



**Responsiveness Summary –
Jefferson County Locally Approved
Shoreline Master Program:
Review and response to issues raised by
State-wide public comment**

DRAFT

November 15, 2010

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Overview..... | 3 |
| Issues of Public Interest..... | 3 |
| Administration/Permits..... | 4 |
| Agriculture..... | 4 |
| Aquaculture..... | 5 |
| Beach Access Structures..... | 5 |
| Boating Facilities..... | 5 |
| Buffers..... | 6 |
| Critical Areas..... | 7 |
| Cumulative Impacts..... | 7 |
| Definitions..... | 7 |
| Forest Practices..... | 7 |
| General..... | 8 |
| Jurisdiction and Shoreline Environment Designations..... | 11 |
| Mining..... | 11 |
| Non-conforming Development..... | 11 |
| No Net Loss and Mitigation..... | 12 |
| Project/Process..... | 13 |
| Public Access..... | 14 |
| Residential Development..... | 14 |
| Restoration..... | 14 |
| Shore Armor/Stabilization..... | 15 |
| Vegetation Conservation..... | 15 |
| Water Quality/Quantity..... | 15 |
| Summary & Conclusions..... | 16 |

Overview

The state of Washington's 1971 Shoreline Management Act (RCW 90.58) and 2003 Shoreline Master Program (SMP) Guidelines (WAC 173-26) call for local jurisdictions to complete a comprehensive SMP update consistent with statutory and administrative requirements. The Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan calls for shoreline management to protect natural resources and maintain quality of life for area residents, including revisions to the SMP as directed by state laws and rules. The Jefferson County SMP Comprehensive Update (MLA08-475) has been in progress for several years, and now nears completion with a County proposal under review by Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology).

After Board of County Commissioner approval of the *Jefferson County Locally Approved SMP (LA-SMP)* in December 2009 (Resolution #77-09), the Jefferson County Department of Community Development (DCD) prepared and sent a complete submittal packet to Ecology on March 1, 2010. Ecology conducted a state-wide public comment period and public hearing in April/May 2010 that yielded over 300 written comments and verbal testimonies. Per state administrative rule (WAC 173-26-120), the County must prepare a Responsiveness Summary to review and respond to the issues raised by the public comments and testimonies. Ecology will review this summary as they prepare their Findings and Conclusions regarding the consistency of the LA-SMP with state requirements, and issue their decision on whether to approve/deny/require changes to the LA-SMP prior to final state adoption.

The state received some 340 written comments and verbal testimonies regarding the LA-SMP during the state-wide public comment period and public hearing. Jefferson County has reviewed the comments and testimonies that were transmitted by Ecology and provides this review of and response to the issues raised by citizen input.

Issues of Public Interest

The large volume of state-wide public input on the LA-SMP was fairly balanced between comments in support of the proposed shoreline management provisions and those that expressed concern over one or more of the proposed policies or regulations. This review is focused on the content of the issues raised, rather than the frequency. The SMP update is a legally mandated action and must comply with state requirements.

Most comment letters/testimonies were brief (one sentence to one page), some were longer (5 – 15 pages; one submittal was 88 pages). Some were very general, others were very detailed. Most people

submitted just one letter/testimony, others sent their letter both via email and US Mail, and some submitted multiple comments via separate letters, emails and verbal testimony (one person submitted 19 separate emails plus a verbal testimony). The public input also covered a range of topics and personal sentiments related specifically to the LA-SMP, generally to the subject of shoreline management, or indirectly to other subjects such as personal anecdotes.

To record and summarize the large volume of public input, the County has used comment summary statements. The full content of all citizen input is present in the public record. These summary statements are not meant to paraphrase exactly what was said, nor meant to replace the full content of submitted comment letters and testimonies. Rather the summary statements are meant to reflect the general topics, themes, and issues expressed by the public input received. The state requirement and the purpose of this County Responsiveness Summary is to ensure that public comments were fully considered and appropriately addressed, not respond to comment or debate matters of personal opinion.

This summary is organized alphabetically by topic and provides a general overview of the perspectives submitted to the state. Comment summary statements are not presented in any order of priority.

