

# SMP Periodic Update 2020

*Exhibit H: Written Public Comments on the Draft Amendments received by staff (updated 9/20/2021 to include P/C Hearing testimony)*

*(Note: Some section numbers in the draft documents have been revised after some of the earlier comments were received and may no longer be accurate.)*

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
BP01	Jeff Chalfant, BP	9/18/20	B	C/P Ch. 11	Removal of "policies" from code and moving it to the Comprehensive Plan – County staff confirmed that all language was transferred to Comp Plan without edits (except for grammatical corrections).	Correct.
BP02	Jeff Chalfant, BP	9/18/20	D	23.20.050(B)(10)	Adding Cherry Point Management Area as a new "Shoreline Environment" – County staff confirmed that this is a simplification step and that no changes to permitted uses or development were made.	Correct. While the CPMA was treated like an environment designation, it just wasn't called out as such.
BP03	Jeff Chalfant, BP	9/18/20	D	23.30.030(D), 23.40.125(E)(1)(e), 23.40.150(C)(2), 23.40.210(B)(8)	The use of galvanized steel appears to be a newly prohibited material for use in or above shoreline. While we understand the limitation for the use of such materials in water there are no feasible alternatives for use above the water on our pier for equipment and structural components. It is our understanding based on our discussion that our comment is consistent with feedback received from the Parks Department and was not the intent and that an adjustment to the language will be made to allow for use above the water.	We have removed the (newly added) prohibition on galvanized steel, as we could find no mention of it in state law or guidance.
BP04	Jeff Chalfant, BP	9/18/20	D	23.30.040(l) & 23.40.020(F)(4)	Fences and signs have specific limitations in terms of size, height, and setback that cannot be accommodated due to requirements of the Coast Guard and other Federal agencies associate with industrial security requirements. We recommend the addition of a provision that will allow for the construction of security fencing and signage required by such regulations including Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards (CFATS) codified a 6 CFR, Part 27.	Based on this comment we have added to 23.40.020(F)(9) (Shoreline Bulk Provisions) "provided, that the Director may exempt security fencing from this requirement as required by federal or state regulations" to acknowledge that in certain circumstances higher fences may be allowed. Additionally, we have added "Signage required by state or federal security requirements" as an exemption to 20.40.020(F)(10)(b)).

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
BP05	Jeff Chalfant, BP	9/18/20	D	23.40.010(B)	<i>Table 1 – Shoreline uses for Cherry Point Environment Area</i> Fill and Excavation activities are shown as a prohibited use. However, there are development activities that are permitted within the Cherry Point Environment that require the use of fill and excavation. County staff acknowledged this discrepancy as unintentional and will amend the language to ensure that fill and grading activities are allowed as a part of approved use and development.	The existing regulation in 23.40.125(E)(3) has always said that fill is prohibited in the CPMA, though provides an exception of “the minimum necessary to access piers or other structures that provide access to the water.” We believe this covers your concern. We have, however, clarified that “fill or excavation waterward of the OHWM requires a shoreline conditional use permit,” which is a requirement of the SMA. In the Use Table 1 we have also changed it to be “X/C*,” meaning that fill and excavation is prohibited except as otherwise permitted by the specific regulations (i.e., 23.40.125(E)(3))
BP06	Jeff Chalfant, BP	9/18/20	D	23.40.010	<i>Table 1 – Shoreline uses for Cherry Point Environment Area, Shoreline Stabilization</i> Revetments are shown as a prohibited use; however, bulkheads are allowed as a conditional use. The definition of bulkheads indicates that revetments are sometimes bulkheads. We understand that this is an unintended circular reference and that the County will amend the definition of bulkhead to remove the reference to revetments and replace with a more appropriate reference to the use of rip rap.	We have struck “such as a revetment or seawall” from the definition of bulkhead (20.60.020(16)) to address this circular inconsistency.
BP07	Jeff Chalfant, BP	9/18/20	D	23.40.010	<i>Table 1 – Shoreline uses for Cherry Point Environment Area, Industrial Moorage</i> The heading of the table indicates industrial moorage includes piers, docks and buoys. The definition of pier indicates that it includes other structures not normally considered to fit Ecology’s definition of a pier such as mooring buoys. County staff clarified that the intent was not to prohibit the installation of buoys and that the definition for piers will be amended to be consistent with the Ecology definition and that it will be clarified that buoys are permitted in the Cherry Point Management Area.	We have deleted the term “recreational” in reference to mooring buoys in Table 1 and added a P (permitted) in the Cherry Point Environment. Additionally, we have modified Table 1 to indicate that mooring buoys are not included as general public, commercial, or industrial moorage for the purposes of the table; the mooring buoys row does.
DOEWG01	Nate Brown, DOE	9/21/20	F	16.16.630	We acknowledge and support the County’s proposed adoption	Comment noted.

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
	Wetlands Group				of buffer tables from Ecology's Wetland Guidance. This approach provides the most flexibility by basing the widths of buffers on three factors: the wetland category, the intensity of the impacts, and the functions or special characteristics of the wetland.	
DOEWG02	Nate Brown, DOE Wetlands Group	9/21/20	F	16.16.225(8)	<p>We are particularly concerned about the provision allowing alteration of "functionally disconnected" ...wetlands. This term appears to be undefined in the CAO. In addition, there are no acreage thresholds for this provision. Nor is there apparent consideration that wetlands that are unconnected to larger undisturbed landscapes can still provide important functions, specifically water quality and hydrologic storage. Additionally, some Category III wetlands may provide high habitat functions, which warrant larger buffers, not weaker protections.</p> <p>We also note that this change does not appear to be supported by any findings in the Whatcom County Best Available Review: Addendum to the 2005 BAS Report. Nor does this approach align with the strategies detailed in the Birch Bay Watershed Characterization and Watershed Planning Pilot Study: <a href="https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/documents/0706030.pdf">https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/documents/0706030.pdf</a>.</p> <p>We offer the following questions in an attempt to better understand the County's rationale for this approach:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What scientific basis is there for reducing protections on these wetlands?</li> <li>• Has any analysis been conducted to indicate these wetlands are not important resources in the UGA?</li> <li>• Has any analysis been conducted of how many wetlands would be affected and what the functions and values of those wetlands are?</li> <li>• Would mitigation be required to occur within the UGAs? If not, what are the cumulative effects of large-scale loss of wetlands in the UGAs in the County?</li> </ul> <p>In the absence of this information it is unclear how implementation of this provision could achieve No Net Loss of ecological function. In addition, the concept of functional isolation cannot</p>	Deleted "functionally disconnected" and amended as per conversation with DOE staff.

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					<p>be applied in SMA jurisdiction since all wetlands within that area are considered associated wetlands, by definition.</p> <p>We recommend the County either conduct a more refined analysis and resulting policy, informed by existing special studies, to develop a scientifically-based approach, or delete subsection (8) from the draft.</p>	
DOEWG03	Nate Brown, DOE Wetlands Group	9/21/20	F	16.16.640(C)(1)	<p><i>Buffer width reduction</i></p> <p>We are concerned about the apparently redundant and potentially additive buffer reduction that is allowed by this section. We cannot determine whether subsection (C)(1) can be applied in addition to the Ecology-recommended buffer reduction strategy listed in subsection (C)(2).</p> <p>If they can both be applied to a single project then they would result in buffers that are well below what science says is necessary to protect wetland functions. For example, in the current draft, a 150-foot buffer for a Category 3 wetland that has moderate habitat function adjacent to high intensity land use. Allowing this buffer to be reduced to 75 feet through additive reductions in (1) and (2) will not provide a buffer adequate to protect the wetlands' habitat functions.</p> <p>We recommend that the language, with respect to these two reduction strategies, be clarified such that they cannot be applied to the same proposal.</p>	Amended as per conversation with DOE staff to clarify that buffer reductions are not additive.
DOEWG04	Nate Brown, DOE Wetlands Group	9/21/20	F	16.16.640(C)(2)	<p>May allow High Impact uses to be reduced to Moderate buffer width if Ecology's minimizing measures are implemented. Per Ecology's CAO guidance, in addition to the minimizing measures, there must be a relatively intact corridor between the wetland and other wetland/priority habitat. Additionally, as worded in the draft regs, this provision does not imply how the applicant chooses which measures to incorporate into the proposal or how many. The wording should be modified to encourage all reasonable/applicable measures. As currently worded, an applicant may argue for the reduction based on minimal measures.</p>	Amended as per conversation with DOE staff to meet DOE guidance.
DOEWG05	Nate Brown, DOE	9/21/20	F	16.16.640(C)(3)	<p>If a buffer width is reduced, then any remaining "substantial"</p>	Deleted "substantial" and amended as

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
	Wetlands Group				(needs a definition) portion of the buffer that is degraded shall be replanted with native vegetation. It is unclear how this relates to buffer mitigation ratios described in 16.16.680(H). The addition of a statement clarifying the applicability of buffer mitigation ratios is needed.	per conversation with DOE staff.
FSJ01	Level Pratt, Friends of the San Juans	9/16/20	F	16.16.710(C)(2)	<p>In the Fish and Wildlife section of the CAO of the SMP (Ch. 16.16), the County mentions ESA-listed species managed by U.S. Fish and Wildlife, but makes no mention of NOAA Fisheries ESA involvement or authority. Further, the County fails to explicitly acknowledge that the marine nearshore is NOAA Fisheries designated critical habitat for Puget Sound Chinook salmon (Figure attached). Research has clearly demonstrated the importance of the marine and estuarine nearshore to the sustainability and recovery of Puget Sound Chinook.</p> <p>To more fully support Chinook and Southern Resident orca recovery, as well as meeting Goals 10A and 10K of the Shoreline Master Program (see also WAC 173-26-221(2)(C)(iii)), Friends of the San Juans recommends the following revision (new text underlined) in WCC §23.05.065(A):</p> <p>16.16.710(C)(2) Areas in which federally listed species are found, have a primary association with, or contain suitable habitat for said listed species, as listed in the U.S. Fish and Wildlife's Threatened and Endangered Species List or Critical Habitat List (<a href="http://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/">http://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/</a>) <u>or the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) (<a href="https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/species-directory/threatened-endangered">https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/species-directory/threatened-endangered</a>), as amended. Note: As of September 2005, NMFS designated the estuarine and marine nearshore environment (extreme high water to a depth of approximately 30 meters mean lower low water, as Puget Sound Chinook Critical Habitat (see Federal Register / Vol. 70, No. 170, 9/2/05) that includes most of the Whatcom County estuarine and marine coastline.</u></p>	We have amended the section (though in practice we've always looked at both lists).
FSJ02	Level Pratt, Friends of the San Juans	9/16/20	F	16.16.225(B)(8)	We also have concerns about a provision in the CAO that is proposed to be incorporated into the SMP that allows for "Alteration of functionally disconnected Type III or IV wetlands when	Based on this and discussions with DOE staff, we have deleted "functionally disconnected" from this provision. Addition-

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					associated with an approved commercial development within an Urban Growth Area;" (WCC §16.16.225.B.8). There is no explanation or definition of a "functionally disconnected" wetland. It is our understanding that they do not exist in the shoreline jurisdiction. The fact they're in the shoreline assumes a functional relationship. We respectfully recommend that the County cite this CAO section as excepted (not included) in the SMP (WCC §23.05.065.A).	ally, based on communication with DOE staff, we have added that the wetlands have to have a habitat score of less than 6 to qualify.
FW/WEC01	Tim Trohimovich, Futurewise, and Rein Attemann, Washington Environmental Council	9/16/20	B	C/P Ch. 11	<p>We strongly support the Climate Change/Sea Level Rise policies with necessary improvements.[They go on to explain why addressing this is important, their interpretation of state requirements, and supporting material.]</p> <p>But more is needed. It is important that wetland and aquatic vegetation be allowed to occur to maintain shoreline functions and values. So we recommend the addition of the following policy on page 11-31 of the PDF version to read as follows.</p> <p><u>Policy 11AA-8: New lots and new and expanded development should be located so they will not interfere with the landward expansion and movement of wetlands and aquatic vegetation as sea level rises.</u></p>	This is a policy decision and all comments will be forwarded to the P/C and Council.
FW/WEC02	Tim Trohimovich, Futurewise, and Rein Attemann, Washington Environmental Council	9/16/20	B	C/P Ch. 11	<p>We recommend that proposed Policy 11AA-5 be modified to read as follows:</p> <p>Policy 11AA-5: <u>Whatcom County shall monitor the impacts of climate change on Whatcom County's shorelands, the shoreline master program's ability to adapt to sea level rise, and other aspects of climate change at least every periodic update, and revise the shoreline master program as needed.</u> Whatcom County <del>shall</del> <u>should</u> periodically assess the best available sea level rise projections <u>and other sciences related to climate change within shoreline jurisdiction</u>, and incorporate them into future program updates, as relevant.</p>	This is a policy decision and all comment will be forwarded to the P/C and Council.
FW/WEC03	Tim Trohimovich, Futurewise, and Rein Attemann, Washington Environmental Council	9/16/20	D	23.05.130(A)	<p>Modify the property rights section so that it is consistent with state and federal law.</p> <p>Proposed 23.05.130(A) would provide that the regulation of private property must be consistent with all relevant constitu-</p>	Our attorney believes that this language does not allow the County to override the SMP. It simply states a legal truth—that regulation of property must be consistent

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					tional and other legal limitations including local laws. This provision would allow W/C to adopt policies or regulations that override the Ecology's approved SMP. This violates the SMA and cannot be adopted.	with other laws. This does not somehow give the County permission to amend the SMP without Ecology's approval.
FW/WEC04	Tim Trohimovich, Futurewise, and Rein Attemann, Washington Environmental Council	9/16/20	D	23.05.130(E)	Proposed 23.05.130(E) provides that this "program shall not be applied retroactively in a way that requires lawfully existing uses and developments (as of the original effective date of this program) to be removed." This provision will prevent the amortization of existing uses in hazardous areas, such as channel migration zones, frequently flooded areas, and areas subject to sea level rise. This would allow frequently flooded homes to always be rebuilt, no matter the hazard. This is poor policy and should not be adopted.	Our attorney agrees with the commenter on this matter; we have removed (E).
FW/WEC05	Tim Trohimovich, Futurewise, and Rein Attemann, Washington Environmental Council	9/16/20	D	23.10.030(C)(2)	Proposed 23.10.030(C)(2) provides "that substantive amendments shall become effective immediately upon adoption by the Department of Ecology." But all SMP amendments must be approved by Ecology and become effective 14 days after Ecology adopts them. Proposed 23.10.030(C)(2) should be modified to reflect these requirements.	The commenter is correct. Though we'd amended similar language in 23.05.090 to meet this requirement, we missed it in this section. The section has now been revised.
FW/WEC06	Tim Trohimovich, Futurewise, and Rein Attemann, Washington Environmental Council	9/16/20	D	23.10.030(C)(3)	Proposed 23.10.030(C)(3) provides that the County Council makes final decisions on shoreline conditional use permits and variances. Ecology must approve both conditional use permits and variances. So this section should provide that these are final County decisions, not final decisions on the permits.	The commenter is correct. Though proposed Ch. 22.07 correctly spells it out, we missed it in this section. The section has now been revised.
FW/WEC07	Tim Trohimovich, Futurewise, and Rein Attemann, Washington Environmental Council	9/16/20	D	23.30.010(B)	Modify so that it is consistent with the SMA and SMP Guidelines. The WA Court of Appeals has held that "reasonable and appropriate uses should be allowed on the shorelines <i>only if they will result in no net loss of shoreline ecological functions and systems</i> . See RCW 90.58.020; WAC 173-27-241(3)(j)."  However proposed 23.30.010(B) exempts development, use, and activities within the shoreline jurisdiction and within "legally existing substantially developed areas" from the no net loss requirement. This violates the SMA and SMP Guidelines cited by the court of appeals. Proposed 23.30.010(B) also ignores avoidance and minimization and can be read to exempt development in critical areas from the no net loss standard. We rec-	We have amended the text as the commenter has suggested.

