

The following changes are recommended, to clarify provisions of the SMP, and are consistent with the SMA (RCW 90.58) and the SMP Guidelines (WAC 173-26, Part III):

ITEM	SMP PROVISION	BILL FORMAT CHANGES (underline = additions; strikethrough = deletions)	RATIONALE	PACIFIC COUNTY ALTERNATIVE	FINAL ACCEPTED CHANGE
11	Section 5.1 Table 5-1 Footnotes Pages 65-66		For readability, reordering the 29 footnotes, in the order in which they first appear in Table 5-1 is recommended. These footnotes are currently in no particular order. For example, under "Fill" the superscript to footnote 27 appears in the table before the reference to footnote 10.	ACCEPTED; also, the order of the following three footnotes in the table was corrected per original intent: Mining ¹⁴ Rural Conservancy – P ¹⁵ Freshwater Aquatic, Willapa Bay Estuary, Columbia River Estuary – X ¹⁶ Footnotes: ¹⁴ Recreational mining of sand is allowed under a Hydraulic Permit Approval as issued by the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife. ¹⁵ Mining within a floodway or channel migration zone requires a conditional use permit. ¹⁶ Mining waterward of the OHWM is prohibited, unless it meets the criteria in 5.16.B.7, in which case it may be approved as a conditional use.	<i>The proposed language is consistent with the purpose and intent of Ecology's original recommended change. Therefore, pursuant to WAC 173-26-120(3)(b)(ii) the County's alternative language can be included as part of the final approved SMP.</i>
14	Section 5.1 Table 5-1 Footnote 26 Page 66	²⁶ Signage associated with a permitted recreational use is coded "P." All signage shall comply with applicable provisions in the Pacific County Zoning Ordinance No. <u>178</u> , or as amended 162 .	The revision provides a current ordinance number, and clarifies that if the ordinance is amended, the current version will be used. Consider doing a global search for outdated references to any of the county's ordinances.	ACCEPTED with modified wording to reflect the correct name of the County ordinance: Pacific County <u>Zoning Land Use</u> Ordinance No. 162 <u>178</u> , or as amended.	<i>The proposed language is consistent with the purpose and intent of Ecology's original recommended change. Therefore, pursuant to WAC 173-26-120(3)(b)(ii) the County's alternative language can be included as part of the final approved SMP.</i>
15	Section 5.5.A Aquaculture – Policies Page 73	2. Aquaculture uses should maintain no net loss of ecological functions, should not <u>significantly</u> adversely impact the aesthetic qualities of the shoreline, and should not significantly conflict with navigation and other water-dependent uses.	The revision is recommended in response to Comment E-14 (see Attachment D) which suggested aesthetics are subjective and any use, development or activity could have adverse impacts. As written, the provision seems to convey that the county's policy is to have "no aesthetic impacts," which we do not believe was the intent. The county's response suggested the term "significantly" is	ACCEPTED with the following modified wording, which the Planning Commission found to be easier to understand: 2. Aquaculture uses should maintain no net loss of ecological functions, should not <u>have significant adversely impacts on</u> the aesthetic qualities of the shoreline, and should not	<i>The proposed language is consistent with the purpose and intent of Ecology's original recommended change. Therefore, pursuant to WAC 173-26-120(3)(b)(ii) the County's alternative language can be included as part of the final approved SMP.</i>

			also subjective and that Policy 2 is followed by a policy that affords some latitude in siting. While generally true, this is the only place aesthetics are discussed in the section. The suggested revision is consistent with Ecology's master program guidelines, which call for aquacultural facilities to be designed and located so as not to "...significantly impact the aesthetic qualities of the shoreline." (WAC 173-26-241(3)(b)(i))(C).	significantly conflict with navigation and other water-dependent uses.	
19	Section 5.17.B Outdoor Advertising, Signs, and Billboards Page 96	1. Use and installation of signage in all shoreline environment designations shall be subject to the signage provisions in the Pacific County Zoning Ordinance No. 162 178, or as amended.	The revision provides a current ordinance number, and clarifies that if the ordinance is amended, the current version will be used.	ACCEPTED with modified wording to reflect the correct name of the County ordinance: Pacific County Zoning Land Use Ordinance No. 162 178, or as amended.	<i>The proposed language is consistent with the purpose and intent of Ecology's original recommended change. Therefore, pursuant to WAC 173-26-120(3)(b)(ii) the County's alternative language can be included as part of the final approved SMP.</i>
20	Section 5.19 Residential Development Page 99	Residential beach access structures	It's recommended the county consider more specifically addressing these types of facilities (e.g. stair towers). As the SMP is currently written, these structures would be considered an unclassified Conditional Use. Without standards, it may be challenging to ensure minimization measures to reduce impacts to bluffs/banks, including designs to avoid encroachment beyond the OHWM, the incorporation of decks into the structure and the use of fill and bank hardening.	ACCEPTED; added provisions are as follows: <u>3. The following structures and improvements for private or public shoreline access are allowed to protrude into the shoreline buffer provided they are constructed and maintained to ensure no net loss of ecological functions and consistent with Section 5.10 of this Program:</u> <u>a. Pedestrian access paths, provided such paths be limited to pervious trails at grade a maximum of six (6) feet in width; and</u> <u>b. Recreational shoreline access structures, such as stair towers.</u>	<i>The proposed language is consistent with the purpose and intent of Ecology's original recommended change. Therefore, pursuant to WAC 173-26-120(3)(b)(ii) the County's alternative language can be included as part of the final approved SMP.</i>
29	Global corrections	Final corrections to citations, formatting, and any other typographical errors	For clarity.	ACCEPTED, including the following corrections: <i>Revisions to reflect current County elected and staff personnel:</i> BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS Steve Rogers Lisa Olsen PACIFIC COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION Scott Turnbull PACIFIC COUNTY PLANNING STAFF Faith Taylor Eldred , Director of Community	<i>The proposed language is consistent with the purpose and intent of Ecology's original recommended change. Therefore, pursuant to WAC 173-26-120(3)(b)(ii) the County's alternative language can be included as part of the final approved SMP.</i> <i>Note: The change related to Table</i>

				<p>Development Tim Crose, Planning Director of Community Development</p> <p><i>Section 1.7.D.2:</i> "...for the version adopted [August 23rd, 2016, as Ordinance No. 180]"</p> <p><i>Table 3-1:</i> Cedar River (T15N R11W S26S25)</p> <p><i>Section 4.3.B.1.c:</i> "5.1718 [Recreational Development]"</p> <p><i>Section 4.4.B.2.e:</i> "5.1516, Mining"</p> <p><i>Section 5.8.B.9:</i> "4.63, Public Access"</p> <p><i>Section 5.13.B.7:</i> "4.5.(-B)-5, Vegetation Management"</p> <p><i>Section 5.14.B.1:</i> 5.8(-B)"</p> <p><i>Section 6.7.B.3:</i> "6.2(B)-B-6"</p> <p><i>Section 7.2.A.8:</i> "...prior to the adoption date of this Master Program [date of adoption] or any relevant amendment..."</p> <p><i>Section 8.1.D:</i> "...purpose and intent of chapter 90.58 RCW and the applicable guidelines."</p>	<p><i>3-1: Cedar River, shown here, is not included. This change is already correctly addressed in Attachment B.</i></p>
--	--	--	--	--	--