

To: SMP@co.clallam.wa.us (Shoreline Master Program)

This message was sent via the Clallam Website Email Form 05-28-2015.

Name: Ed Bowen

Email: SMP@co.clallam.wa.us

Subject: Shoreline Master Program

Comments: For the record to whom it may concern; since it doesn't appear to concern the Clallam County Planning Commission given the information provided on the SMP website:

<http://www.clallam.net/LandUse/smp.html>

“The Planning Commission comment period has CLOSED.

Any comments received after February 27 will still be part of the record that will go to the Board of County Commissioners.”

SMP update email sent out to interested parties on May 28th 2015 continues the apparent trend of the Planning Commission ONLY considering public comments and testimony provided related to the release of the November 2014 Draft version of the SMP Update:

“To Interested Parties (SMP Update Email Notification List):

Upcoming Schedule

The next few meetings of the Clallam County Planning Commission will focus on review and evaluation of written and oral comments received on the 2014 Draft SMP. Here is their upcoming meeting schedule:

- June 3, 2015: The Planning Commission at their Work Session will start addressing the public comments matrix. Staff and the Commission will focus on issues found in respective chapters related to the Draft November 2014 SMP concerns and evaluate recommendations and changes from the public.
- June 17, 2015: Work Session before the Planning Commission on public comments received on 2014 Draft SMP. Staff and the Planning Commission will continue to address each chapter of the 2014 Draft SMP/public comment matrix.

Planning Commission agendas can be viewed at:

<http://www.clallam.net/LandUse/pcmeetings.html>

For more information, visit the County SMP Update Home Page at:

<http://www.clallam.net/LandUse/smp.html>

Thank you again for your interest.

Staff Contacts:

Steve Gray, Planning Manager: 360-417-2520 Kevin LoPiccolo, Principal Planner: 360-417-2322
Deborah Kucipeck, Planner: 360-417-2563”

I am identifying this as a flaw in the public/citizen's process and to due process.

- On several occasions in public comment to the Planning Commission it was brought to this body's attention that comments prior to a perceived August 2014 date have been/were submitted that are relevant to the update:
 - o For the purpose those issues to date have not been addressed/answered in the Nov2014 Draft
 - o This limitation on the extent of which comments would be considered/discussed/addressed by the commission was not made known to the public during the period of the now determined timeframe of public comment for consideration.
 - o The decision is not a publicly discussed or decision made in an open meeting to the public. County staff presented the "concept" but no formal decision was or has been made by the commission, at least not in an open meeting and transparency.
 - o The commission nor the Department of Community Development have not to this date explained as to the rationale behind this approach; why not openly consider public comments from the entire update process.

An August 2014 date is brought up by county staff, without open explanation as to why that point in time. When reading the text of the current notification email I would like to emphasis why this runaround is occurring when you ask staff and the commission are they going to consider/answer/respond/include all comments received:

 "...will focus on issues found in respective chapters related to the Draft November 2014 SMP concerns". If the intent is to also include those concerns that are not specifically incorporated within the NOV2014 Draft then why not be open and clear about that point. Otherwise, it's a runaround. The best answer I can get to date is the individual Planning commissioners are at liberty to consider any comment they so choose. But will that public transparency?

 "Work Session before the Planning Commission on public comments received on 2014 Draft SMP." Again, it does not openly address or consider comments that were not specifically received on the NOV2014 Draft; therefore, creating the runaround that the commission is bias only to those particular comments and is not obligated to address all public comments.

- The commission is limiting what public comment can be made to the body now, along with focusing on hypotheticals and the attempt to address to the commission the flaw in such approach clearly in my opinion creates a significant bias in the commission's approach. As an advisory body to the Community Development Director and the Board of Clallam County Commissioners, it does not appear to me the advice that is being generated by the commission is reliable.

It is essential that all public comments and issues brought to the attention of the update process be considered and addressed. It would be reasonable to expect an answer to all these comments too, and not leave that Planning Commission appearance that the SMP will be a product of SELECTIVE PUBLIC INPUT WITH LIMITED ISSUE SOLUTIONS.

Ed Bowen

P.O. Box 111
Clallam Bay, WA 98326