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					<p>commend that proposed 23.30.010(B) be modified to read as follows:</p> <p>B. Development, use, and activities within the shoreline jurisdiction <del>and outside of critical areas and legally existing substantially developed areas</del> shall avoid and minimize adverse impacts, and any unavoidable impacts shall be mitigated to meet no net loss of ecological function and ecosystem-wide processes pursuant to WAC 173-26-186.</p>	
FW/WEC08	Tim Trohimovich, Futurewise, and Rein Attemann, Washington Environmental Council	9/16/20	D	23.30.010(B)	The mitigation sequencing requirement in <i>existing</i> WCC 23.30.010(B) must be retained or included elsewhere in the SMP regulations. Mitigation sequencing applies to all development in shorelines jurisdiction, not just development that adversely impacts critical areas. Deleting existing WCC 23.30.010(B) and relying only on the critical areas regulations violates WAC 173-26-201(2)(e)(ii)(A) and other provisions of the SMP Guidelines.	WAC 173-26-201(2)(e)(ii)(A) seems to be addressing how one applies mitigation sequencing to mitigation applied through SEPA review for those types of impacts not regulated by the SMP (e.g., traffic impacts). The County has already adopted WAC 197-11-768 by reference in our SEPA regulations (WCC 16.08.175).
FW/WEC09	Tim Trohimovich, Futurewise, and Rein Attemann, Washington Environmental Council	9/16/20	D	23.30.050 Ch. 16.16	We recommend that shoreline jurisdiction be expanded to include the 100-year floodplain and that the buffers for river and stream shoreline be increased to use the newly recommended 200-year SPTH of 204 feet and that this width should be measured from the edge of the channel, channel migration zone, or active floodplain whichever is wider. This will help maintain shoreline functions and Chinook habitat.	<p>Proposed WCC 23.20.010(B)(4 lists the shoreline jurisdiction as including "floodways and contiguous floodplain areas landward <i>two hundred feet from such floodways,</i>" straight from RCW 90.58.030.</p> <p>The 204 ft. referenced is not a hard SPTH; this is the weighted 3<sup>rd</sup> Quantile. WDFW Vol 2 provides a step by step process to determine the Riparian Management Area for a parcel based on the ability of a given soil type to support tree growth. The 200 yr. index curve is variable, and as shown in Figure A2-33 the SPTH in Whatcom Co. ranges from 101' to 250'. The buffer on Type S Freshwater is proposed to be 200 feet (16.16.740(B), Table 4), measured, presumably, from the edge of the floodway.</p>
FW/WEC10	Tim Trohimovich, Fu-	9/16/20	D	23.30.060	We strongly support the amendments to 23.30.060 to require	This section was developed in consulta-



Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
	turewise, and Rein Attemann, Washington Environmental Council				review of sites that may have cultural or archaeological resources but are concerned that the SMP update deletes the inadvertent discovery requirements in the existing SMP. Even with predevelopment review, cultural resources can still be inadvertently discovered. Proposed WCC 23.30.606 provides that certain state and federal inadvertent discovery provisions apply, but they delete the County's provisions. This will prevent Whatcom County from requiring compliance with the inadvertent discovery requirements. So we recommend that the existing inadvertent discovery requirements in "B" be retained so the County can effectively address the inadvertent discovery of cultural resources.	tion with the Lummi Nation Tribal Historic Preservation Office and the WA State Dept. of Archaeology & Historic Preservation, so we assume it meets all requirements. 23.30.060(B)(3)(a) still requires an inadvertent discovery plan conform to DAHP's most current management standards when warranted.
FW/WEC11	Tim Trohimovich, Futurewise, and Rein Attemann, Washington Environmental Council	9/16/20	D	23.30.070(A)(3)	Proposed WCC 23.30.070(A)(3) must be deleted. WAC 173-26-221(4)(d)(iii) does not allow developments to not provide public access because "[o]ther reasonable and safe opportunities for public access to the shoreline are located within ¼-mile of the proposed development site" as the proposed amendments do.	WAC 173-26-221 applies to the establishment of environment designation boundaries and provisions, and there is no subsection (4)(d), so we're not clear as to what the commenter is referring.
FW/WEC12	Tim Trohimovich, Futurewise, and Rein Attemann, Washington Environmental Council	9/16/20	D	23.30.080	<p>We recommend that the SMP require new lots and new buildings be located outside the area of likely sea level rise and if that is not possible, buildings should be elevated above the likely sea level rise. These requirements will provide better protection for buildings, property, and people and will also allow wetlands and marine vegetation to migrate as the sea level rises. We recommend the following new section be added to the SMP periodic update:</p> <p><b><u>23.30.080 Sea Level Rise.</u></b></p> <p>A. <u>New lots shall be designed and located so that the buildable area is outside the area likely to be inundated by sea level rise in 2100 and outside of the area in which wetlands and aquatic vegetation will likely migrate during that time.</u></p> <p>B. <u>Where lots are large enough, new structures and buildings shall be located so that they are outside the area likely to be inundated by sea level rise in 2100 and outside of the area in which wetlands and aquatic vegetation will likely migrate during that time.</u></p> <p>C. <u>New and substantially improved structures shall be elevat-</u></p>	<p>Before adopting specific regulations, we'd need to know the details of likely sea level rise (location, elevation, magnitude, etc.). The COB and WCPW are currently developing the CoSMoS model, which should provide the best data for Whatcom County. The policies being introduced would set us up for developing such regulations once this model is completed.</p> <p>It should also be noted that in reviewing development proposals, PDS already requires structures to be built above the anticipated flood stage through the County's critical area (i.e., geohazard/tsunami) and flood regulations.</p> <p>Nonetheless, this is a policy decision and all comments will be forwarded to the P/C and Council.</p>

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					<u>ed above the likely sea level rise elevation in 2100 or for the life of the building, whichever is less.</u>	
FW/WEC13	Tim Trohimovich, Futurewise, and Rein Attemann, Washington Environmental Council	9/16/20	D	23.40.010	<i>Table 2, Shoreline Use.</i> We recommend that bulkheads and other forms of hard armoring should be shoreline conditional uses. This ensures that these damaging uses will get an appropriate level or review. The SMP should also provide that all property owners seeking to construct a bulkhead on the shoreline of their property must receive Hydraulic Project Approval (HPA) from the Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife per 2SHB 1579 starting on July 1, 2019.	Our code already allows requires staff to do the same level of review as a substantial or CUP and to condition administrative permits. It also requires a geotechnical analysis for all shoreline stabilization types to ensure the least impactful method is selected.  Obtaining an HPA is already a state requirement for any work in waters of the state. WCC 23.05.040(C) reminds applicants that it's their duty to seek any other required permits from other agencies. Additionally, a standard condition on all of our permits is that one may need additional permits from other agencies. We do not believe that we should be listing every state and federal permit one may need in every section of code where such might apply.
FW/WEC14	Tim Trohimovich, Futurewise, and Rein Attemann, Washington Environmental Council	9/16/20	D	23.90.130(C) (existing)	We oppose the elimination of environment specific impervious surface and open space requirements in current 23.90.130(C) Table 2, Buffer, Setbacks, Height, Open Space, and Impervious Surface Coverage Standards for Shoreline Development.  WAC 173-26-211(5)(b)(ii)(D) requires rural conservancy shoreline environments to limit impervious surfaces to ten percent of the lot which Table 2 currently does. Research by the University of Washington in the Puget Sound lowlands has shown that when total impervious surfaces exceed 5 - to 10% and forest cover declines below 65% of the basin, then salmon habitat in streams and rivers is adversely affected. This science documents the need to retain the existing impervious surface limits and open space standards to achieve no net loss.	New Table 3. Bulk Regulations for Shoreline Development still contains impervious surface limits meeting this requirement.  However, we did miss the open space requirements, and have added them back in as 23.40.020(E) and Table 3
FW/WEC15	Tim Trohimovich, Fu-	9/16/20	D	23.40.125(B)(2)	We strongly support the fossil fuel use regulations in proposed	Comment noted.

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
	turewise, and Rein Attemann, Washington Environmental Council				23.40.125(B)(2). The changing climate shows the need for a just transition away from fossil fuels. The proposed fossil fuel use regulations are an important step in this important transition. We support them.	
FW/WEC16	Tim Trohimovich, Futurewise, and Rein Attemann, Washington Environmental Council	9/16/20	D	23.40.010	In the Cherry Point Aquatic Reserve we recommend that conditional use permits be required for changes of use, that existing uses be defined specifically, and that new piers, docks, wharfs, and wings be prohibited at Cherry Point. These measures are necessary to protect the valuable resources of the Cherry Point Aquatic Reserve.	The County Council is considering such regulations for Title 20 (Zoning), which would also apply. Staff doesn't believe they need to be repeated here. Nonetheless, we have incorporated their proposed use requirements into 23.40.010 Table 2 (Use Table).
FW/WEC17	Tim Trohimovich, Futurewise, and Rein Attemann, Washington Environmental Council	9/16/20	D	23.40.140	<p>We oppose the amendments to 23.40.140 Mining policies and regulations and urge the County to retain the existing policies and regulations as they are needed to achieve no net loss.</p> <p>If mining is going to be allowed in floodplains, floodways, and channel migration zones, which the County is proposing to allow, then additional standards are needed. First, mines should be located outside the channel migration zone so that they do not increase the rate of channel migration. Second, mines should be no deeper than the bottom of the nearby streams and rivers so when the river moves into the mine, which is a certainty, the impacts will be reduced. Third, the mine reclamation plan should have a design so that when the river or stream moves into the mine, the mine workings are not so wide that the captured sediments destabilize the river or stream or increase erosion risks on upstream properties.</p> <p>We recommend that the following new regulation be added.</p> <p><u>D. Mining in the 100-year floodplain, floodway, or channel migration zones shall meet the following standards:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>i. Mines should be located outside the channel migration zone unless there is no feasible alternative site.</u></li> <li><u>ii. Mines shall be no deeper than the bottom of the nearby streams and rivers.</u></li> <li><u>iii. The mine reclamation plan shall have a design so that when the river or stream moves into the mine it is not</u></li> </ul>	Such mining has always been allowed; we're not changing that. Nonetheless, all comments will be forwarded to the P/C and Council.

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					<u>so wide or deep that the captured sediments destabilize the river or stream or increase erosion risks on upstream properties.</u>	
FW/WEC18	Tim Trohimovich, Futurewise, and Rein Attemann, Washington Environmental Council	9/16/20	D	23.40.140	<p>In 2020, the legislature adopted RCW 90.48.615(2) which prohibits “[m]otorized or gravity siphon aquatic mining or discharge of effluent from such activity to any waters of the state that has been designated under the endangered species act as critical habitat, or would impact critical habitat for salmon, steelhead, or bull trout. This includes all fresh waters with designated uses of: Salmonid spawning, rearing, and migration.”</p> <p>We recommend that the SMP Update prohibit motorized or gravity siphon aquatic mining and discharging effluent from this type of mining in shorelines that are the critical habitat for salmon, steelhead, or bull trout and that salmonids use for spawning, rearing, and migration.</p>	We have added a section regarding this.
FW/WEC19	Tim Trohimovich, Futurewise, and Rein Attemann, Washington Environmental Council	9/16/20	D	(existing) 23.100.150	<p>We oppose the amendments to remove policies and regulations encouraging or requiring low-impact development.</p> <p>The update removes some policies and regulations that encouraged, allowed the County to require, or required low-impact development techniques. For example, former (C)(2) on page 156 provided that “[c]lustering and low impact development techniques may be required where appropriate to minimize physical and visual impacts on shorelines in accordance with policies and regulations of WCC 23.90.090.” This regulation has been deleted. While the subdivision regulations are now proposed to allow the County to require clustering, the requirement for low-impact development has been deleted. Low impact development is an important technique for reducing development’s water quality impacts on rivers, lakes, streams, wetlands, and Puget Sound. We urge the County to retain these policies and regulations; they needed to maintain no net loss of shoreline resources.</p>	Former 23.100.150 (C)(2) was moved to 23.40.130(A)(10), though without the reference to LID. At the time, we had been thinking about stormwater LID techniques, which is covered by a general regulation of meeting our Title 20 stormwater regulations; we had not been thinking about LID in terms of plat design. The term has now been reinstated. 23.40.130(A)(10).
FW/WEC20	Tim Trohimovich, Futurewise, and Rein Attemann, Washington	9/16/20	D	(existing) 23.40.200(A)(10), (11), and (12)	Do not delete existing 23.40.200(A)(10), (11), or (12) prohibiting freestanding signs between the right-of-way and buildings, the waterbodies, or placing them in critical areas buffers, or the sign	The SMA, WAC, or DOE guidelines do not address signs. For simplicity’s sake we were proposing to just have our Title

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
	Environmental Council				<p>limits in Table 2, Sign Area Limits.</p> <p>Existing WCC 23.40.200(A)(10), (11), and (12) currently prohibit many freestanding signs between the right-of-way and buildings the waterbodies or placing them in critical area buffer. Signs are not a priority shoreline use, but the policy of the SMA calls on the County and Ecology to protect shoreline views. These existing regulations are necessary to implement the policy of the SMA and cannot be deleted. Existing Table 3 is also needed to limit the sizes of signs in shoreline jurisdiction to implement the policy of the SMA. Again, it cannot be legally deleted.</p>	<p>20 sign regulations address signs. However, T-20 does not address these circumstances, so we have reinserted existing 23.40.200(A)(10), (11), &amp; (12) as 23.40.200(A)(6), (7), &amp; (8).</p> <p>Existing Table 3 does not address sign size.</p>
FW/WEC21	Tim Trohimovich, Futurewise, and Rein Attemann, Washington Environmental Council	9/16/20	F	16.16.265(A)(1)	<p>Require wider setbacks between development and shoreline and critical areas buffers to protect homes and property from wildfire danger.</p> <p>Whatcom County is susceptible to wildfires. Climate change has the potential to increase wildlife risk through changes in fire behavior, wildfire ignitions, fire management, and the vegetation that fuels wildfire.</p> <p>Setbacks from critical areas buffers provide an area in which buildings can be repaired and maintained without having to intrude into the buffer. It also allows for the creation of a Home Ignition Zone that can protect buildings from wildfires and allow firefighters to attempt to save the buildings during a wildfire. Since a 30-foot-wide Home Ignition Zone is important to protect buildings, we recommend that 16.16.265(A)(1) require a setback at least 30 feet wide adjacent to shoreline and critical area buffers. Combustible structures, such as decks, should not be allowed within this setback to protect the building from wildfires. This will increase protection for people and property.</p>	<p>This distance was established by Council and staff is not proposing to change it. However, all comments will be provided to them.</p> <p>(Note that this comment contradicts comments GCD12 and MES09.)</p>
FW/WEC22	Tim Trohimovich, Futurewise, and Rein Attemann, Washington Environmental Council	9/16/20	F	Article 3	<p>We strongly support updating the Geohazard Area standards in Article 3.</p> <p>Whatcom County is susceptible to landslides. The SMP Guidelines, in WAC 173-26-221(2)(c)(ii)(B), provide: "Do not allow new development or the creation of new lots that would cause foreseeable risk from geological conditions to people or improvements during the life of the development." Landslides are a</p>	<p>16.16.322(D) already precludes land divisions, and requires risk-reducing measures be taken for non-division development in geohazard areas. 16.16.310 also covers landslide deposits, scarps and flanks.</p>

