

# Attachment D: Camas SMP – Responsiveness Summary (State Comment Period 5/4 to 6/4/2012)

ITEM	Topic or Section Number (cite)	Commenter	Specific Comment	Local Government Response and Rationale Ecology Response in <i>italics</i>
1	General	George Fornes, WA Department of Fish & Wildlife	Thank you for considering WDFW comments. We support the current draft.	Comment noted.
2	Shoreline jurisdiction – Mill Pond	LeAnne Bremer, Miller Nash LLP	Revise the SMP, including the map, to remove any indication that Mill Pond is a regulated water body under the SMA (per attached order from the Shoreline Hearings Board SHB 11-020)	The city’s shoreline map will be revised accordingly.  <i>Ecology response: Shoreline Hearings Board #11-020 found that Mill Pond shares the Ordinary High Water Mark but is separate and distinct from Round Lake. Because it is less than 20 acres it is not subject to the SMA. Mill Pond will not be regulated under the SMA except those portions that are located within 200’ of the OHWM of Round Lake. See Attachment B – Required Changes.</i>
3	SMP Maps – Mill Pond and shoreline jurisdiction	Manoj Kripilani	The Camas SMP shows that Mill Pond is regulated under the SMA. The Shoreline Hearings Board decision determined that Mill Pond is distinct, is less than 20 Acres, and serves a different purpose than Round Lake and can’t be regulated under the SMA. The Camas SMP needs corrections to reflect the Board’s order.	The city’s shoreline map will be revised accordingly.  <i>Ecology: See #2 above</i>
4	SMP Uses	Manoj Kripilani	The SMA has preferred uses but not all development can be water-oriented. Don’t prohibit non-water oriented use as these can be beneficial to the community.	One purpose of the Shoreline Management Act is to provide for appropriate uses along shorelines, with a stated preference for water-dependent, water-related, and water-enjoyment uses.  <i>Ecology response: Non-water oriented uses are not prohibited in the proposed SMP but the SMP clearly states a preference for water-dependent development consistent with RCW 90.58.020 and WAC 173-26.</i>
5	No Net Loss	Manoj Kripilani	The goal is to achieve no net loss of ecological functions over time yet the SMP has language that states “net gain” The SMP should reflect the goal of no net loss.	Nowhere in the city’s SMP is there any requirement for a net gain of ecological function. However, the stated purpose of <i>voluntary</i> restoration efforts is a net gain in shoreline ecological function. (See

ITEM	Topic or Section Number (cite)	Commenter	Specific Comment	Local Government Response and Rationale Ecology Response in <i>italics</i>
				page 3-5, Section 3.8.1 Goal)  <i>Ecology: Concur</i>
6	"recordings" for dedication of private land	Manoj Kripilani	"Recordings" for dedication of private land should not be forced. This should be voluntary and encouraged for owners of smaller parcels.	The only situation in which an easement is required is when the Shoreline Administrator requires existing wetlands to be protected in perpetuity by a covenant or easement; and for public access easements.  <i>Ecology: Concur</i>
7	Recordings and land dedications	Manoj Kripilani	Any requirements of these recordings and land dedications imposed by the SMP must be the responsibility of the public and local government.	(See response above at #6)  <i>Ecology: Comment noted.</i>
8	Chapter 8 - Definitions	Manoj Kripilani	Include a definition of "party having interest" as provided for in RCW 90.58.130.	RCW 90.58.130 requires that reasonable efforts be made to inform people about the SMP and its purposes, and to encourage participation in decision-making. The city's SMP continues to require that notices of proposed shoreline development be sent to adjacent property owners, and requires posting of a development sign viewable from the public right-of-way (See page B-3, Appendix B).  <i>Ecology: Whether the term is defined in the SMP or not, the statutory requirements still hold. In review of the locally adopted SMP, Ecology finds that Camas and the Clark County Coalition have met the requirements to inform and invite participation by all persons and entities having interest in the master program and shorelines of the state (see Attachment A – Findings and Conclusions).</i>
9	Public Access	Manoj Kripilani	If requiring public access, public access sites should be consolidated, with parking available on publicly owned lands.	Comment noted. Due to the fact that the waters of the state are a public asset, one of the goals of the Shoreline Management Act is to ensure there is public access to this asset. In the city's SMP, public access, potentially including parking, is required on shoreline development proposals that involve public funding; land divisions; and non-residential shoreline development unless that development meets specific criteria (See page 5-5).