Administration/Permits

Those in favor of the LA-SMP expressed agreement:

- Conditional use permits (CUPs) allow better protection at the individual-project level.
- County needs even better GIS/mapping for more accurate implementation of the shoreline regulations.

Those critical of the LA-SMP expressed concern:

- LA-SMP is too big/complex for County to implement; not enough staff to enforce new provisions.
- County staff doesn't have the expertise to review the special reports required.
- Permit review process and fees will discourage compliance.
- RCW & WAC don't require expanding use of conditional use permits.
- CUPs allow too much Ecology control.
- CUPs can't be required by government, only offered as an option for the applicant to choose.
- CUP based on adjacent upland designation is absurd.
- CUPs will be too expensive & time consuming.
- Eliminate all CUPs from the LA-SMP.
- Statement of Exemption for preferred uses dilutes purpose of exemptions.

Agriculture

Those critical of the LA-SMP expressed concern:

- LA-SMP does not comply with State agricultural requirements/exemptions.
- New regulations will impede farming.

Aquaculture

Those in favor of the LA-SMP expressed agreement:

- Adopt the shellfish provisions as written.
- Support the aquaculture provisions, but they need additional limits to be more protective.
- Only low-intensity aquaculture operations should be allowed in Natural and Priority Aquatic designated areas.
- Allowing high-intensity aquaculture in sensitive areas will cause net loss.
- Geoduck aquaculture has negative impacts to other aquatic species/habitat.
- Geoduck should be more strictly regulated.
- Geoduck aquaculture should be banned.
- Support the net pen prohibition.

Those critical of the LA-SMP expressed concern:

- LA-SMP needs to recognize that aquaculture is important to local economy.
- Aquaculture industry is already regulated enough by other agencies.
- LA-SMP regulations are too restrictive and will cripple the industry.
- Aquaculture provisions could be more clearly written.
- Geoduck aquaculture shouldn't require CUP.
- Fish farming would provide local jobs.
- Finfish net pens should be allowed.
- Allow net pens w/ CUP.
- Net pens should be allowed with some restrictions to ensure adequate protection.
- Net pen prohibition is inconsistent with intent of WAC/State Guidelines.

Beach Access Structures

Those critical of the LA-SMP expressed concern:

- Everyone should be allowed to build a beach access structure.
- Denying access to my beach is a property rights infringement.
- Siting and design standards/dimensions are infeasible.
- Applicant obligation to prove no adverse impact is overly burdensome.
- Different provisions for public/private are not fair.

Boating Facilities

Those critical of the LA-SMP expressed concern:

- Every waterfront homeowner should be allowed a dock
- SMP allows too much regulatory discretion and uncertainty for landowners

Buffers

This topic received many comments. Those in favor of the LA-SMP expressed agreement:

- Buffers are needed for shoreline protection.
- Support 150' buffer.
- Support 100' buffer on lakes, rivers/streams.
- Buffers are based on science.
- Buffers are appropriate for protection.
- Support the flexible buffer provisions.
- Support protection of wetlands, fish and wildlife habitat, flood areas.
- Channel migration zone (CMZ) protection is needed and appropriate.
- Buffers help reduce erosion/landslide risks thereby protecting taxpayers from having to pay for problems after the fact
- Buffers should be bigger for adequate protection and no net loss.
- Economic value of ecosystem services should be part of the buffer/protection equation.

Those critical of the LA-SMP expressed concern:

- Many people that will be affected by SMP are opposed to it.
- Buffers are too big.
- Buffers are one-size fits all.
- Buffers are a 'takings' and property owners should be compensated.
- Buffers are not based on science.
- Buffer science used is inadequate/not applicable.
- Buffers won't protect the environment.
- Opposed to building setbacks.
- Oppose 165' setback.
- Oppose the 150' buffer.
- It's not fair City of Port Townsend requires 50' but County will require 150'.
- 150' might be appropriate in some cases but not as a standard since individual site evaluation is needed.
- Consider 75' buffer as a compromise.
- Support 50' buffer.
- Buffers will create hardship for property owners.
- Buffers will prevent waterfront views.
- Buffers will preclude development.
- Buffers will reduce property value.
- Buffers will affect personal property not commercial interests.
- Adjacent/nearby jurisdictions with smaller buffers will out-compete the County in the housing market.