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					<p>type of geological hazard that can result in major impacts to people and property.</p> <p>We strongly support designating the landslide deposits, scarps and flanks, and areas with susceptibility to deep and shallow landslides as geologically hazardous areas. This will better protect people and property.</p>	
FW/WEC23	Tim Trohimovich, Futurewise, and Rein Attemann, Washington Environmental Council	9/16/20	F	Article 3	Landslides are capable of damaging commercial, residential, or industrial development at both the tops and toes of slopes due to the earth sliding and other geological events. So the areas at the top, toe, and sides of the slope are geological hazards. We recommend these areas be designated as landslide hazards.	CAO Article 3 already covers this.
FW/WEC24	Tim Trohimovich, Futurewise, and Rein Attemann, Washington Environmental Council	9/16/20	F	Article 3	<p>Require the review of geologically hazardous areas capable of harming buildings or occupants on a development site.</p> <p>We recommend that the regulations require review of any landslide capable of damaging the proposed development. Geological hazards, such as landslides are capable of damaging property outside the hazard itself. The 2014 Oso slide ran out for over a mile (5,500 feet) even though the slope height was 600 feet. A 2006 landslide at Oso traveled over 300 feet. Recent research shows that long runout landslides are more common than had been realized. This research documents that over the past 2000 years, the average landslide frequency of long runout landslides in the area near the Oso landslide is one landslide every 140 years. The landslides ran out from 787 feet to the 2,000 feet of the 2014 landslide. So we recommend that Whatcom County require review of all geological hazards capable of harming a proposed lot or building site.</p>	CAO Article 3 already covers this.
FW/WEC25	Tim Trohimovich, Futurewise, and Rein Attemann, Washington Environmental Council	9/16/20	F	16.16.325(C)	We support WCC 16.16.325(C) which requires individualized setbacks from landslide hazard areas based on the actual hazard. WCC 16.16.325(C) will help protect people and property. Construction should not be allowed in these setbacks.	Comment noted.
FW/WEC26	Tim Trohimovich, Futurewise, and Rein Attemann, Washington Environmental Council	9/16/20	F	Article 5.5	<p>To protect the coastal aquifers, we recommend that Article 5.5 apply to all areas subject to saltwater intrusion.</p> <p>All of the islands in the County and its marine shorelines have</p>	To staff's knowledge, only Lummi Island has been designated as a vulnerable seawater intrusion areas by the County Council (which is why it has the rules in

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					<p>the potential for wells to be contaminated by salt water. WAC 173-26-221(2)(a) requires that shoreline master programs must provide for management of critical areas designated as such pursuant to RCW 36.70A.170(1)(d) located within the shorelines of the state with policies and regulations that ... [p]rovide a level of protection to critical areas within the shoreline area that assures no net loss of shoreline ecological functions necessary to sustain shoreline natural resources." Critical areas include areas with a critical recharging effect on aquifers used for potable waters.</p> <p>Saltwater intrusion can worsen until wells "must be abandoned due to contaminated, unusable water." Saltwater intrusion is often worsened by over-pumping an aquifer. The Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board has held that Growth Management Act requires counties to designate vulnerable seawater intrusion areas as critical aquifer recharge areas. The Board also held that counties must adopt development regulations "to protect aquifers used for potable water from further seawater degradation."</p>	Art. 5.5).
FW/WEC27	Tim Trohimovich, Futurewise, and Rein Attemann, Washington Environmental Council	9/16/20	F	Table 1, Standard Wetland Buffer Widths	We support updating the buffer widths to conform to Ecology's most recent recommendations, as they are based on best available science	Comment noted.
FW/WEC28	Tim Trohimovich, Futurewise, and Rein Attemann, Washington Environmental Council	9/16/20	F	16.16.640(B)	Buffer averaging should not allow widths less than 75% of the required buffer for all wetlands. Type IV wetlands have important functions and values. Allowing 50% buffer reductions for type IV wetlands is inconsistent with best available science and should not be allowed.	Based on this comment we have removed the allowance for Type IV wetlands in 16.16.640(B) and inserted the language from 2016 DOE Guidance (XX.040 Exemptions and Allowed Uses in Wetlands) providing exceptions to regulation of certain wetlands/buffers from regulation in a new section 16.16.612.
FW/WEC29	Tim Trohimovich, Futurewise, and Rein Attemann, Washington Environmental Council	9/16/20	F	16.16.740(B)	<p>Retain using the PHS recommendations as the default for buffers and management recommendation priority habitats and species.</p> <p>Currently, Table 4, Buffer Requirements for Habitat Conservation Areas (HCAs), provides that for areas with which federally</p>	While the text in the table is proposed for deletion, amended (B)(2) requires that minimum buffers be based on habitat a management plan prepared pursuant to WCC 16.16.750, subsection (B)(4) of

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					<p>listed species have a primary association, state priority habitats, and areas with which priority species have a primary association the "[m]inimum buffers shall be based on recommendations provided by the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife PHS Program; provided, that local and site-specific factors shall be taken into consideration and the buffer width based on the best available information concerning the species/habitat(s) in question and/or the opinions and recommendations of a qualified professional with appropriate expertise." This requirement is being deleted and instead the buffers are based on a habitat a management plan. While we recognize the habitat management plan will include information on the PHS program recommendation and a survey of best available science related to the species or habitat, the current requirement is clearer that the default buffer should be the PHS recommendations. We think this is clearer and provides better protection for priority species and habitats and recommend it be retained.</p>	<p>which requires that assessment reports include Management recommendations developed by WDFW through its PHS program. Thus, the requirement is still there (and always was, as this section isn't proposed for modification).</p>
FW/WEC30	Tim Trohimovich, Futurewise, and Rein Attemann, Washington Environmental Council	9/16/20	F	16.16.740(B)	<p>We also recommend that the required consultation with Indian Tribes and Nations in Table 4 be retained. They have significant expertise on fish and wildlife and their habitat needs.</p>	<p>16.16.750(C) still allows for agency and tribal consultation.</p>
FW/WEC31	Tim Trohimovich, Futurewise, and Rein Attemann, Washington Environmental Council	9/16/20			<p>We support preparing a No Net Loss technical memo. While WAC 173-26-090(2)(d)(ii) provides that "[t]he review process provides the method for bringing shoreline master programs into compliance with the requirements of the act that have been added or changed since the last review and for responding to changes in guidelines adopted by the department, together with a review for consistency with amended comprehensive plans and regulations," this provision does not excuse compliance with WAC 173-26-090(2)(d)(i) and cannot override RCW 90.58.080(4)(a) of the Shoreline Management Act. So, while SMPs must be brought into compliance with new laws and new SMP Guidelines, they must also comply with all current provisions of the SMA and the SMP Guidelines including the no net loss requirement. We urge Whatcom County to update the SMP to achieve no net loss.</p>	<p>A NNL technical memo will be prepared prior to the P/C making their recommendations to Council. We thought it more appropriate to do this task after the public comment period in case the proposals needed to be amended.</p>
GCD01	Glyn & Carol Davies	9/23/20	D	23.10.160(C)	<p>A penalty of double standard post development is excessive.</p>	<p>This section doesn't say that penalties in</p>



Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					Please consider reducing the penalty to the cost of mitigation plus a percentage penalty in the range of 15% - 25%.	the way of fines are doubled; it says that "corrective action, restoration, or mitigation" will be required at a double ratio "when appropriate" as a way to discourage violations.
GCD02	Glyn & Carol Davies	9/23/20	D	23.30.040(C)	Please consider clarifying the planting of vegetation to minimize impacts to views from the water requirement in this provision. For example, views from the water are optimized by plants and shrubs that do not exceed 3' – 4' in height. Dense, forested vegetation on the shoreline is highly obstructive to views, so this provision should be clear regarding the type of vegetation that protects views.	This provision is aimed at protecting views from the water. The SMA requires protecting views to <i>and from</i> the water. (RCW 90.58.020)
GCD03	Glyn & Carol Davies	9/23/20	D	23.40.020(F)	Suggest adding a 15 <sup>th</sup> provision to this clause to conform to 16.16.720(G)(4) Accessory Uses. "When located in the shoreline jurisdiction, residential water-oriented accessory structures may be permitted in an HCA buffer; provided that the size shall be limited to 10% of the buffer's area or 500 square feet, whichever is less."	We have added a cross reference to that section.
GCD04	Glyn & Carol Davies	9/23/20	D	23.40.150(A)(2)	<i>"No pier or dock shall be used for a residence."</i> This provision should be deleted since it contradicts 23.40.150(A)(A) that allows moorage for single family residences.	23.40.150(A)(A) to which the commenter refers is proposed for deletion. Furthermore, it refers to "moorage associated with a SFR," which means a private dock at a private SFR (i.e., a personal dock), which is still allowed. The prohibition in 23.40.150(A)(2) refers to someone living on their boat or dock.
GCD05	Glyn & Carol Davies	9/23/20	D	23.40.150(A, B, & C)	<i>Dimensional Standards – Freshwater and Marine – tables</i> Please consider allowing ramps to be 6' wide rather than 4' wide as a safety measure when transporting kayaks, canoes, or boating provisions, equipment and supplies to the dock for launching (kayaks or canoes) or loading into a boat (ice chests, water skis, wakeboards, etc.). 4' is narrow when carrying bulky items to the float, and can be dangerous, particularly if the ramp or pier is high off the water due to the shoreline configuration relative to the float. This would also mean increasing the square footage for the individual use dock or pier to 520 sq. ft. to accommodate	WDFW regulations in WAC 220-660-140 and 380 limit the width of residential dock ramps to 4' wide.

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					a 6' wide ramp, and increasing the added square footage if the dock has to be extended due to water depth to 6 sq. ft. rather than 4 sq. ft.	
GCD06	Glyn & Carol Davies	9/23/20	D	23.40.150(A, B, & C)	We also suggest changing the minimum water depth to either 10' measured below ordinary high water, or 6' measured over mean low low water. This is to allow adequate clearance for propellers to protect the sea floor or lake bed from turbulence when a boat is operating in shallow water	Changing to a 10' standard would essentially allow a doubling of the length of docks on our lakes, when we're required to minimize overwater structures. It would also interfere with public navigation.
GCD07	Glyn & Carol Davies	9/23/20	D	23.40.150(C)(8)	Please consider adding a qualifier to this provision stating "...unless shoreline constraints, and/or positioning of pilings make it infeasible to create sufficient buoyancy for the float without positioning flotation components under a portion of the grating."	This standard is from WDFW regulations in WAC 220-660-140 and 380.
GCD08	Glyn & Carol Davies	9/23/20	D	23.40.150(D)(6)	Please consider increasing the size of a covered moorage accessory for a single-family pier or dock to 500 sq. feet (25 x 20) and 20 ft. in height above OHWM to accommodate larger boats that are increasingly common on the lakes in Whatcom County. Also please consider deleting the requirement in this provision that the cover (the "roof materials") be "...translucent or at least 50% clear skylights." The purpose of a covered moorage is to protect the boat, principally from sunlight, which is not served by a translucent cover. Additionally, even if the cover is translucent, the boat under it is not, which defeats the purpose of a translucent cover in any case.	These standards are from DOE guidance.
GCD09	Glyn & Carol Davies	9/23/20	D	23.40.170(C)(3)	Please consider increasing the total allowed footprint of home, sidewalks and similar structures, parking areas and normal appurtenances to "the greater of 40% of the total area of the lot or 4,000 sq. ft." 2,500 sq. ft. is small for just the residence by today's standards, and is prohibitively small when it includes the garage, driveway, sidewalks, decks, patios, etc. in addition to the home.	This provision is existing and is for construction on constrained lots, which by definition cannot accommodate larger development; if one wants a larger home, one can buy an unconstrained lot.
GCD10	Glyn & Carol Davies	9/23/20	F	16.16.235(4)(b)(iii)	Why is tree replacement at a 3:1 ratio? Please consider a tree replacement ratio of 1:1.	A 3:1 ratio is based on DOE guidance, which recommends a ratio of 4:1 for mature trees and 2:1 for young trees. For simplicities sake, we averaged it. Additionally, this is the same replacement

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
						ratio in on Council's adopted tree protection regulations for Lake Whatcom and our other special watershed districts.
GCD11	Glyn & Carol Davies	9/23/20	F	16.16.235(B)(5)(e)	Please consider a pruning height for shrubs on the order of 2' – 3' in order to minimize view obstruction.	We have now moved that provision from the view corridor section to the vegetation management section.
GCD12	Glyn & Carol Davies	9/23/20	F	16.16.265(A)(1)	Please consider eliminating the building setback. The purpose of the critical area buffer is to provide protection; with generous buffer requirements (100' for shoreline, 50' – 100' for critical areas, etc.) there is no need for an additional 10' building setback (or consider reducing the building setback to 5' from the buffer).	This setback was established by Council and staff is not proposing to change it. We have, however, amended the section to allow for a reduction where the setback isn't warranted, modeled on the COB's similar regulation.  (Note that this comment contradicts comment FW/WEC21.)
GCD13	Glyn & Carol Davies	9/23/20	F	16.16.265(A)(1)(b)	Please consider allowing for a grade-level deck that is covered by a corresponding deck on the 2 <sup>nd</sup> floor, as well as the bottom of the stairs/staircase for access to a second level deck, if any.	Comment noted.
GCD14	Glyn & Carol Davies	9/23/20	F	16.16.270(C)(12)	Same comment as GCD08 above: Please consider increasing the total allowed footprint of home, garages/shops, decks, parking, and all lawn and nonnative landscaping to "the greater of 40% of the total area of the lot or 4,000 sq. ft." 2,500 sq. ft. is small for just the residence by today's standards, and is prohibitively small when it includes the garage, driveway, sidewalks, decks and patios and lawn in addition to the home. Also, 23.40.170.C.3 allows an additional 500 sq. ft. for landscaping, lawn, turf, ornamental vegetation, or garden. This provision should match and allow the same additional 500 sq. ft.	Reasonable use as proposed would now be the last effort to avoid a constitutional taking and allow development on very constrained lots and these cases should be rare. The new paradigm is to administratively allow up to 50% buffer reduction (with mitigation) through a minor variance (administrative) and a greater reduction with a public hearing (Hearing Examiner). This new approach should provide greater flexibility while cutting down on costs to applicants and cases going to the H/E. The shoreline code cited is what is allowed without a shoreline variance; an applicant always has the option to seek a larger footprint through a variance.
GCD15	Glyn & Carol Davies	9/23/20	F	16.16.620(F)	Please allow for a storage tank when a storage tank is mandated by County requirements for the well.	A storage tank is not required to be adjacent to a well, as is a pump(house); it could be placed elsewhere on a property,

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
						outside of critical areas/buffers.
GCD16	Glyn & Carol Davies	9/23/20	F	16.16.620(G)(2)(d)	Please consider allowing the dispersion outfall within the outer 50% of the buffer.	The 25% is existing language; however, we have proposed adding, "unless a closer location is demonstrated to be the only feasible location" to account for odd circumstances.
GCD17	Glyn & Carol Davies	9/23/20	F	16.16.265(A)(1)	Please consider eliminating the building setback. The purpose of the critical area buffer is to provide protection; with generous buffer requirements (100' for shoreline, 50' – 100' for critical areas, etc.) there is no need for an additional 10' building setback (or consider reducing the building setback to 5' from the buffer).	We have added text to the section describing its purpose.  However, this setback was established by Council and staff is not proposing to change it.
GCD18	Glyn & Carol Davies	9/23/20	F	16.16.680(F)	Please consider limiting the replacement ratio for preservation to 3 times the ratio for reestablishment or creation (in most cases, 1:1 ratio should be applicable, so a 3 times ratio is generous and should suffice).	Mitigation ratios for wetland impacts are taken verbatim from DOE guidance.
GCD19	Glyn & Carol Davies	9/23/20	F	16.16.720(A)	Since you are proposing eliminating provision "O" under this section that calls out residential, perhaps reference residential use in this provision: "...including, without limitation, residential uses."	We're not sure to what the commenter is referring.
GCD20	Glyn & Carol Davies	9/23/20	F	16.16.720(B)(3)	Please allow for a storage tank when a storage tank is mandated by County requirements for the well.	Tanks do not necessarily need to be next to a well, as a pump house does. Tanks could be located elsewhere on a property, outside of critical areas/buffers.
GCD21	Glyn & Carol Davies	9/23/20	F	16.16.720(G)(1)(d)	Please consider 6 foot width for private trails.	Comment noted.
GCD22	Glyn & Carol Davies	9/23/20	F	16.16.745(C)(1)(c)	Please consider allowing buffer reduction to 65% of the standard buffer specified in the table.	The amendments proposed are intended to meet DOE guidance. As such, we cannot vary without developing our own Best Available Science.
GCD23	Glyn & Carol Davies	9/23/20	F	16.16.760(8)	Please consider mitigation at 1:1 ratio regardless of whether placed before or after impact occurs. Sometimes mitigation must occur after the impact occurs for logistical reasons. This should not result in a 25% penalty.	This ratio is not proposed for amendment; Council approved it in 2017 to account for temporal loss.
LNTHPO01	Tamela Smart, Lummi Nation Tribal Historic Preservation Office	9/15/20	D	23.60.030(18)	One of our primary concerns is the use of the term "significant" in regards to cultural resources. This term has a specific meaning under Federal law. The definition that is included for this	The term significant has been deleted from the definition of "cultural resource site" as it is no longer used in the regula-

