From:	Ed Bowen
To:	zSMP
Subject:	Shoreline Master Program
Date:	Friday, October 07, 2016 9:34:08 AM

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

This message was sent via the Clallam Website Email Form 10-07-2016.

Name: Ed Bowen

Email: smp@co.clallam.wa.us

Subject: Shoreline Master Program

Comments: My public comment to the Clallam County SMP Update is regarding Public Comment.

It appears this public comment process still is not functioning, at least not in the sense of posting comments that are received from this citizen. Could this be an environment of discrimination on the part of the county to only consider comments received from select "public"? I have to believe this may very well be the case.

Submitted 24 September 2016:

In a posting to the SMP Update website's public comment section, dated 10 August 2016 , the "county-zSMP" provides a response to the comment that "...very meticulous records of all comments with written copies that are indexed and filed as they were received." I contest that statement and do not believe it is true. I suggest all citizens of the county consider if they have submitted public comment on the SMP Update, in their view whether it be at county hosted meetings (workshops, Planning Commission public meetings, community briefings/regional watershed processes such as the WRIAs or salmon lead entities), in letter to DCD or other branches of the county government, at the working group that met for quite some time back in the infant phases of the update process (previous DCD administration), or submitted using the online comment form/process at the SMP Update webpage. Consider if that public comment has been recorded and is/will be considered in the update process.

I brought to the attention of the DCD elected director on at least three occasions over a period of a year what appeared to be two periods in time of public comments that such aren't posted to the SMP Update webpage for at least two of the three public comment sections:

- For the time period October 2013 to August 2014,
- and the time period February 28, 2015 to date

With no response of action apparently take to identify and correct if such comments during those periods were missing from the "...very meticulous records of all comments with written copies that are indexed and filed as they were received. " record, a public records

request was submitted to aid in making such a determination. The results did show that comments were in the record keeping system, but apparently not a matter of the active record being relied upon in the update process. In other words, there are records of public comments submitted but apparently are not known to the update process. It became apparent that possibly some comments submitted via zSMP were either never received or lost. The irony of this is fueled by even those "found" records are to this date not a matter of the public comment posting on the SMP Update website; the question is are they now even in the SMP Update file in a staff position's folder let alone the file being maintained for use by the BOCC commissioners when the recommendation comes before them?

In addition and should be a concern to those citizens possibly affected, for the period of October 2013 to August 2014 the public records request found no such records submitted. A period of ten months and there aren't public comments on record per the response to the public records request; a period when the draft was in the process of being prepared for consideration by the Planning Commission (the November 2014 version)? My comment is that I am very concerned of what in my view clearly is a period of lost and valuable public comment to the process. I don't believe the County has a very meticulous record keeping system when the at-best "glitches" have been identified but even still have not be corrected. It would seem fitting that if the County is itself concerned about this matter, it too will reach out to the citizens of the county and inquire if they believe their public comment was submitted but active record of such doesn't appear to be the case.