- Buffers are intentionally large to create lots of non-conforming structures so they can be eliminated.
- Buffers are intended to force a return to a pre-development state.
- Buffers should be based on high/medium/low impacts of development.
- Buffers should be designed to protect water quality.
- Buffers shouldn't include FAA 'airspace'.
- Want same buffer as existing neighbors' homes.
- Common Line Buffer should be allowed with 300' separation.

Critical Areas

Those in favor of the LA-SMP expressed agreement:

- Critical Area Ordinance (CAO) inclusion is needed and appropriate

Those critical of the LA-SMP expressed concern:

- County improperly adopted CAO into SMP.
- Shorelines aren't critical areas.
- No CAO or other Growth Management Act (GMA) jurisdiction allowed in shorelines, SMA only.
- Public didn't get to review CAO regulations when incorporated into SMP.

Cumulative Impacts

Those critical of the LA-SMP expressed concern:

- Cumulative impacts provisions are insufficient and will allow unjust denials.
- Cumulative Impacts Analysis is inadequate.
- Exempt activities shouldn't have cumulative effects review.
- Cumulative impacts analysis requirement is too onerous/burdensome for applicant.
- Cumulative Impacts Analysis is inadequate to measure/track 'no net loss'.

Definitions

Those critical of the LA-SMP expressed concern:

- Channel Migration Zone definition is too broad and includes regulatory language.
- Feeder Bluff definition, standards, and identification/classification criteria are unclear.
- Need to define 'lateral'.
- 'No net loss' is undefined.

Forest Practices

Those critical of the LA-SMP expressed concern:

- Forestry provisions don't comply with State FPA.

General

Those in favor of the LA-SMP expressed agreement:

- Support the SMP as written.
- Mostly support the SMP, with a few concerns.
- SMP is as good a compromise between allowing more development and protecting resources as we can expect.
- SMP satisfies all RCW/WAC requirements.
- SMP is largely consistent with Tribal Treaty Fishing Rights.
- SMP fairly balances property rights & shoreline protection.
- SMP is based on science.
- SMP document is clearly organized and well-written.
- SMP offers improved shoreline protection and better SMA consistency.
- SMP is a benefit for whole community, including those who cannot afford shoreline property.
- SMP helps fix current problems so we don't leave them for future generations.
- Support the preference for water-dependent uses.
- Support best management practices to minimize impacts.
- Support use of 'precautionary principle' to protect shorelines.
- SMP should and does balance protection with use of shorelines.
- SMP will improve property value through protection and consistency.
- We must protect Puget Sound and Hood Canal.
- Value the ecological and economic benefits of a healthy shorelines & Puget Sound ecosystem to protect quality of life.
- Value the access/view and cultural benefits of healthy shorelines.
- Protecting what we have will attract others who value healthy resources.
- Landowners need to be educated to not pollute/damage shoreline.
- Concerned about cruise ship sewage pollution.
- Some people think it's their right to break the rules, regardless of safety or damage to neighbors.
- SMP opponents have a narrow/selfish vision.
- SMP opponents seem ill informed/haven't read the proposal.
- SMP opponents well attended the public process and voiced dissent.
- Landowners are not always the best stewards of their land, but often the cause of degradation.
- Many rural lots are risky to develop due to dynamic/fragile natural resources.
- Taxpayers shouldn't have to pay for landowners stupid mistakes.
- Safety must be a priority for shoreline management.
- All human activity has an environmental impact.
- All landowners have property rights, whether they are good stewards or exploit and degrade.

- There is balance in having existing landowners' reduced profit and new landowners' increased cost of privilege.
- Everyone must yield something for the greater good.
- Citizens and regulators must work together to protect shorelines and natural resources.
- Property owners need to hold themselves and their neighbors accountable for protecting shorelines.
- Public good must trump private/commercial interests.
- County needs stormwater ordinance and low impact development standards to complement SMP.
- Consider using students, creative arts, and digital/social media to educate, honor, and discuss SMP implementation issues.