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					term on page 227 is taken from the Federal process and it does not apply here. Under state law a different process is followed.	tions.
MES01	Ed Miller, Miller Environmental Services	9/18/20	F	16.16.255(B)	Subsection (5) was stricken, and a side bar note says this is addressed by (4). This does not appear to be the case as 4 is an allowance for water dependent use.	We think the commenter erred in his reference. Allowance for water dependent uses is subsection (3); (4) refers to uses allowed by Ch. 16.16, which includes activities allowed with or without notification.
MES02	Ed Miller, Miller Environmental Services	9/18/20	F	6.16.255(B)(8)	<i>Alteration of functionally disconnected Type III or IV wetlands with associated with an approved commercial development within an Urban Growth Area.</i> Please define "functionally disconnected". If this was intended to mean "isolated wetlands", this provision would exclude many wetlands that have seasonally flowing outlets within the Birch Bay area. Also, why doesn't this exemption apply to residential development in other UGAs?	The term "functionally disconnected" has been deleted.
MES03	Ed Miller, Miller Environmental Services	9/18/20	F	16.16.225(C)	Please define "ecological connectivity" and "habitat corridors." It appears this section will grant the County the authority to protect/prohibit development over areas outside of defined critical areas and their buffers. The language is vague, which will create unpredictable review and requirements. A corridor could be 10 feet wide or >300 feet wide, depending on which species we are seeking to maintain a corridor for. Additionally, corridors are already covered in the CAO, as a WDFW priority habitat covered under the HCA section.	The commenter is correct. However, this verbiage was added in response to the Council's direction in the adopted scoping document.
MES04	Ed Miller, Miller Environmental Services	9/18/20	F	16.16.225(D)	Was this section intended to apply to native plant communities within critical areas and buffers or within any native plant community "associated" with critical areas? What does "associated" mean? This could potentially imply that any native vegetation beyond the regulated buffer should be prioritized for protection. This new section seeks to extend authority over all vegetation (native and non-native) on a property.	The CAO only applies to critical areas and their buffers, and as adopted by reference in the SMP, only applies to the shoreline jurisdiction. This proposed language does not extend authority over all vegetation on a property.
MES05	Ed Miller, Miller Environmental Services	9/18/20	F	16.16.230(B)	We noted the verbiage change from the prior "exempt activities" title. With this modification, no activities would be exempt from the critical areas ordinance. Additionally, under subsection B of this section, the language was modified to remove the allowance to prune or plant ornamental or native trees within critical	Per state law, <i>all</i> activities are subject to the CAO, including those listed here. They are not exempt; they just don't need a permit or review. We changed the title

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					areas or buffers. This would take away any rights to prune or plant native or non-native trees in lawfully established gardens or landscaped areas, including fruit trees? Why? This seems to be taking away some existing established rights. This section is inconsistent with 16.16.235.B.4.a.i.	to make it clearer.  Pruning (and all vegetation management) still listed as an activity allowed in buffers with notification (16.16.230((B)(4)). We removed <i>planting</i> so people don't think they can plant new non-native trees in the buffer. However, one can still maintain existing vegetation.
MES06	Ed Miller, Miller Environmental Services	9/18/20	F	16.16.235(B)(4)(b)(iv)(B)(2)	Evergreen trees may not be appropriate for all environments, particularly wetlands with high levels of seasonal ponding. We recommend removing the evergreen tree requirement.	This language is the same that is used in our tree protection regulations for our watersheds. Nonetheless, we agree that in certain circumstances evergreens may not be the best choice. Therefore we have added, "unless otherwise approved by the Director."
MES07	Ed Miller, Miller Environmental Services	9/18/20	F	16.16.235(B)(5)	What is the time scale when referring to "one-time"? The life of the tree? The duration of property ownership? Please clarify.	This was unclear. We have removed "a one-time," but added "a cumulative total of." We were trying to limit the total amount of buffer that could be cleared.
MES08	Ed Miller, Miller Environmental Services	9/18/20	F	16.16.255(C)(3)	"Habitat corridor" and "ecological connectivity" are general ecology terms, not defined in this code and not regulated as a critical area – unless they are a specific, identified HCA (such as old growth/mature forest, Oregon White Oak, etc.). Biodiversity areas and corridors are identified as a state "priority habitat" by Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW)– with corridors defined as "relatively undisturbed and unbroken tracts of vegetation that connect fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas, priority habitat, areas identified as biologically diverse, or valuable habitat within a city or UGA." Critical areas reports are already required to cover biodiversity areas and corridors as an HCA. If the intent of this added section is to include other areas in addition to those currently regulated as critical areas, it seems to be an extension of and addition of a new regulated area.	The commenter is correct. However, this verbiage was added in response to the Council's direction in the adopted scoping document.
MES09	Ed Miller, Miller Environmental Services	9/18/20	F	16.16.265(A)(1)	What is the intent of the building setback? If it is to protect tree root zones and allow for building access and maintenance, a building setback is not always needed. For example, a new	This setback was established by Council and staff is not proposing to change it. We recognize, however, that there may

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					building within a grass field would not disturb root zones within a buffer or result in significant disturbance by a homeowner walking around the house. Assuming this 10-foot building setback area would or could be tabulated as impact, the setback will effectively reduce the allowed "reasonable use" footprint (which is proposed to be reduced back down to 2,500 square feet under this code). Forcing applicants to build smaller homes on reasonable use lots in order to accommodate a 10-foot building setback will significantly reduce the buildable area on a property. For example, a 50 x 50-foot building (2,500 SF) would have to shrink to 40 by 30-foot building (1,200 SF) if it is against a road setback in order to leave a 10-foot building setback around three sides of the structure.	be instances where the setback isn't warranted and have amended the section to allow for a reduction in such cases, modeled on the COB's similar regulation.
MES10	Ed Miller, Miller Environmental Services	9/18/20	F	16.16.265(B)(1)	Significant Trees" needs to be defined in the CAO.	The WCC has too many disparate definition sections, many of which define the same words differently. Staff is working toward ultimately having one definition chapter. But until that happens, we're trying not to add new definitions where words are already defined elsewhere, which is why we've added "Any words not defined herein shall be defined pursuant to Titles 20 (Zoning), 22 (Land Use and Development), 23 (Shoreline Management Program), or their common meanings when not defined in code" at the beginning of the definition section.
MES11	Ed Miller, Miller Environmental Services	9/18/20	F	16.16.270(C)(12)	<p><i>Reasonable Use Exceptions. For single-family residences, the maximum impact area may be no larger than 2,500 square feet. This impact area shall include the residential structure as well as appurtenant development that are necessarily connected to the use and enjoyment of a single-family residence. These appurtenant developments include garages/shops, decks, parking, and all lawn and nonnative landscaping.</i></p> <p>Why is reasonable use reduced from 4,000 SF to 2,500 SF? The County Council previously approved the larger area so that</p>	Reasonable use as proposed would now be the last effort to avoid a constitutional taking and allow development on very constrained lots and these cases should be rare. The new paradigm is to administratively allow up to 50% buffer reduction (with mitigation) through a minor variance (administrative) and a greater reduction with a public hearing (Hearing Examiner). This new approach should provide great-

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					<p>property owners could use a reasonable portion of their 5, 10, 20-acre properties with a house, shop, garden, etc. If the intent is to make it the same as the SMP reasonable use allowance (2,500 square feet), please explain why they need to be the same. Shoreline lots fall within 200 feet of the shoreline, a more highly protected area designated by the Shoreline Management Act. Additionally, shoreline lots are often smaller-sized lots. A majority of non-shoreline lots in the County are at least five acres in size. No specific reasoning is given on why the reasonable use allowance is being lowered, despite the recent critical areas code update in 2017 which brought it to 4,000 square feet.</p> <p>This is particularly concerning if a 10-foot building setback is required to be included within the reasonable use allocation area, severely reducing building size. Potentially, a property owner with five acres or more could be limited to a 1,000 SF house with a required 10-foot building setback and max out the reasonable use allowance with a small house footprint.</p>	<p>er flexibility while cutting down on costs to applicants and cases going to the H/E. The shoreline code cited is what is allowed without a shoreline variance; an applicant always has the option to seek a larger footprint through a variance.</p>
MES12	Ed Miller, Miller Environmental Services	9/18/20	F	16.16.630(C) & 16.16.740(A)(1)	<p>This section of code was revised to remove the provision that buffers do not extend across substantially developed areas and/or across legally established roads. The language was changed to only include "existing, legally established substantially developed surface". This change would allow larger buffers to include disconnected area on the opposite side of roads or developed surfaces (such as buildings). Please explain the reason for this change. We are not aware of any Department of Ecology guidance that proposes including disconnected portions of buffer across roads or developed areas.</p> <p>While some wildlife species may cross roads (e.g. birds, mammals), it seems unlikely that water-dependent species (e.g., amphibians) would regularly access buffers across roads and buildings. Since the intent of the buffer is to protect the functions of the wetland, perhaps the analysis should focus on what functions a disconnected buffer would provide to a wetland across a road or building. The disconnected buffer would not provide</p>	<p>Hydrologic or water quality functions are not the only reason for buffers. While small water-dependent species (e.g., amphibians) may not cross roads, many others do, or they nest, roost, or any number of other activities. DOE guidance does not provide provisions for reducing buffers because of minor (e.g., dirt driveways) intrusions.</p>



Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					hydrologic or water quality functions for the wetland across the road.  This change would substantially increase the amount of regulated buffer areas in Whatcom County, particularly in conjunction with the larger buffers proposed under this code change. As such, it seems there should be some reasoning provided as to why this change is needed or even valid.	
MES13	Ed Miller, Miller Environmental Services	9/18/20	F	16.16.640(A)	How will the Director determine what distance is necessary to increase the buffer if it's "poorly vegetated"? This appears subjective as there is no definitive science that provides clear buffer widths in these cases – they could vary depending on what function or which species you are seeking to protect. What would qualify as "poorly vegetated"? Bare dirt? Grass? Significant coverage of invasive species? This section of code could be interpreted and applied very differently among staff, decreasing predictability and consistency for landowners. The section has also been altered from the existing code to allow for buffer increases to "provide connectivity to other wetland and habitat areas". This seems to be an especially broad provision to increase buffers almost anywhere.	Staff is proposing amendments to this section to provide better rationale (based on DOE guidance) for an already existing section.
MES14	Ed Miller, Miller Environmental Services	9/18/20	F	16.16.640(B)(2)	<i>Buffer Width Averaging. In the specified locations where a buffer has been reduced to achieve averaging, the Director may require enhancement to the remaining buffer to ensure no net loss of ecologic function, services, or value.</i>  This section effectively eliminates the intent of buffer averaging and converts it to buffer reduction by requiring mitigation. Buffer averaging is an important and simple way to allow more flexibility for property owners that need to make minor buffer adjustments. This section will also reduce consistency and predictability (each staff member could apply this differently), and will increase the cost for simple projects by requiring plantings, monitoring, bonding, etc. by thousands of dollars.	The intent that if the remaining reduced buffer area is degraded, it is now narrower and lacks the vegetation to properly function. If it is well vegetated, enhancement would not be necessary (nor required).
MES15	Ed Miller, Miller Environmental Services	9/18/20	F	16.16.640(C)(1)(c)	<i>Buffer Width Reduction. The buffer shall not be reduced to less than 75 percent of the standard buffer.</i>  The existing code section allows for up to a 50 percent (or min-	We are responding to comments from DOE regarding having to meet their latest guidance.

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					imum of 25 feet) reduction of a Category IV wetland buffer, while higher category wetland are restricted to a 25 percent reduction. Why is this being changed? Is there guidance from the Department of Ecology supporting the change or data from Whatcom County showing that the current allowed reduction up to 50 percent for Category IV wetlands is not working? Category IV wetlands are generally low functioning wetlands – why are we further restricting buffer flexibility here?	
MES16	Ed Miller, Miller Environmental Services	9/18/20	F	16.16.640(C)(1)(e)(iii)	Does this mean the Director could require property owners to protect non-critical area and non-buffer areas with a conservation easement? This essentially gives the Director unlimited authority to restrict uses over non-protected uplands on properties, further limiting uses on properties without clear rationale, size limitations/restrictions, or predictability. Again, this section of code will create highly unpredictable review, requirements, and result in additional cost and critical areas assessment report revisions, depending on staff interpretations and personal beliefs. Additionally – allowed buffer reductions already require buffer mitigation to offset the impact. Please provide rationale for requiring additional mitigation that may include non-designated critical areas.	This is not intended to be in addition to mitigation, but one of the ways to achieve no net loss through the mitigation sequence while applying landscape ecology principals.
MES17	Ed Miller, Miller Environmental Services	9/18/20	F	16.16.640(C)(1)(g) & 16.16.640(C)(3)	<p><i>Buffer Width Reduction. All buffer reduction impacts are mitigated and result in equal or greater protection of the wetland functions and values. This includes enhancement of existing degraded buffer area and provide mitigation for the disturbed buffer area.</i></p> <p>Define “degraded”. This could result in the Director arbitrarily requiring acres of additional planting, above and beyond the 1:1 or 1.25:1 buffer mitigation. How is the amount of area determined? What if the area is an active hayfield or established pasture that is in use? The Director could remove the ability to use a legally established, non-conforming uses and require planting over such area. This again will add uncertainty, lack of predictability, and significantly increase costs without any clear limitations on how much planting could be required. Additionally, this sounds like two things are now required – enhancement of</p>	The planting of degraded buffers has been a part of our CAO since 2005 and is based on DOE guidance. Based on case history, we are only clarifying that the area that might be enhanced is limited to the specific portions of the buffer being reduced, not anywhere on the lot, and certainly not outside critical area buffers (and thus does not “grant unlimited potential for mitigation requirements”). Per DOE guidance, “degraded” is any portion of a buffer that is not in a densely vegetated community.

