of your power point presentation.  
I am particularly interested in the list of groups, NGO'S, that you have named for **PUBLIC OUTREACH** presentations.

**THIS IS NOT PUBLIC OUTREACH THIS IS SINGING TO THE CHOIR**

Dungeness River Management Team (DRMT)

- Strait Ecosystem Recovery Network (Strait ERN)
- North Olympic Lead Entity
- North Pacific Coast Lead Entity
- Clallam County Marine Resources Committee
- North Pacific Coast Marine Resources Committee
- Clallam Bay–Sekiu and Crescent Community Advisory Councils
- Others

**As Ed, pointed out, there may be other areas to expand the public outreach, like GRANGES.**