Those critical of the LA-SMP expressed concern:

- I oppose the SMP.

Update not needed because...

- Current SMP is fine 'as is'.
- Economy is too bad now for new rules.
- If liberal construction is included in SMP, it should also apply to the SMA and WAC.
- I oppose the WAC/SMP Guidelines.

SMP is/does...

- SMP is not based on science.
- SMP is too broad and far-reaching.
- SMP is too long/complex/onerous.
- SMP language is too vague and imprecise.
- SMP is too restrictive and will eliminate jobs, hurt local economy.
- SMP is so restrictive it will cause a mass exodus of existing and potential shoreline property owners looking to escape oppressive government.
- SMP goals, policies and regulations are disjointed.
- SMP seems based on distrust of property owners.
- SMP is redundant of other regulations (i.e. GMA, SEPA, stormwater, etc).
- Vague language gives DCD too much discretion.
- SMP infringes on property rights but expands public access/rights.

SMP isn't/doesn't...

- SMP doesn't comply with State requirements re: 'takings'.
- SMP doesn't clarify how to address Tribal inholder parcels.
- SMP doesn't adequately prevent pollution.
- SMP doesn't accommodate population expansion to 2060.
- SMP is not consistent w/ legal/case law.
- SMP provisions/prohibitions are not in-line with intent of SMA/WAC.
- SMP isn't consistent w/ County Comprehensive Plan.
- SMP isn't consistent w/ Port of Port Townsend policies.
- SMP isn't consistent w/ US Constitution - Equal Protection Clause; Takings.

- SMP isn't consistent w/ GMA.
- SMP isn't consistent w/ SMA.
- SMP isn't consistent w/ City of Port Townsend SMP.

SMP is unfair...

- SMP unfairly punishes new landowners instead of making existing owners fix the problem.
- SMP unfairly punishes existing when new development is the problem.
- SMP unfairly makes Jefferson County clean up pollution caused by City of Port Townsend, and more urban areas around Puget Sound.
- Jefferson County is unfairly being forced to fix problems that are state-wide.
- It's unfair that Port Townsend, Port Ludlow and Cape George are exempt from SMP.
- SMP is unfair because it treats similar properties inconsistently.
- It's not fair NW Maritime Center was approved, but garages get declined.

SMP needs/should...

- SMP needs better monitoring & enforcement provisions.
- SMP should balance property rights & shoreline protection.
- New rules should only apply when property is sold so new owner has to comply.
- Public lands should have to comply by the same rules as private.
- Throughout document, term 'impacts' should always be 'significant impacts'.

SMP will...

- SMP will be too expensive to implement.
- SMP will increase development costs (permits, construction).
- SMP will reduce tax revenue.
- SMP will reduce shoreline property values and increase tax burden to everyone else.
- SMP will cause many lawsuits in opposition.
- Lawsuits against this SMP will be too expensive and/or bankrupt the County.
- SMP will preclude responsible stewardship and coastline preservation.

The people & rights...

- Property owners love & appreciate shoreline resources.
- Property owners are the best stewards of their land.
- Increased shoreline property values are evidence that landowners are best at protecting/improving their property.
- Private property ownership means being able to use your land as you see fit.
- Private property rights should trump public interest.
- Environmentalists seem to think all development causes adverse impacts.
- Environmental activists that support the SMP commonly get the facts wrong, thereby fueling opposition.
- SMP opponents will vote out any elected officials and then fire any staff that support this SMP.
- Support any litigation in opposition of this SMP.
- I have questions about the SMP I want answered.

Other...

- We already have too much government.
- Global climate change and sea level rise (SLR) goals are unreasonable.

- Disagree with some aspects of Kramer et al. white paper on SMP Updates.
- Overharvesting is the main problem with salmon.
- Eroding bluffs, tsunamis, and global warming haven't occurred/don't exist.