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					<p>existing degraded buffer and conducting additional mitigation. Why are property owners penalized for the current condition of the property – that may have been in place for generations? Also, it should be noted that buffers are not static, and have been increasing with every update and version of the CAO. As a result, areas which now may be considered “degraded buffer,” potentially requiring additional enhancement (per the draft change), may not have even been regulated as buffer a few years ago.</p>	
MES18	Ed Miller, Miller Environmental Services	9/18/20	F	16.16.680(C)(4)	<p><i>Mitigation Ratios. For impacts to wetland buffers, mitigation shall be provided at the follow ratios... (1) Where the mitigation is placed after the impact occurs, at a 1.25:1 ratio (area or function); and (2) where the mitigation is in place and functional before the impact occurs (i.e. advanced mitigation), at a 1:1 ratio (area or function).</i></p> <p>Planting mitigation prior to project construction is complicated because of access for equipment, permit issuance, and seasonal constraints (plants generally must be planted in winter or spring) – which doesn’t always coincide with project construction. At the stage when the mitigation is designed and the critical areas assessment report is submitted to the County for review with the site plan, we don’t know when or if planting could occur prior to project construction. This makes it impossible to assume applicants could achieve a 1:1 mitigation ratio unless they are using an established mitigation bank to offset their impacts. Why is this being changed? Is there a directive from the Department of Ecology or data in Whatcom County supporting this, and the higher ratio?</p>	<p>The amendments to this section are proposed to meet Best Available Science and DOE guidance to account for temporal loss, i.e., the time between impact and when mitigation is providing the same functions and values as to prior to the impact.</p>
MES19	Ed Miller, Miller Environmental Services	9/18/20	F	16.16.720(D)	<p><i>Private Access. Access to existing legal lots may be permitted to cross habitat conservation areas if there are no feasible alternative alignments.</i></p> <p>This section as modified implies that no new lots could be created (subdivided) if a road would be needed to cross through a habitat conservation area. This could include trumpeter swan loafing areas (which are roughly mapped on WDFW priority habitats and species maps), biodiversity corridors, bat habitat</p>	<p>We believe Mr. Miller was reviewing an older draft. We have since amended this subsection (and subsection (C) to clarify how subdivisions could still occur.</p>

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					(which includes entire townships where bats are mapped), streams, Pileated woodpecker habitat (which is not mapped by WDFW and must be determined by the project biologist or County staff), and many other priority habitats.	
MES20	Ed Miller, Miller Environmental Services	9/18/20	F	16.16.630(F)	<p><i>Table 1 Standard Wetland Buffer Widths.</i></p> <p>Based on a sampling of numerous projects in Whatcom County, the most common wetland category is a Category III with a moderate habitat score (110 or 150-foot buffers for moderate or high intensity land uses respectively). However, we also find that Category III wetlands with a high habitat score occur. This could easily occur in a wetland of small to moderate size (5,000 to 10,000 square feet), and partially in a pasture. The updated buffer for this type of wetland would be 225 feet or 300 feet (for moderate or high intensity development respectively). A 225-foot buffer would result in over 3.6 acres of land that would be protected as buffer. On a five-acre property, with multiple wetlands, this could easily create many more reasonable use properties, resulting in many more variances.</p>	Based on conversations with DOE staff, Table 1 is proposed to be updated to be consistent with their latest guidance. Mr. Miller provides a good example as to why staff is proposing an (up to 50%) administratively approved minor variance.
MES21	Ed Miller, Miller Environmental Services	9/18/20	F	16.16.740(A)	<p><i>Buffer Widths</i></p> <p>This is the same concern as comment MES12, and would allow for buffers to extend to areas across roads.</p>	Hydrologic or water quality functions are not the only reason for buffers. While small water-dependent species (e.g., amphibians) may not cross roads, many others do, or they nest, roost, or any number of other activities. DOE guidance does not provide provisions for reducing buffers because of minor (e.g., dirt driveways) intrusions.
MES22	Ed Miller, Miller Environmental Services	9/18/20	F	16.16.740(B)	<p><i>Table 4. Buffer Widths.</i></p> <p>What is a Type O water? No definition is given and there is no other correlation with any other part of the HCA section or Washington State water typing.</p> <p>The buffer provision for natural ponds and lakes under 20 acres was previously 50 feet, but was removed. What are the buffers for small lakes and natural ponds? The added water typing buffers in the table include a 100-foot buffer for lakes. Assumedly</p>	<p>A definition of Type O waters is provided in §16.16.710(C)(1)(a)(v).</p> <p>Natural ponds and lakes under 20 acres fall into one of the five listed types, which are generally based on size, permanence, and presence of fish.</p>

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					natural ponds and small lakes would not be required to have the same buffer as large lakes in the County. Currently artificially created ponds (created prior to 2005) do not require a buffer, is this still the case?	
MES23	Ed Miller, Miller Environmental Services	9/18/20	F	16.16.745(A)	<i>Buffer Width Increasing.</i>  There is a new provision to this section that allows the Director to extend Type S or F buffers to resources within 300 feet – including Category III wetlands, other HCA's or other waters. Again, this is an exceptionally broad provision to add in additional regulated areas that are not currently designated as critical areas or buffers in the existing or even the proposed amended code. There is also no clear guidance on how this would be done. The amount of additional area in Whatcom County this could include is hard to imagine. The extension of every fish stream or lake buffer to another resource within 300 feet is essentially extending most of the buffer areas to 300 feet.	This provision has been borrowed from Skagit County as a way to provide inter-jurisdictional consistency, making it easier for our consultants working in multiple jurisdictions.
MES24	Ed Miller, Miller Environmental Services	9/18/20	F	16.16.745(B)	<i>Buffer Averaging.</i>  Same concern as comment MES14.	The intent is that if the remaining reduced buffer area is degraded, it is now narrower and lacks the vegetation to properly function. If it is well vegetated, enhancement would not be necessary (nor required).
MES25	Ed Miller, Miller Environmental Services	9/18/20	F	16.16.745(C)	<i>Buffer Reduction.</i>  Same concern as comment MES17 and MES18.	Planting of degraded buffer has been a part of our CAO since 2005 and based on DOE guidance. We have only tried to clarify based on case history; we are clarifying that the area that might be enhanced is limited to the specific location being reduced.  Per DOE guidance, degraded is any portion of a buffer that is not in a densely vegetated community.
MES26	Ed Miller, Miller Environmental Services	9/18/20	F	16.16.760(B)	<i>Buffer Mitigation.</i>  Same concern as comment MES18.	It is being amended to meet DOE guidance.
NES01	Molly Porter, North-	9/14/20	F	16.16.270(C)(12)	Please provide additional clarification on what is included in the	Whatever fits in 2,500 sq. ft. We could set

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
	west Ecological Services				maximum allowed 2,500 sq. ft. impact area to provide consistency in application. The text states driveways shall be the minimum necessary but does not specify if any of this square footage shall be included in the allowed 2,500 sq. ft. impact area. Is there a minimum square footage of parking area that is required to be included? Is the 10-foot building setback counted towards this allowance?	specific numbers, but that would provide less flexibility to a homeowner.
NES02	Molly Porter, Northwest Ecological Services	9/14/20	F	16.16.270(C)(12)	<p>For projects that require a critical area buffer impact, it appears these will be reviewed in the following order: reduction of up to 25% administered by the Director; a minor variance (buffer reduction of 25-50%) administered by the Director; a major variance (buffer reduction beyond 50%) administered by the Director; and last, if major variance is denied or if all other code requirements including mitigation cannot be met, a reasonable use application is administered by the Hearing Examiner. A flow chart similar to Table 1. Project Permit Processing Table in 22.05, may be helpful to describe this process and requirements associated with each.</p> <p>Please clarify if there are any specific criteria for minor and minor variances in regards to total allowed impact area. It appears variances have no maximum allowable footprint and can be permitted as long as mitigation sequencing is applied and impacts can be mitigated.</p>	The commenter is correct; and a flow chart might be helpful; we'll try to develop one. As to variance criteria, see WCC 22.07.050. There are no criteria in regards to total allowed impact area (though one would have to mitigate).
NES04	Molly Porter, Northwest Ecological Services	9/14/20	F	16.16.640(C)(1)(g) & 16.16.640(C)(3)	Both sections appear to require mitigation, as well as additional enhancement of 'existing degraded buffer area' to provide mitigation for the 'disturbed buffer area.' Please define 'degraded buffer area' and 'disturbed buffer area,' and provide additional clarity on how much additional enhancement may be required beyond the standard 1:1 and 1.25:1 mitigation ratios. Further defining these terms and the amount of enhancement that is expected will help clarify the application of this code section to specific projects.	Per DOE guidance "degraded" is the difference between existing conditions and a densely vegetated community. As each site is different, it would be difficult to have a code that accounts for every variation. We are trying to balance having a code that is a "cookbook" verses providing flexibility to homeowners and their consultants.
NES05	Molly Porter, Northwest Ecological Services	9/14/20	F	16.16.640(B)(1)(a) & (C)(1)(a)	Buffer averaging is preferred to buffer reduction [16.16.640(C)(1)(b)]. Sections 16.16.640(B)(1)(a) and (C)(1)(a) imply a development proposal cannot use a combination of buffer averaging in one area and buffer reduction in another.	Clarification has been added.

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					Clarification could be added to state buffer averaging is not allowed if the portion of impacted buffer has already been reduced. This would allow mitigation plans to use buffer averaging where feasible (preferred) and buffer enhancement to compensate for the remainder of buffer reduction.	
NES06	Molly Porter, Northwest Ecological Services	9/14/20	F	16.16.740, Table 4	Provide definition of a Type O stream. This stream type does not appear to be defined in the Washington Administrative Code (WAC 222.16.030), Washington Department of Natural Resources (WDNR) water typing system, or anywhere in the Code update.	A definition of the water types has been added.
NES07	Molly Porter, Northwest Ecological Services	9/14/20	F	16.16.710(C)(1)(b)(i)	Throughout 16.16.710(C)(1) the term "natural streams" has been revised to "natural waters." The term "waters" leaves ambiguity which could be interpreted to mean wetlands or water flowing out of wetlands. Under this definition, 16.16.710(C)(1)(b) would regulate any artificial man-made ditch that receives water from a wetland and categorize the ditch as a stream that would require a stream buffer. Many ditches, including roadside ditches, receive water from wetlands and could be regulated as streams. Is this the intent of this change? If not, for clarity, the term "natural waters" could be replaced "waters of the state" which is defined in (16.16.900).	Based on this comment we have amended the section to say "waters of the state" rather than "natural waters."
NWC01	Katrina Jackson, Northwest Wetlands Consulting	9/9/20	F	16.16.680	As written, it isn't clear that the area of substantial surface and the area beyond the substantial surface are no longer functioning as a part of the buffer protection. As I read it, the provision only seems to address the substantial surface itself.	Correct.
NWC02	Katrina Jackson, Northwest Wetlands Consulting	9/9/20	F	16.16.273	Can we presume that the minor variance is in addition to the standard buffer reduction? Otherwise the minor variance would force many more projects to the Hearing Examiner than under the current reasonable use.  For example a 100' buffer would go to 75' minimum; then with minor variance the buffer could then be modified to 25% to 50% of that number or 56.25 or 37.5. When the 10' building setback is added, the relief is no way near what reasonable use is allowing currently especially on smaller lots where the separation is many times only 10' to 20' between the wetland and the foundation. As I describe the minor variance would still require a 66.25	The proposed new approach would allow the applicant to request, and the County to vary, any numerical or dimensional standard to provide reasonable development. It would be the duty of the Hearing Examiner to determine if a legally permissible project has been recommended.

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					<p>foot to 47.5 foot separation between the foundation and the wetland. It is our belief that even a variance on the standard buffer reduction would overburden the Hearing Examiner if reasonable use would under the revisions be required to go to the hearing examiner. You state "They would be limited to variances for a 25% to 50% reduction of critical area buffers (when mitigated and they meet certain criteria) but would address most of the instances that reasonable use exceptions are currently applied for. We believe that overall, these changes would significantly reduce the number cases having to go to the Hearing Examiner." Perhaps you have better statistic than I do about the narrow buffers we have needed under reasonable use. I do a lot of work in Sudden Valley and for the most part many of the projects can stay about 35 feet from a critical area, but those would under the revisions be moved to the hearing examiner.</p>	
NWC03	Katrina Jackson, Northwest Wetlands Consulting	9/9/20	F	16.16.265(B)(4)	<p>Is the intent that the conservation easement shall only apply to the specific altered buffer on properties containing critical areas and/or associated buffers? If so then it should so state. It seems since Notice on title is expected for properties that have critical areas and/or assoc. buffers that are not altered. My thoughts go to the properties that have an established house, want to put a shop in one corner and may need to alter a buffer to do so, but the permittee should not be asked to then identify all of the non-altered wetlands or buffers on the rest of the acreage. So then the applicant would do a conservation easement for the altered buffers and or wetlands, and then also a notice on title to cover any of the other critical areas that are unaltered. If all wetlands and buffer on the property are required to be placed in a CE when only one wetland and/or wetland buffer is altered, this would result in excessive wetland delineation, surveying of wetland boundaries, and reporting costs.</p> <p>Also alteration to buffers on a property should be allowed in the future modified to the full extent of the code provisions and not forced locked into a conservation easement when the first project might only be a minor modification.</p>	<p>The commenter raises a good point. We have revised the section to refer to the "review area."</p> <p>As to the 2<sup>nd</sup> point, our conservation easements do allow for future development as permitted by code.</p>
NWC04	Katrina Jackson,	9/9/20	F	16.16.680	It seems that some effort has been made in part of the code to	Comment noted.



Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
	Northwest Wetlands Consulting				use the label of compensatory mitigation. Thank you. When a violation occurs clearing or overlayment, once repaired the reparation area should not be then placed in a conservation easement. Because the word mitigation is still somewhat interchangeable in the code or in the minds of those enforcing the code, it needs to be clear than only compensatory mitigation areas are to be placed in conservation easements.	
NWC05	Katrina Jackson, Northwest Wetlands Consulting	9/9/20	F	16.16	<p>Administratively, through reasonable use, wetlands are being filled. This action does not show up as an administrative option under minor variance. As written it looks like wetland fill would need to go to hearing examiners as well. This again would send several more of the single family small residential lots to the hearing examiner. Basically I like the idea of administrative variance or minor variance, but with changes it looks significantly more restrictive than the current practices for what can be handled without going to the hearing examiner.</p> <p>You might also talk with the City of Bellingham. I was working on a stream buffer reduction below minimum standards, very soon after the hearing examiner had told the City to start handling these as an administrative variance and to quit sending them to the hearing examiner. I found this interesting.</p>	Staff's recollection is that staff has only been approving wetland fill for a SFR through administratively processed reasonable use exceptions (RUE) for the last 2 years, and that has only happened once. However, we do not believe that wetland fill (or other uses approve through an RUE ought to be approved by staff; thus the reason for the proposed change.
PA01	Paul Anderson	9/18/20	F	16.16.225(B)(8)	I recommend that this provision be listed "as excepted in WCC § 23.05.065," since it is not applicable for shoreline associated wetlands. Interpretation and enforcement of this section within shoreline jurisdiction is problematic as shoreline associated wetlands by definition (WAC 173-22-030(1)) have proximity and influence with the shoreline water and therefore, are not "functionally disconnected".	Based on this and discussions with DOE staff, we have deleted "functionally disconnected" from this provision. Additionally, based on communication with DOE staff, we have added that the wetlands have to have a habitat score of less than 6 to qualify.
PA02	Paul Anderson	9/18/20	F	16.16.260(G)(1)	Three years is not adequate to establish whether a mitigation site will successfully compensate for lost critical area functions, especially where that mitigation includes the planting of shrubs and trees. In terms of wetland mitigation, state and federal agencies have required a minimum of five years monitoring for several years and I recommend that five years be the minimum monitoring required in the SMP.	Though staff had not proposed to amend this section, based on this comment we realized that the existing code does not reflect current practices. We have updated this section to do so, and to address Mr. Anderson's comment.