ITEM	Topic or Section Number (cite)	Commenter	Specific Comment	Local Government Response and Rationale Ecology Response in <i>italics</i>
				<p><i>Ecology: Concur. Public access is one of the major policies of the SMA (RCW 90.58.020). The Guidelines (WAC 173-26-221(4) define it as “the ability of the general public to reach, touch, and enjoy the water’s edge, to travel on the waters of the state, and to view the water and the shoreline from adjacent locations.” The design, form and location of public access sites is left to local jurisdictions but the Guidelines encourage s planning for an integrated shoreline public access system.</i></p>
10	Land segregation	Manoj Kripilani	Submitted map of area between Lacamas Lake and SR 500 - Maps and text need to reflect the area is segregated and divided by fence, SR 500, manmade bridges and lake.	<p>The city’s shoreline map will be revised consistent with the decision of the Shoreline Hearings Board.</p> <p><i>Ecology: Shoreline designation maps are not intended to reflect site-specific features but are meant to indicate the approximate boundaries of those areas that are located within shoreline jurisdiction. Site specific conditions are reviewed during any permit application process.</i></p>
11	Beaver dams	Manoj Kripilani	Include provisions on how to address health hazards caused by standing water.	<p>This is not a function of an SMP, but rather for the county’s vector control department.</p> <p><i>Ecology: Concur</i></p>
12	Shoreline setbacks	Jan Baldwin	Why does Camas have a 35' setback (from the high water mark) for medium density housing, while the rest of Clark County cities are requiring a 50' minimum setback for the same. I also think you will find some different setback requirements in high density.	<p>The SMA allows local governments the ability to set standards based on local conditions. There are also critical area buffers that if applicable to that parcel would require buffers that are greater than the minimum of 35’.</p> <p><i>Ecology: Concur. Identified setbacks are minimum standards. Any proposal must meet both the shoreline setback and any required critical area buffer. The residential setbacks listed in Table 6-1 have a footnote (Footnote 2) which provides that uses may only be set back less than the 150’ critical area Type S (shoreline stream) buffer as provided in Section 5.3(2) or in Appendix C Section 16.61.040(D)(2) Stream Buffer Area Reduction and Averaging. In most cases, this will result in development located greater than 35’ from the OHWM.</i></p>

ITEM	Topic or Section Number (cite)	Commenter	Specific Comment	Local Government Response and Rationale Ecology Response in <i>italics</i>
13	Shoreline setbacks	Jan Baldwin	Do Camas's shoreline setbacks (in general) meet the state's requirements?	<p>The proposed setbacks along with the supporting policies and regulations were reviewed and supported by independent scientists, to ensure, at minimum, no net loss of shoreline ecological functions.</p> <p><i>Ecology: Camas's shoreline setbacks generally meet the state's requirements and are applied in conjunction with required critical area buffers. Ecology does not provide numerical standards for setbacks but does require that SMP provisions be analyzed to ensure the provisions of the SMP, on a planning level, are achieving no net loss over time when implemented. This was adequately demonstrated by the Revised Cumulative Effects Analysis, Matrix of Potential Impacts by Reach (Parametrix, December 2011). In addition, each development proposal must first avoid, then minimize impacts. If there are unavoidable impacts there must be mitigation. Shoreline permit and exemption decisions will be tracked over time and Camas is required to assess whether no net loss has been achieved in 8 years. If not, revisions to the SMP may be necessary.</i></p>