Jurisdiction and Shoreline Environment Designations

Those in favor of the LA-SMP expressed agreement:

- Priority Aquatic Shoreline Environment Designation (SED) is innovative and needed for resource protection.
- Natural and Priority Aquatic SEDs need more protective standards to avoid/minimize impacts and keep uses low-intensity.
- Conservancy SED needs more protective standards for industrial/port and multi-family uses to keep uses low-intensity.
- Default SED should be Natural to better protect resources.

Those critical of the LA-SMP expressed concern:

- Disagree with application of jurisdictional/SED criteria.
- RCW doesn't say to include 'associated wetlands' in shoreline jurisdiction.
- SED designation criteria are inconsistent w/ WAC.
- Disagree with application of SED at specific site.
- Priority Aquatic SED is unnecessary.
- Natural SED is too restrictive.
- Too much shoreline designated as Natural.
- Default Conservancy SED would allow water-dependent development on Tribal lands not allowed by the Tribe.
- The County doesn't have jurisdiction to designate Tribal shorelines.
- Should have process for contesting/changing parcel/reach SEDs.

Mining

Those in favor of the LA-SMP expressed agreement:

- I support the mining prohibitions.
- Prohibit mining in channel migration zones too.
- Oppose Pit-to-Pier project or similar future efforts.

Those critical of the LA-SMP expressed concern:

- Support some mining restrictions to ensure adequate protection, but not complete prohibition.

Non-conforming Development

This topic received many comments. Those in favor of the LA-SMP expressed agreement:

- Support 'grandfather' allowance for maintenance and repair of existing development.

- Support limited expansion of existing development when impacts are adequately addressed.

Those critical of the LA-SMP expressed concern:

- Term 'non-conforming' seems ominous.
- Non-conforming development standards are not clear – What happens to existing development that ends up in the new buffer?; Who can do what, when?
- The County is incorrectly/inconsistently regulating non-conforming uses in/outside shoreline jurisdiction.
- SMP will make too many existing homes non-conforming.
- Non-conforming status is 'taking' - should be compensated.
- Non-conforming status will damage property value, increase taxes, preclude insurance and resale.
- Non-conforming status will result in eventual elimination.
- Non-conforming standards will illegally force shoreline restoration.
- My existing shoreline development should be 'grandfathered'.
- SMP should have a 'grandfather' clause.
- SMP should allow rebuilding after fire/damage.
- Non-conforming rules shouldn't apply to interior remodels.
- If existing non-conforming development can expand, then everyone should be able to locate that close.
- Support non-conforming lot provisions that protect landowner investment in property, not restrict property improvements.
- The State shouldn't be able to seize property based on non-conformity.
- Sellers may have to disclose 'non-conforming' status to potential buyers.
- Abandonment clause is unconstitutional.

No Net Loss and Mitigation

Those in favor of the LA-SMP expressed agreement:

- Support 'no net loss' (NNL) as a worthwhile and needed goal.
- ICR was extensive and well-done.
- Support mitigation sequencing requirements.

Those critical of the LA-SMP expressed concern:

- Shoreline Management Act (SMA) doesn't require NNL.
- Basing the SMP update process on NNL is flawed & without any SMA basis.
- NNL is not possible or a reasonable goal.
- NNL is used as permission to restrict all shoreline uses.
- Inventory & Characterization Report is too general to establish a NNL baseline.
- NNL can't be standard used if/when there are no baseline/indicators to monitor.

- Without clear NNL baseline/indicators, cumulative impacts and restoration needs cannot be assessed.
- Past restoration efforts and other increased regulatory controls should be part of equation to reach NNL.
- Neither RCW nor WAC requires making preferred uses non-conforming.
- Mitigation requirements are inadequate.
- Mitigation standards don't meet nexus & proportionality requirements/definitions.

Project/Process

This topic received many comments. Those in favor of the LA-SMP expressed agreement:

- Public involvement was extensive and well-done.
- Appreciate that the Shoreline Technical and Shoreline Policy Advisory Committees (STAC /SPAC) included shoreline property owners.
- BoCC review was above adequate – listened to public and reviewed science.
- County has adequately addressed legal review re: 'takings'.
- SMP is result of much hard work by County staff, consultants, residents, Planning Commission (PC), BoCC, and Ecology staff.
- Support periodic SMP updates to allow for changes in resources, science, economy.
- Government plays important role to moderate between private interests and the public good.
- ECY should ignore the fear-based hysteria that was evident at the public hearing.
- ECY should avoid further delay in adopting the SMP.