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
PA03	Paul Anderson	9/18/20	F	16.16.640(C) & 16.16.720(D)	<p><i>[Wetland] Buffer Width Reduction</i></p> <p>Allowing an outright reduction in buffer width will not protect critical area (wetland or fish and wildlife habitat) functions or shoreline ecological functions. The only time a reduction in adopted buffer widths should be allowed (no &gt; than a 25% reduction) is when it is used with buffer averaging (see Bunten et al. 2016). To ensure that there is no net loss of shoreline ecological functions, I recommend that this provision be stricken within shoreline jurisdiction. This same concern and recommendation applies to 16.16.720.D. (Buffer Width Variance).</p>	<p>We have added language to this section from DOE guidance, clarifying that buffer reductions are not allowed outright, but only under certain (DOE approved) circumstances.</p>
PA04	Paul Anderson	9/18/20	F	16.16.710(C)(2)	<p><i>Habitat Conservation Areas – Designation, Mapping, and Classification: “Areas in which federally listed species are found, have a primary association with, or contain suitable habitat for said listed species, as listed in the U.S. Fish and Wildlife’s Threatened and Endangered Species List or Critical Habitat List...”</i></p> <p>Within shoreline jurisdiction, this section needs to be edited to also include the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), the federal agency responsible for managing marine species listed under the Endangered Species Act that includes Puget Sound Chinook salmon (<i>Oncorhynchus tshawytscha</i>) and Southern Resident killer whales (<i>Orcinus orca</i>). These two iconic species are of significant cultural, commercial and recreational importance for the Pacific Northwest and not acknowledging their importance and presence within the SMP is a substantial oversight. Due to its critical importance for Chinook salmon rearing and migration, NMFS designated the marine and estuarine nearshore (extreme high water to approx. 30 meters depth), including most of the Whatcom County coast, as critical habitat for the recovery of Puget Sound Chinook in September 2005 (see Federal Register, Vol. 70, No. 170, 9/2/05). NMFS is acknowledged as a regulatory agency in WCC §16.16.900 (Definitions; “Critical habitat”).</p> <p>The marine and estuarine nearshore within the County meets the definition of a Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Area in</p>	<p>We have amended 16.16.710(C)(2) to include NMFS listings and critical habitat.</p>

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					WAC 365-190-130 and, more importantly for the SMP, the definition of Critical Saltwater Habitat in WAC 173-26-221(2)(C). I respectfully recommend that the County include reference to NMFS-managed listed species in the SMP and that the marine and estuarine nearshore is designated critical habitat for Puget Sound Chinook. To simplify the permitting process and assist staff and applicants in understanding this update, I would also recommend that the salmonid habitat maps be updated to show the marine and estuarine nearshore as a regulated critical area.	
PA05	Paul Anderson	9/18/20	F	16.16.720 & 16.16.740	<p><i>Habitat Conservation Areas – Use and Modification and Habitat Conservation Area Buffers</i></p> <p>Since shorelines and shorelands (associated wetlands) include more than just streams and the SMP protective standards apply to those other waters, I recommend changing “stream(s)” to “water(s)” in Table 3 (§16.16.720) and in §16.16.740. Also, since tidal waters include a number of species and habitats of cultural, commercial and recreational importance (e.g., shellfish areas; Chinook salmon), what is the rationale and science to support requiring a wider buffer on marine versus freshwater habitats; 150 and 200 feet, respectively? To ensure no net loss of ecological function, I recommend that the upland buffer on marine habitats be increased to 200 feet, which is well within the buffer range reported in the scientific literature (see Protecting Nearshore Habitat and Functions in Puget Sound; Protection of Marine Riparian Functions In Puget Sound, Washington; available from WDFW: <a href="https://wdfw.wa.gov/">https://wdfw.wa.gov/</a>).</p>	<p>Amended per this suggestion (though in Table 3 only for the performance standards that apply to all waters.)</p> <p>And while the buffer is proposed to be 150’ in the marine areas, we are still managing for NNL in the entire shoreline jurisdiction.</p>
WCPW01	Atina Casas, W/C Public Works	9/18/20	E	22.05.020	Shoreline Substantial is included in both the Type II and Type III sections of the table. The footnote (c) in the Type II section explains the circumstances when a Shoreline Substantial will be processed as a Type III. This footnote should also be in the Type III section for further clarity.	Comment noted.
WCPW02	Atina Casas, W/C Public Works	9/18/20	E	22.07.020(B)(1)	How will the applicant know what the dollar amount is when OFM changes it every 5 years? Will updated values be shown on the permit application form so applicants know if their project qualifies based on the current value at the time of application	Correct, the application is changed when OFM updates the amount.

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					submittal?	
WCPW03	Atina Casas, W/C Public Works	9/18/20	E	22.07.030(A)	<i>A. Shoreline substantial development permits are considered Type II applications pursuant to WCC 24 22.05.020 (Project Permit Processing Table).</i>  For clarity, add a sentence that this permit could be considered a Type III application pursuant to 22.05.090(2) (Open Record Public Hearing).	We have modified the sections to clarify.
WCPW04	Atina Casas, W/C Public Works	9/18/20	F	16.16.680(H)(1)	Consider keeping the wetland buffer impact mitigation ratio 1:1 for public road and bridge projects. Mitigation is not possible before impacts. And between clear zone requirements for vehicle safety and limited right-of-way, there often isn't onsite area available to accommodate a 1.25:1 mitigation ratio.	The mitigation ratios are proposed to be amended to meet DOE guidance. Nonetheless, Public Works could choose to enhance publicly owned property now and apply the mitigation to future projects (i.e., advance mitigation).
WCPW05	Atina Casas, W/C Public Works	9/18/20	F	16.16.760(B)(8)	Consider an HCA buffer impact mitigation ratio of 1:1 for public road and bridge projects. Mitigation is not possible before impacts. And between clear zone requirements for vehicle safety and limited right-of-way, there often isn't onsite area available to accommodate a 1.25:1 mitigation ratio.	The mitigation ratios are proposed to be amended to meet DOE guidance. Nonetheless, Public Works could choose to enhance publicly owned property now and apply the mitigation to future projects (i.e., advance mitigation).
WCPW06	Atina Casas, W/C Public Works	9/18/20	F	16.16.900	Add a definition for Critical Facilities, which is referenced in 16.16.322.	A definition has been added.
WCPW07	Chris Elder, W/C Public Works	9/18/20	B	C/P Ch. 11	Under the Council approved scope of possible amendments, topic #6 highlights Climate Change/Sea Level Rise with the recommended action of "Develop and/or strengthen policies regarding climate change/sea level rise, including the incorporation and use of new data (as it becomes available), to review and revise, if warranted, shoreline use regulations". The proposed amendments to the Shoreline Master Program have not sufficiently addressed this topic based on available data including projected impacts of climate change and have not incorporated best management practices developed to address the projected impacts of climate change.	Policies regarding climate change/ sea level rise have been developed and/or strengthened and are proposed to be included in Chapter 11 of the CompPlan (pg. 11-30).
WCPW08	Chris Elder, W/C Public Works	9/18/20			Related to climate change, the most significant projected climate impacts related to the SMP update include sea level rise and increases in coastal and riverine flooding, both in magnitude and	Before adopting specific regulations, it seems like we'd need to know the details of likely sea level rise (location, elevation,

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					<p>frequency. I have included the several regional and state scientific climate data reports and data informed recommendations on how to incorporate projected climate change impacts such as sea level rise and increased coastal and riverine flooding into planning processes. The list of resources supplied is located at the end of this memo.</p> <p>It should be noted that Whatcom County is currently participating in development of a local Coastal Storm Modeling System (CoSMoS) which will further inform the extent of potential impacts of sea level rise combined with storm surge, wind currents, barometric pressure, and other environmental factors. Data from this effort will inform the magnitude and area of impact and will support selection of an actual sea level rise elevation and/or shoreline impact zone, but existing data already highlights that sea level rise has occurred and will continue to occur at an increasing rate.</p>	<p>magnitude, etc.) and anticipate the development of the CoSMoS model (on which the COB and WCPW are working), which should provide the best data for Whatcom County. The policies being introduced would set us up for developing such regulations once this model is completed.</p> <p>It should also be noted that in reviewing development proposals, PDS already requires structures to be built above the anticipated flood stage through the County's critical area (i.e., geohazard/tsunami) and flood regulations.</p> <p>Nonetheless, this is a policy decision and all comments will be forwarded to the P/C and Council.</p>
WCPW09	Chris Elder, W/C Public Works	9/18/20			<p>While this periodic update to the Shoreline Master Program may not spur development or adoption of an actual sea level rise projection for Whatcom County shorelines, staff recommends developing new code language that clearly identifies the projected impacts of sea level rise and increased impacts of riverine and coastal flooding within Title 23. Furthermore code improvement must require applicants pursuing development within the shoreline jurisdiction to perform a climate vulnerability assessment for the proposed action and highlight mitigation measures proposed to address projected climate impacts. This language will support applicants in mitigating climate risk to their private investment and will support local government in protecting public safety, private property, and environmental health.</p>	<p>Your comments will be forwarded to the P/C &amp; Co/C for their consideration.</p>
WCPW10	Chris Elder, W/C Public Works	9/18/20			<p>The resources described below have been attached to this comment letter to support the above comments and recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The University of Washington's Climate Impacts Group Shifting Snowlines and Shorelines (2020) highlights this significant climate changes occurring within our region and does provide summary projections of potential changes in</li> </ul>	<p>Thank you.</p>

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					<p>sea level.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Extreme Coastal Water Level in Washington State (Guidelines to Support Sea Level Rise Planning) (2019) provides valuable guidance regarding incorporation of sea level rise projections into local planning.</li> <li>Maps of Climate and Hydrologic Change for the Nooksack River Watershed (2017) highlights the projected changes in seasonal precipitation in the Nooksack River which projects an increase in winter precipitation over the next 30 years of between 9.5% and 20.8% which will contribute to increased magnitude and frequency of flooding.</li> <li>Incorporating Sea Level Change in Civil Works Programs is a US Army Corps of Engineers regulation requiring consideration of sea level impacts on all coastal projects as far inland as the extent of estimated tidal influence and providing guidance for incorporating the direct and indirect physical effects of projected future sea level change across the project life cycle in managing, planning, engineering, designing, constructing, operating, and maintaining projects and systems of projects.</li> <li>Integrating Climate Resilience into Flood Risk Management (2010) provides significant policy guidance and considerations.</li> </ul> <p>Additional online resources that may support development of climate change related improvements can be found at the following sites.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="https://toolkit.climate.gov/">https://toolkit.climate.gov/</a></li> <li><a href="https://toolkit.climate.gov/tool/adaptation-tool-kit-sea-level-rise-and-coastal-land-use">https://toolkit.climate.gov/tool/adaptation-tool-kit-sea-level-rise-and-coastal-land-use</a></li> </ul>	
RES01	Ander Russell, Resources	9/17/20	D	23.30.020	<p><i>SMP Scoping Document Item 5 : Consistency with Shoreline Management Act (RCW 90.58) and 2003 SMP Update Guidelines (WAC 173- 26)</i> – Thank you for adding language referencing WCC Title 23 Shoreline Regulations 23.30.020 as it pertains to mitigation. We feel that in order to adequately address item 5b from the Scoping Document further clarification is needed on exactly what mitigation actions are needed for development. Please add clarification and reference WCC 16.16.</p>	<p>5b from the scoping document is “Clarify development mitigation requirements.” We feel we have done this in many sections of both Title 23 &amp; WCC 16.16. While most of the “clarifying” has been done to the text of WCC 16.16, it pertains to shoreline permits since the CAO is adopted as part of the SMP.</p>

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
RES02	Ander Russell, Re-Sources	9/17/20	D	23.40.020(G)	<i>Shoreline Bulk Provisions – Buffers, Setbacks, Height, Open Space and Impervious Surface Coverage</i> – Thank you for adding in language about the need for mitigation under G (Development activities allowed in buffers and setbacks). Please clarify and strengthen that language. Any impacts from activities happening within the critical area buffer must be mitigated please show how this will be done.	The text of that section clearly states, “provided...that they comply with all the applicable regulations in WCC Chapter 16.16, including mitigation.” Please note that mitigation requirements are in WCC 16.16, a part of the SMP, and that both need to be read together.
RES03	Ander Russell, Re-Sources	9/17/20	B & D	C/P Ch. 11 & Title 23	<p><i>Climate Change/Sea Level Rise</i> – Thank you for the updated language concerning climate change and sea level rise that was added to the Chapter 11 of the CompPlan (Exhibit B). We strongly support the recommended changes outlined by Futurewise and WEC for this scoping item. A comprehensive approach to addressing the impacts of climate change by protecting natural shorelines and other natural systems will help our community withstand and recover from the increase in those impacts over time.</p> <p>Please add language to reflect a focus on climate change and sea level rise impacts to Exhibit D. The SMP and CompPlan must do a better job at addressing sea level rise and other climate change impacts. We understand that the bulk of the revisions in this area have been added to Exhibit B. However, the words climate change and sea level rise do not appear at all in Exhibit D.</p> <p>Climate change impacts on sea levels, storm surges and riverine and marine flooding are extensively documented and must be planned for and addressed in all County regulations and planning documents. The County need not look any further than its own report on climate change impacts to have the data needed to develop and strengthen policies around climate change, flooding and sea level rise. Just this past winter Whatcom County was inundated with unprecedented flooding from heavy rains that breached dikes and submerged houses. The cost of the damage from the flooding between late January through early February was over \$4 million, \$2.5 million of which was related to road and infrastructure damage.</p>	<p>Before adopting specific regulations, it seems like we'd need to know the details of likely sea level rise (location, elevation, magnitude, etc.) and anticipate the development of the CoSMoS model (on which the COB and WCPW are working), which should provide the best data for Whatcom County. The policies being introduced would set us up for developing such regulations once this model is completed.</p> <p>It should also be noted that in reviewing development proposals, PDS already requires structures to be built above the anticipated flood stage through the County's critical area (i.e., geohazard/tsunami) and flood regulations.</p> <p>Nonetheless, this is a policy decision and all comments will be forwarded to the P/C and Council.</p>

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					<p>Further recommendations on how to incorporate climate change impacts on rising sea levels, storm surges, and riverine and marine flooding in to Exhibits B and D:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Make the changes recommended by Futurewise/WEC to Exhibit B, policy 11 AA-5 and include new policy 11 AA-8 outlined in their letter.</li> <li>• We strongly support the addition of a Sea Level Rise section to Exhibit D. We support the language proposed for a new Section 23.30.080 by Futurewise and WEC in their letter.</li> <li>• Shoreline maps should be updated to include Best Available Science (BAS) and reflect any additional areas that are now considered within the 200' of the OHWM as a matter of shoreline jurisdiction.</li> <li>• Given the impacts of sea level rise on property and life, please prevent construction in areas that will be underwater in the next 30 years. The Washington Coastal Hazards Resilience Network has the best available science on this with various sea level rise projections depending on various greenhouse gas scenarios.</li> <li>• Whatcom County has over 50 Toxic Cleanup Sites in marine shoreline areas.<sup>3</sup> Please add language about what steps can be taken to plan for Sea Level Rise impacts on those sites. Proactive steps to protect communities, water and habitat now will prevent high costs down the road.</li> <li>• Science around climate change, sea level rise, storm surges and their impacts is dynamic and evolving - often at a faster pace than required SMP update timelines. Strengthen the language around assessing and incorporating Best Available Science. Be specific about the intervals at which BAS will be assessed and what the process for incorporating BAS will look like. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Examples from local jurisdictions that incorporate climate impacts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The City of Tacoma has included many updates in their 2019 Periodic Update regarding climate</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	



Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					<p>change impacts. Below are the additions they are proposing which Whatcom County could incorporate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A new general policy of “Evaluate sea level rise data and consider sea level rise risks and implications in the development of regulations, plans, and programs.” (p. 66)</li> <li>▪ New site planning policies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ “Development should be located, designed, and managed both to minimize potential impacts from sea level rise and to promote resilience in the face of those impacts, by such actions as protecting wetland and shoreline natural functions, incorporating green infrastructure, retaining mature vegetation, and considering soft-shore armoring wherever possible.” (p. 69)</li> <li>○ “Assess the risks and potential impacts on both City government operations and on the community due to climate change and sea level rise, with special regard for social equity.” (p. 70)</li> <li>○ “Promote community resilience through the development of climate change adaptation strategies. Strategies should be used by both the public and private sectors to help minimize the potential impacts of climate change on new and existing development and operations, including programs that encourage retrofitting of existing development and infrastructure to adapt to the effects of climate change.” (p. 70)</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ A new general policy for Critical Areas and Marine Shoreline Protection: “Protect natural processes and functions of Tacoma’s environmen-</li> </ul>	