Those critical of the LA-SMP expressed concern:

- No problem defined to need SMP update.
- Not enough public outreach.
- Public involvement was inadequate.
- The County didn't coordinate with the Tribes.
- No shoreline property owners on the STAC/SPAC.
- Not enough shoreline property owners on the committees.
- Tribal staff were not STAC/SPAC members and did not participate.
- Update process fails to meet RCW/WAC requirements.
- Inventory & Characterization is not adequate.
- Ecology staff comments during local process were improper.
- No cost/benefit or financial analysis performed.
- No 'concise explanatory statement' to answer public questions prior to rule adoption.
- SMP should have had an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) evaluation.
- BoCC made changes to PC recommendation.
- Submittal of PC recommendation that was different from committee recommendation was inappropriate.
- County improperly approved LA-SMP.
- Location of public hearing was inconvenient.

- Most people who attended the public hearing were opposed to the SMP and represent majority opinion.
- Only residents of rural Jefferson County should have a say in the SMP, not City of PT residents.
- Only shoreline property owners should have a say in the SMP.
- I'm a scientist and no-one asked for my professional input.
- Process to implement SMP needs to be simplified for general public.
- SMP process was biased by personal agendas.
- County staff is clearly biased and tried to influence public input.
- The County is promoting indoctrination under the guise of education.
- County receipt of Ecology funding makes whole SMP process suspect.
- Ecology is pushing this through against property owner wishes.
- Ecology should deny the SMP and start over.
- Ecology should deny the SMP and require the County to work with the Tribes.
- Ecology should postpone all SMP Updates until they streamline the process and provide more money.

Public Access

Those in favor of the LA-SMP expressed agreement:

- Shorelines need to be open to everyone, not allow all uplands to be privately owned & preventing public access.

Those critical of the LA-SMP expressed concern:

- SMP will limit public access to public waters.
- SMP will force public onto private property and cause litter/sanitary pollution/property damage.
- Increased public access will result in resource degradation since private property owners take better care of the land.
- Public access requirements are a 'taking' and should be compensated.
- Feeder bluff prohibitions ignore mitigation and engineering options.

Residential Development

Those critical of the LA-SMP expressed concern:

- Requiring a CUP in Natural is illegal.

Restoration

Those critical of the LA-SMP expressed concern:

- Neither SMA nor GMA require restoration.
- SMP shouldn't require restoration.
- SMP requires restoration to pre-settlement conditions.
- Restoration Plan isn't parcel-specific.

Shore Armor/Stabilization

Those in favor of the LA-SMP expressed agreement:

- I support stricter standards for hard shore armoring.
- I support the reduction of hard shore armoring.
- I support non-structural shore stabilization.
- Beach armor only provides neatness, no natural productivity/discovery/fun/interest.

Those critical of the LA-SMP expressed concern:

- Bulkheads should always be allowed for single family residential (SFR) and appurtenances.
- Shore armor regulations are too broad and restrictive.
- Shore armor regulations are not based on science.

Vegetation Conservation

Those in favor of the LA-SMP expressed agreement:

- Shoreline trees need protection.
- I support responsible trimming/pruning.
- Native vegetation is important for bluff stability, water quality, habitat.
- Bluff-top non-native vegetation is high maintenance and poor performing.
- Previous bluff damage was caused by the cutting of upland trees.

Those critical of the LA-SMP expressed concern:

- SMP vegetation provisions are too strict.
- WAC doesn't specify 'native' when requiring maintenance of shore vegetation.
- Native vegetation doesn't adequately mitigate impacts.
- SMP should recognize that shoreline views add value to residential development.
- Limiting view maintenance is a property rights infringement.
- The 25% tree removal limit isn't based on science.
- SMP won't allow removal of blackberries/weeds.
- SMP won't allow protection from fire danger.
- The 'hazard tree' provisions are inadequate.
- Some tree topping should be allowed for unique cases.

Water Quality/Quantity

Those in favor of the LA-SMP expressed agreement:

- Dumping chemicals and waste into Puget Sound will harm the kelp that produces oxygen.

Those critical of the LA-SMP expressed concern:

- City residents are polluting Puget Sound, not county residents.

- Stormwater runoff and chemical use are the problem.
- Septics are not the problem.
- Septics are the problem, sewers the solution to Puget Sound.
- Septics/sewage pollution is the problem.
- Ecology didn't prevent pollution from an aluminum plant in Bellingham Bay decades ago so don't trust them now.

Summary & Conclusions

The comments summarized above are generally reflective of the broad spectrum of public input that the County received throughout the SMP update process. Prior to the state-wide public comment period, the County received similar comments on these issues as well as other topics including boathouses, commercial development, dredging, historical, archaeological, cultural, scientific and educational resources, industrial/port development, in-stream structures, recreation, signs, transportation, use table, and utilities. The County attempted to address public comments and questions received throughout the update process in myriad ways such as preparing Frequently Asked Question (FAQ) Handouts, providing frequent website and email updates, and conducting numerous public outreach events. In doing so, the County complied with the statutory mandate and worked in good faith to protect the public interest in shorelines of the state consistent with state law.

To support and augment staff work on the update project, the County hired two consulting firms - ESA Adolfson and Battelle Marine Sciences Laboratory. Under staff direction, the consultants have assisted with technical analyses and the resulting preparation of proposed shoreline goals, policies, designations and regulations. Washington Department of Ecology staff also provided technical analysis to support the County's scientific review of shoreline and ecosystem resources. As a result, the County has prepared key documents that serve as technical supplements to the updated SMP proposal, including the *Final Shoreline Inventory and Characterization Report*, the *Final Shoreline Restoration Plan*, and the *Cumulative Impacts Analysis*.

These technical reports were prepared in consultation with two advisory committees consisting of broad representation from stakeholder agencies, tribes, non-governmental organizations, County Planning Commissioners and the general public. The Shoreline Technical and Shoreline Policy Advisory Committees also reviewed proposed SMP policy and regulatory provisions. During the three years of committee involvement, staff also made frequent and iterative efforts to inform and seek input from citizens, affected property owners and other interested parties. Because the County greatly values public input as important to the process of government, SMP public involvement efforts far exceeded the state requirements and provided ample opportunity for citizen participation. County staff and

consultants considered the committees' input along with informal public comments in preparing a Preliminary Draft SMP proposal for formal public review.

Over the course of seven months, the Planning Commission held weekly meetings that were open to the public in order to review the Preliminary Draft SMP proposal and conducted two comment periods to provide additional citizen input opportunities. The Planning Commission duly considered the formal public comments in preparing their final recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners.

The Board of County Commissioners hosted a public workshop and provided another public comment period then reviewed and considered the Planning Commission recommendation, staff input and more citizen input. Over the course of two months, the Board conducted nearly 30 hours of deliberation delving into details noted in the public comment record. The County firmly holds that a high level of public involvement and scrutiny is both needed and desired for issues of such importance. The SMP is a local program designed to balance the diverse values and varied opinions of the community in a proposal that fully satisfies legal requirements. The County is grateful to all parties who participated and thanks everyone for sharing their perspectives to help shape the future of local lake, river/stream and marine shorelines.

As a result of considering all the evidence, the Board accepted most of the Planning Commission recommendations, revised some provisions for legal consistency and/or for clarity, and opted to exercise their legislative authority on issues such as geoduck aquaculture, finfish and net pen aquaculture, mining, mooring buoys, accessory dwelling units, common line buffers, non-conforming uses/structures, and public transportation infrastructure. Finally, the Board adopted Resolution #77-09 to submit the *Locally Approved SMP* (LA-SMP) to the state for final review and approval.

After careful consideration of all of the comments received to date, including those obtained during the state-wide public comment period, the Board's previous decision on the LA-SMP stands. The County concludes the update process and submitted LA-SMP are consistent with statutory and administrative rule requirements.