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					tal assets (wetlands, streams, lakes, and marine shorelines) in anticipation of climate change impacts, including sea level rise."	
RES04	Ander Russell, Resources	9/17/20	B	C/P Ch. 11	<i>Scoping Document Item 8: Habitat</i> – Please address Scoping Document item 8a. We understand it is not necessary to have references to the WDFW and DNR Shore Friendly Program in the code in order for the County to mirror the program but referring to it adds weight and legitimacy for the use of practices outlined in the WDFW and DNR Shore Friendly Program.	8a is, "Reference WDFW and DNR's Shore Friendly Program." And you're right; the code need not reference all the helpful programs the state (or feds or County) manages. However, we have added reference to that program in C/P policy 111-2, and we do provide such references to applicants here at PDS.
RES05	Ander Russell, Resources	9/17/20	F	16.16.225(C)	Please make the following changes to strengthen weak language:  <u>Development proposals shall seek to maintain ecological connectivity and habitat corridors whenever possible.</u> <u>Restoration of ecological connectivity and habitat corridors shall be considered a priority restoration and mitigation action.</u>	See response to RES07. Further, until actual wildlife corridors are identified, mapped, and adopted, trying to maintain a variable corridor width dependent on the species one's trying to manage would not be possible through piecemeal development review.
RES06	Ander Russell, Resources	9/17/20	F	16.16.255(B)(3) & (5)	We support the addition of 16.16.255 B #'s 3 and 5	Comment noted.
RES07	Ander Russell, Resources	9/17/20	D		Please add a wildlife corridor overlay to shoreline maps in Exhibit D or wherever else is relevant.	The only wildlife corridor that the Council has adopted is the Chuckanut Wildlife Corridor, which is shown on our critical areas maps. Our understanding is that the Council's Wildlife Advisory Committee is looking into recommending others (based on a scientific review), but until the Council acts to adopt any new ones we have nothing to map.
RES08	Ander Russell, Resources	9/17/20	D		We are generally opposed to expansions of nonconforming overwater structures, and will make recommendations to P/C & Co/C on revisions to Chapter 23.50.	Comment noted (however, the code does not allow this).
RES09	Ander Russell, Resources	9/17/20	D	23.40.160	<i>Recreation</i> – Item 13d: The language around trails within critical area buffers must be strengthened. Any impacts to any portion of the critical area buffer from recreational trails must comply with all applicable regulations in WCC 16.16 and be mitigated.	In general we have tried not to repeat every requirement of one code in another (i.e., those of 16.16 in T-23, and vice versa), as there is a general rule that

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
						shoreline permits are subject to 16.16. Nonetheless, we have added subsection 23.40.160(A)(6) to remind folks.
RES10	Ander Russell, Re-Sources	9/17/20			<i>Cherry Point Management Area and heavy impact industrial zone</i> – We support the Aug 17 <sup>th</sup> draft revisions to the Cherry Point Management Area section of Chapter 11. Going further, to fully implement the Comprehensive Plan policy amendments for the Cherry Point industrial zone adopted by the County in May 2017, and to maintain consistency with the proposed Cherry Point Amendments—if adopted—additional amendments to other sections of the SMP are warranted. We intend to propose additional revisions, and will seek feedback from PDS and stakeholders before submitting specific language for consideration by the P/C this Fall. Particularly, specifications for where shoreline conditional use permits are required and conditional criteria should be updated further.	Comment noted.
RES11	Ander Russell, Re-Sources	9/17/20	F	16.16.745	<i>Scoping Document Item 18: Shoreline Setbacks/Riparian Management</i> – We were unable to see where language around Scoping Document item 18b had been added. Please provide specific language to show what incentives will be provided to enhance Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas.	18(b) reads, “Provide incentives to enhance Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas (FWHCA).  Staff had added this to the scope as we had originally considered developing a site-specific shoreline buffer program wherein incentives to enhance would allow buildings be built closer to the shoreline. However, while exploring this option we determined that additional analyses of shoreline characterization would be required, and doing so was not part of the overall scope of a periodic update.
RES12	Ander Russell, Re-Sources	9/17/20	A & B		<i>Scoping Document Item 19: Water Quality</i> – Lake Whatcom is the drinking water source for 100,000 Whatcom County residents. Scoping Document item number 19 addresses Lake Whatcom water quality. However, no recommendations about Lake Whatcom have been added to this or any section in Exhibits A or B. Please add policy language about the importance of	Ch. 10 of the CompPlan already contains an entire narrative regarding this (pg. 10-22), as well as multiple policies (Goal 10-J and its policies, pg. 10-36, as well as multiple other policies throughout). We didn't think this all needed to be repeated.

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					Lake Whatcom as the source of drinking water for most County residents and about the current water quality improvement plan (TMDL). We understand that this language is referenced in Exhibit A, however that language is only in the narrative. Please add policy language (in Exhibit A and Exhibit B) about how the County will improve water quality specific to the TMDL for Lake Whatcom.	
RES13	Ander Russell, Re-Sources	9/17/20			<p><i>Scoping Document Item 22: No Net Loss</i> – Thank you for providing clarification in the Guide to Reviewing Draft SMP Amendments document, about the creation of a Not Net Loss Technical (NNL) memo. We support the creation of the memo and understand that it will be completed at an unspecified date after, “public review of draft amendments,” is completed.</p> <p>We agree with the statements made by Futurewise and WEC in their letter. It is very likely that until the County can show that it achieves NNL of shoreline ecological functions it may not be in compliance with the Shoreline Management Act and the Shoreline Master Guidelines.<sup>4</sup></p> <p>Throughout the update clarification is needed on how no net loss (NNL) will be met and monitored. Please provide clarification in the memo of how the County will monitor activities such as forest practices, mining, construction of structures and trails, shoreline stabilization and all others in a way that will result in NNL of shoreline ecological functions.</p> <p>In order to restore salmon, orca and the shoreline ecological functions we all depend on we must think beyond bare minimum requirements. We know the NNL standard is not fully protecting shorelines and wetlands from degradation and we cannot afford to wait another 8 or 9 years for the next update.</p> <p>Please provide clarity on when the technical memo will be completed, allow for public input on the memo and if the memo or resulting actions, show that the SMP is not achieving NNL outline how NNL or net ecological gains, will be achieved and how those new standards will be incorporated in to the SMP, Comp-Plan and Critical Areas Ordinance.</p>	Comment noted. A draft will be provided to the P/C prior to their final action. The draft will need to be finalized once the Co/C has completed their review.

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
RES14	Ander Russell, Re-Sources	9/17/20	C	C/P Ch. 8	Thank you for including the new Whatcom County Comprehensive Plan Chapter 8: Mineral Resource Lands in this recommended update draft.	Comment noted (though we believe you're referring to the <i>Marine</i> Resource Lands section).
RES15	Ander Russell, Re-Sources	9/17/20	D	23.30.050	<i>Vegetation Management</i> – Add language requiring the restoration of native vegetation and vegetation conservation standards (lawns and turf are prohibited) for any new building permits, expansions or change of use in the following areas: within 50' of the OHWM for Lake Whatcom or impaired water bodies on the 303(d) list.	Thank you. We had inadvertently left out some of the existing language of the vegetation management section, but have now reinserted it.
RES16	Ander Russell, Re-Sources	9/17/20	D	23.30.060	<i>Cultural Resources</i> – We support the suggestions added by Lummi Nation. Accept and approve all changes added by Lummi Nation in this section.	Comment noted.
RES17	Ander Russell, Re-Sources	9/17/20	D	23.40.040	<i>Agriculture</i> – We support staff's recommendation during scoping around manure holding facilities. We plan to make comments to the P/C & Co/C during this update process to, again, request that requirements be added that any manure holding facility permitted within the shoreline jurisdiction be in the form of above ground tanks or towers instead of earthen lagoons. In order to be protective of our waterways and groundwater, please make manure holding facilities a shoreline conditional use.	Comment noted (though we believe you brought this issue up during scoping, staff did not).
RES18	Ander Russell, Re-Sources	9/17/20	D	23.40.040	<i>Agriculture</i> – Along the same lines, to reduce the risk of contaminant run-off from flooding and seepage, consider making it mandatory for any new or replaced manure lagoons to be above ground in tanks or towers.	Comment noted.
RES19	Ander Russell, Re-Sources	9/17/20	D	23.40.140	<i>Mining</i> – We oppose the amendments to WCC 23.40.140, Mining. We support the language proposed by Futurewise and WEC in their letter. Please update this section with their language for 23.40.140(D).	Comment noted.
RES20	Ander Russell, Re-Sources	9/17/20	D	23.40.140	<i>Mining</i> – We recommend that the SMP Update prohibit motorized or gravity siphon aquatic mining and discharging effluent from this type of mining in shorelines that are the critical habitat for salmon, steelhead, or bull trout and that salmonids use for spawning, rearing, and migration. This is necessary in order to follow RCW 90.48.615(2).	We have added such language.
RES21	Ander Russell, Re-Sources	9/17/20	D	23.40.150	<i>Docks, Piers and Mooring Buoys</i> – Overwater structures, including docks, cause direct and indirect impacts to shoreline functions and habitat for salmon and forage fish like Cherry Point	Please review 23.40.150 again, as we believe we have accomplished these.

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					<p>herring during the construction process and over the useful life of the dock. The cumulative impacts of overwater structures are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Increase in pollutants and habitat disturbance associated with boat operations and dock and piling maintenance",</li> <li>• "Increased travel distance and time for juvenile salmon and extended time in deeper water, increasing predation risk",</li> <li>• "Decrease in eelgrass and plant habitat and overall photosynthesis in intertidal zone",</li> <li>• "Alteration in juvenile salmon prey base and predation pressure", and</li> <li>• "Change in wave energy and longshore drift patterns, and resulting changes in upper intertidal sediment distribution"</li> </ul> <p>Please make these changes concerning Overwater Structures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add a clear preference for the use of mooring buoys.</li> <li>• Applicants must demonstrate conclusively that use of a moorage buoy, nearby marina, public boat ramp, or other existing shared facility is not possible. This includes providing evidence of contact with abutting property owners and evidence that they are not willing to share an existing dock or develop a shared moorage. For commercial/industrial facilities, this would include evidence that existing commercial facilities can't be shared or are inadequate for the proposed use.</li> <li>• Minimum grating requirements to allow for light.</li> <li>• Any dock, pier, and moorage pile must include an evaluation of the nearshore environment and the potential impact of the facility on the environment.</li> </ul>	
RES22	Ander Russell, Re-Sources	9/17/20	F	16.16.235(B)(4)	<p><i>Mitigation requirements for hazard trees</i> – Currently there's no requirement to mitigate, or replant, a hazard tree. We suggest adding a requirement to replant a native tree in an appropriate location on site for every hazard tree removed in the shoreline.</p>	Please refer to 16.16.235(B)(4)
RES23	Ander Russell, Re-Sources	9/17/20	D	23.40.150	<p><i>Lake Whatcom</i> – The City of Bellingham's SMP (Title 22, BMC) makes many mentions of Lake Whatcom and discourages certain new uses and activities like docks (a whole section in BMC 22.09.060 "Piers, floats, pilings – Lake Whatcom and Lake Pad-</p>	We have reviewed Bellingham's sections of code that you reference and do not see any discouragement as you say; in fact, there's has the same components as

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					den) and the spraying of herbicides (BMC 22.05.020(B)(1)(n)). Please consider mirroring the City's SMP regulations for Lake Whatcom.	ours.
RES24	Ander Russell, Re-Sources	9/17/20	D	23.40.190	<i>Bulkheads and Shoreline Armoring</i> – Bulkheads and other forms of hard armoring should be conditional uses because of their adverse impacts on the shoreline environment.	Comment noted. Please note that in the use table most of the hard armoring measures are either prohibited or require a CUP. For bulkheads specifically we did not change existing text. Furthermore, we did add text that prioritizes soft-stabilization measures, and that hard measures are of last resort.
PB01	Pam Borso	11/8/20	C	C/P Ch. 8	I would like to urge you to include the amendment to Whatcom County's comprehensive plan to include Marine Resource Lands as a way to recognize marine and tidal lands in Chapter 8 of the Comprehensive plan. Marine and tidal lands are as important as forestry, mining and agricultural lands. These lands are significant resources and along with the upland areas adjacent to them need to be protected for their cultural, social and economic values.	Your comments will be forwarded to the P/C for their consideration.
MS01	Mike Sennett	11/8/20	C	C/P Ch. 8	Whatcom County's geography stretches from the coasts of the Salish Sea to the Cascades, and all the watersheds of the three forks of the Nooksack River are gathered and delivered to the Salish Sea. It seems to me that the unique areas where land and ocean meet have been undervalued by the settler culture. The original functioning ecosystems that supported the indigenous peoples have been severely degraded. Estuaries and wetlands have been filled in, and development has sprawled along the shores in Sandy Point, resulting in shoreline armoring. Birch Bay, Drayton Harbor and The Lummi Nation's tide flats have been contaminated by dairy industry pollution. The lack of protection for our coast has resulted from a lack of recognition of its singular importance by the various governments that have oversight over those areas.  It is time to correct that myopia, and to recognize the important status of our marine lands. By adding the Marine Resources Lands Amendment to Chapter Eight of the Comprehensive Plan,	Your comments will be forwarded to the P/C for their consideration.

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
KC01	Kim Clarkin	11/12/20	C	C/P Ch. 8	<p>joining Forestry, Agriculture, and Mining as codified land uses.</p> <p>I support calling out, recognizing and protecting Marine Resource Lands specifically in Ch. 8 of the Comprehensive Plan. I do not understand parts of the new section:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. p8-36, para 1 makes it sound like MRLs are only marine shorelines. According to the map they actually extend to the county line. It would be helpful to describe the extent and exclusions in this section. The map shows that part of Bellingham Bay, Drayton Harbor and the shoreline around Blaine are excluded for unexplained reasons. Some of these areas are in special designations but there is no explanation of what these designations mean. Perhaps this could be clarified.</li> <li>b. On p8-39, Policy 8U-3 seems unnecessary. If it is meant to convey a specific meaning, could that be stated clearly?</li> <li>c. Policy 8U-4 refers to State marine resource lands within Whatcom County. I think we may mean State aquatic lands within the county.</li> <li>d. On p 8-41, goal 8W includes no policies. Is this because specifics are listed in other areas of the CompPlan? It would seem useful to incorporate policies related to e.g., reducing shading of near-shore habitat by piers and docks; reducing hard shoreline stabilization methods and incentivizing soft ones; preventing oil spills; removing creosote; protecting kelp and eelgrass beds, etc. If this is done elsewhere in the Comp Plan perhaps reference to those sections here would help integrate the Plan.</li> <li>e. I suggest including the boundaries of the Cherry Point Aquatic Reserve on the map.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Portions of other jurisdictions' shoreline jurisdiction are excluded; the County has no jurisdiction there.</li> <li>b. You would have to ask the MRC.</li> <li>c. We believe the MRC chose the word "marine" instead of aquatic because they were focused on the <i>Marine</i> Resource Lands, not all aquatic lands.</li> <li>d. Goal 8W has no policies because the MRC did not propose any.</li> <li>e. Not a bad idea.</li> </ul>
CPAPCSC 01	Cherry Point Aquatic Reserve Citizen Stewardship Committee	11/11/20	C	C/P Ch. 8	<p>The CPAR CSC supports policies and regulations that further protect and enhance marine shoreline areas, such as the Cherry Point Aquatic Reserve. Therefore, the CPAR CSC writes this letter to express support for the Chapter 8 Marine Resource Lands addition to the Whatcom County Comprehensive Plan. This addition to Chapter 8 recognizes marine resource lands and designates long overdue protection of these marine resource lands that are vital economically, culturally, recreationally</p>	<p>Your comments will be forwarded to the P/C for their consideration.</p>



Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					and environmentally.	
BIAWC01	Jacquelyn Stryna, BAIWC	11/5/20	D, F		Terminology – There is initial concern about terminology that requires clarification, including terms such as “Type O water,” “functionally disconnected,” “habitat corridors,” and “ecological connectivity,” among others. Please clarify and specify where these terms are codified.	All terms are defined in Ch. 23. 60 (Definitions) of Title 23 or Article 9 (Definitions) of Ch. 16.16.
BIAWC02	Jacquelyn Stryna, BAIWC	11/5/20	F	16.16.265(A)(1)	Building setbacks – It is unclear why there is a need for building setbacks to be a minimum of 10 feet from the edge of a CA buffer (WCC 16.16). As currently written, the building setbacks further reduce the “reasonable use” footprints from a mere 4,000 square feet to 2, 500 square feet.	The 10’ building setback from critical area buffers is an existing rule (only moved in the amended version). It was adopted by Council to minimize impacts when maintaining structures (e.g., when putting a ladder up against a 2-story structure the bottom would need to stick out 5-10 feet) and to provide a “fire safe” area where combustible materials can be removed.
BIAWC03	Jacquelyn Stryna, BAIWC	11/5/20	D, F		SMP and CAO changes lend increased authority to the County over development, which restricts the freedom and business autonomy of home builders and homeowners alike. Private property rights are infringed upon with less autonomy for land owners and more authority for County government to determine garden and landscape decisions. Restated, the SMP and CAO updates specifically narrow the choices of home builders and homeowners for no reasonable benefit. These proposed updates extend County authority.	Your comments will be forwarded to the P/C for their consideration.
BIAWC04	Jacquelyn Stryna, BAIWC	11/5/20	F	16.16.270(C)(12)	Reasonable Use Exceptions/Reduction: Why is the County proposing a reasonable use reduction to such a small footprint of 2,500 square feet?	Staff has proposed to go back to the 2,500 sq. ft. maximum impact area we had prior to the 2017 Critical Areas update , as under a reasonable use exception granted by the Hearing Examiner no mitigation would be required.
BIAWC05	Jacquelyn Stryna, BAIWC	11/5/20	F	16.16.630(E)	Increased Buffers only further restrict land availability and choke the potential for a home to be built.	Your comments will be forwarded to the P/C for their consideration.
BIAWC06	Jacquelyn Stryna, BAIWC	11/5/20	D, F		Mitigation requirements cost burden projects and mitigation ratio changes impede autonomy in the construction schedule.	Your comments will be forwarded to the P/C for their consideration.
BIAWC07	Jacquelyn Stryna, BAIWC	11/5/20	D, F		All of the proposed land use modifications add to the overall project cost of building a house. This type of over-regulation directly contributes to the high cost of housing Whatcom County	Your comments will be forwarded to the P/C for their consideration.

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					is experiencing, plus constricts the availability of land supply.	
LSK01	Lesla Starkenburg-Kroontje, on behalf of John and Leanne Olson, Larry and Barbara Nims, and John and Gladys Van Boven	11/19/20	G	Shoreline Environment Designation Map	<p>This letter is written on behalf of John and Leanne Olson and Larry and Barbara Nims, the owners of APN 390302 428076 0000 and 390302 485039 0000, and on behalf of John and Gladys Van Boven, the owners of APN 390302 440200 0000. Their property is located at the corner of East Pole Road and Everson Goshen Road and is depicted on the attached Assessor section map.</p> <p>My clients' property was designated as a shoreline of the state under the Shoreline Management Program during the 2008 Comprehensive Plan update. However, this entire property is part of the mineral resource overlay under the Whatcom County Code with permits to mine and the ability to change the configuration of the water body.</p> <p>In 2008 after the completion of the Shoreline Management Program update, the property owners were made aware of the designation. Whatcom County staff at the time believed that the owners had requested the designation. This was not the case. In fact, it was the Department of Ecology who mistakenly noted this area as requiring designation in their correspondence with Whatcom County in January of 2007. Had the property owner's been notified they would have explained the temporary configuration of the water body that is still actively mined.</p> <p>The property owners were told to correct the erroneous shoreline designation, they needed to wait until the next Shoreline Management Program Periodic Update. Since the periodic update time is upon us, it is now time to correct the designation. However, I see the error is continuing forward as the maps still note the area is designated as "shoreline".</p> <p>The Washington State Department of Ecology and Whatcom County have not made it a practice to designate mineral extraction sites as shorelines because the size and configuration of the shoreline is not certain until mineral extraction is complete and the mineral resource land zoning overlay removed from the</p>	Before a determination can be made, staff has requested of their attorney an approved reclamation plan.

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					<p>property.</p> <p>In fact, as mineral extraction, and its accessory uses, are considered the highest and best use for the property within the mineral resource land overlay it is presumed that expansion and contraction of the water body will continue over the course of many decades. To create a nonconformity for the preferred zoning use and the existing permits for a waterbody that may to temporary in nature is not good planning.</p> <p>This situation has been discussed many times in different permit settings with the County with the understanding that at this time of this periodic update the error would be corrected.</p>	
RFW01	Ander Russell & Eddy Ury (ReSources), Rein Attemann (Washington Environmental Council), and Tim Trohimovich (Futurewise)	11/12/20	A, B, C, E, G	C/P Ch. 10, Ch. 11, Ch. 8 & Title 22, & Shoreline Environment Designation Map	<p>We recommend that the P/C tentatively approve all Comprehensive Plan amendments proposed in Exhibits A, B, and C, as well as all proposed amendments to WCC Title 22 shown in Exhibit E, as well as the Shoreline Environmental Designations map.</p> <p>However, as our previous comments stated, we are recommending additional policies be added into the Comprehensive Plan, with corresponding development regulations updated in Title 22.</p>	Your comments will be forwarded to the P/C for their consideration.
RFW02	Ander Russell & Eddy Ury (ReResources), Rein Attemann (Washington Environmental Council), and Tim Trohimovich (Futurewise)	11/12/20	B	C/P Ch. 10	<p>Modify Policy 11AA-5 be modified to read as follows:</p> <p>Policy 11AA-5: <u>Whatcom County shall monitor the impacts of climate change on Whatcom County's shorelands, the shoreline master program's ability to adapt to sea level rise and other aspects of climate change at least every periodic update, and revise the shoreline master program as needed.</u></p> <p>Whatcom County <del>shall</del> <u>should</u> periodically assess the best available sea level rise projections and other science related to climate change within shoreline jurisdiction and incorporate them into future program updates, as relevant.</p>	The P/C accepted this recommendation, though retained "should" (instead of "shall") in both the 1 <sup>st</sup> and 2 <sup>nd</sup> sentences.
RFW03	Ander Russell & Eddy Ury (ReResources), Rein Attemann (Washington Environmental Council), and Tim Trohimovich	11/12/20	B	C/P Ch. 11	<p>Add a new Policy 11AA-8 reading: <u>New lots and new and expanded development should be located so they will not interfere with the landward expansion and movement of wetlands and aquatic vegetation as sea level rises.</u></p>	Your comments will be forwarded to the P/C for their consideration.

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
	(Futurewise)					
RFW04	Ander Russell & Eddy Ury (ReSources), Rein Attemann (Washington Environmental Council), and Tim Trohimovich (Futurewise)	11/12/20	A	C/P Ch. 8	Add an additional policy, possibly under Goal 10D: <u>Protect natural processes and functions of Marine Resource Lands and critical areas in anticipation of climate change impacts, including sea level rise.</u>	Your comments will be forwarded to the P/C for their consideration.
RFW05	Ander Russell & Eddy Ury (ReSources), Rein Attemann (Washington Environmental Council), and Tim Trohimovich (Futurewise)	11/12/20	D, F	Title 23, Ch. 16.16	We recommend that the P/C table all changes to WCC 16.16 and WCC 23.40 until a No Net Loss memo is prepared.	A draft NNL addendum is anticipated in December 2020. The P/C will have it prior to any final action.
MM01	Mike MacKay	11/30/20	D	23.40.190(A)(8)	<p>1. When hard shoreline stabilization measures are demonstrated to be necessary, they must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Limit the size of stabilization measures to the minimum necessary; and</li> <li>b. Assure no net loss of shoreline ecological functions, <u>including loss of substrate for forage fish spawning; and</u></li> <li>c. <u>Regular beach nourishment must be provided to retain beach material with substrate size suitable for forage fish spawning; and,</u></li> <li>d. Ensure that publicly financed or subsidized shoreline erosion control measures do not restrict appropriate public access to the shoreline except where such access is determined to be infeasible because of incompatible uses, safety, security, or harm to ecological functions.</li> </ul>	<p>Though the commenter cited §23.4.180, the text to which he is referring is found in §23.40.190(A)(8).</p> <p>Though staff agrees with the sentiment, we don't believe the addition to (b) is necessary, as loss of substrate for forage fish spawning is just one of many shoreline ecological functions already addressed in Ch. 16.16. Thus, it is one of many specific aspects already addressed by the general rules. Additionally, such areas are already designated as critical saltwater habitat, which is designated a Habitat Conservation Area in Ch. 16.16.</p> <p>The addition of (c) is similar (one specific aspect already covered by the general). But furthermore, beach nourishment is not always the best solution for all habitats. Determining whether beach nourishment is necessary should be determined through the Critical Area Assessment Report process.</p>
MM02	Mike MacKay	11/30/20		23.50.020	Nonconforming Structures <u>H. Seasonal floating traps and weirs for enumerating salmon on</u>	Staff opposes this addition. We don't believe that we ought to blanket designate

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					<p><u>streams and rivers are considered a legally nonconforming structures, provided they do not impede river vessel transport or otherwise affect the normal functions of river flow and sediment transport.</u></p>	<p>nate all seasonal traps and weirs as “legally nonconforming.” To achieve this status, the structure has to have been in the same place prior to August 27, 1976—or permitted prior to being made non-permissible by a change in code—and remain in place without a gap of 18 months. The fact that they’re seasonal and moved around makes that highly unlikely. Nonetheless, seasonal traps and weirs are considered a water-dependent use allowed in the aquatic environment and are permissible (though we can’t recall when anyone’s ever applied for a permit to install one).</p>
MM03	Mike MacKay	11/30/20		23.060.060	<p>"F" definitions  <u>24. "Forage Fish" means a group of marine fishes such as surf smelt, sandlance, and herring which provide an important primary food sources for juvenile salmonids and other fish. Intertidal and subtidal gravel and sand sediments on many beaches provide the essential spawning and incubation habitat for surf smelt and sandlance.</u></p>	<p>Staff isn’t opposed to adding such a definition, but think it unnecessary as “spawning and holding areas for forage fish, such as Pacific herring, surf smelt and Pacific sandlance” is already included in the definition of “Critical saltwater habitat.” Nonetheless, were it to be added it should be added to Ch. 16.16, not Title 23. However, the second sentence isn’t really part of a definition of what these fish are, just a statement of the importance of sediment to them. Staff suggests not including it.</p>
MM04	Mike MacKay	11/30/20		23.40.090	<p>Fill and Excavation  <u>9. Marine fill or excavation shall not impede the normal movement of juvenile salmon to move along the intertidal shoreline (salmon migratory corridor) or to force them into deeper water where they are subject to increased predation.</u></p>	<p>Similar to comment MM01, we find this a very specific issue already covered by the general rules. Subsection (A)(1) (and other sections of Title 23) already state that shoreline uses and modifications cannot impact shoreline ecological functions and ecosystem-wide processes. Part of our goal for this update was to</p>

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
						reduce such redundancies and we don't think each section needs to list all the potential impacts a use or modification may have.
MM05	Mike MacKay	11/30/20		23.60.190	"S" definitions 1. <u>"Salmon migratory corridor" means the intertidal pathway used by juvenile salmonids during the first few months of saltwater migration. This intertidal habitat provides protection from predators during initial entry into saltwater.</u>	Again, were such a definition added it should be added to Ch. 16.16, not Title 23. Nonetheless, staff doesn't think this definition is needed as the term is not used in either Ch. 16.16 or Title 23.
NWSF01	Eleanor Hines, NW Surfrider Foundation	11/11/20	C	Marine Resource Lands	<p>Writing to express our strong support for the addition of marine resource lands in chapter 8 in the Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>Agriculture, forest, and mineral lands are already recognized in the Whatcom County Comprehensive Plan, so the addition of Marine Resource Lands to Chapter 8 is fully supported by the Surfrider Northwest Straits Chapter. We only regret that Marine Resource Lands were not included sooner as they are extremely important economically, culturally, recreationally, and environmentally to Whatcom County. Marine resource lands deserve the same protection as our other resource lands and would add a unique protection from other current policies and regulations.</p> <p>We strongly support the inclusion of education and recreation in this section, and we ask that appropriate resources and capacity are allocated to ensure the Chapter 8 additions are fulfilled. We will continue to advocate for the effective and sustainable management of our marine resource lands so that future generations enjoy all the economic, cultural, recreational, and environmental benefits they provide.</p>	Your comments will be forwarded to the P/C for their consideration.
RFW06	Ander Russell & Eddy Ury (ReSources), Rein Attemann (Washington Environmental Council), and Tim Trohimovich (Futurewise)	12/10/20	B		<u>Add new Policy 11AA-8: New lots and new and expanded development along the marine shoreline should be located two feet above the OHWM so they will not interfere with the landward expansion and movement of wetlands and aquatic vegetation as sea level rises. Sea level rise elevation data shall be revised every eight years or when the SMP is updated.</u>	Your comments will be forwarded to the P/C for their consideration.

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
RFW07	Ander Russell & Eddy Ury (ReSources), Rein Attemann (Washington Environmental Council), and Tim Trohimovich (Futurewise)	12/10/20	D	Ch. 23.30	<p>Add new section:</p> <p><u>23.30.080 Sea Level Rise.</u></p> <p>A. <u>New lots shall be designed and located a minimum of two feet above the OHWM so that the buildable area is outside the area likely to be inundated by sea level rise in 2100 and outside of the area in which wetlands and aquatic vegetation will likely migrate during that time.</u></p> <p>B. <u>Where lots are large enough, new structures and buildings shall be located so that they are outside the area likely to be inundated by sea level rise in 2100 and outside of the area in which wetlands and aquatic vegetation will likely migrate during that time.</u></p> <p>C. <u>New and substantially improved structures shall be elevated above the likely sea level rise elevation in 2100 or for the life of the building, whichever is less.</u></p>	Your comments will be forwarded to the P/C & Co/C for their consideration.
RFW08	Ander Russell & Eddy Ury (ReSources), Rein Attemann (Washington Environmental Council), and Tim Trohimovich (Futurewise)	12/10/20	D	23.40.010	Modify Table 1, Shoreline Use by Environment Designation: Change Liquid Manure Storage Facilities and Spreading from a Permitted use to a Conditional Use for the Rural, Resource, and Conservancy Shoreline environments.	
RFW09	Ander Russell & Eddy Ury (ReSources), Rein Attemann (Washington Environmental Council), and Tim Trohimovich (Futurewise)	12/10/20	D	23.40.040	<p>Agriculture – Add to subsection (A) General:</p> <p><u>6. Replacement manure storage facilities must be tanks or towers.</u></p> <p><u>7. All new manure storage facilities must be tanks or towers.</u></p>	Your comments will be forwarded to the P/C for their consideration.
RFW10	Ander Russell & Eddy Ury (ReSources), Rein Attemann (Washington Environmental Council), and Tim Trohimovich (Futurewise)	12/10/20	D	23.40.140	<p>Mining – Add:</p> <p><u>D. Mining in the 100-year floodplain, floodway, or channel migration zones shall meet the following standards:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. <u>Mines should be located outside the channel migration zone unless there is no feasible alternative site.</u></li> <li>ii. <u>Mines shall be no deeper than the bottom of the nearby streams and rivers.</u></li> <li>iii. <u>The mine reclamation plan shall have a design so that when the river or stream moves into the mine it is not so wide or deep that the captured sediments destabilize the</u></li> </ul>	<p>Your comments will be forwarded to the P/C for their consideration.</p> <p>(Were this added it should probably be (B)(2), not (D).)</p>

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					<p><u>river or stream or increase erosion risks on upstream properties.</u></p>	
RFW11	Karlee Deatherage (Resources), Tim Trohimovich (Futurewise), & Rein Attemann (WEC)	1/12/21	B	11AA-8	<p>Add new policy:</p> <p><u>11AA-8: The buildable area of new lots and new and expanded development along the marine shoreline should be located two feet above the OHWM so they will be at a lower risk of damage and not interfere with the landward expansion and movement of wetlands and aquatic vegetation as sea level rises. The part of the ownership waterward of the buildable area may be used as required open space. If new data is available, sea level rise elevation data shall be revised during the SMP periodic update.</u></p>	<p>This is a revised proposal after speaking with staff about our implementation concerns. Though staff still takes the position that we should await the CoSMoS model to be completed for Whatcom County, this policy is probably implementable.</p>
RFW11	Karlee Deatherage (Resources), Tim Trohimovich (Futurewise), & Rein Attemann (WEC)	1/12/21	D	23.30.080	<p>Add new section:</p> <p><b><u>23.30.080 Sea Level Rise.</u></b></p> <p>A. <u>The buildable portion of new lots shall be designed and located a minimum of two feet above the OHWM so that the buildable area is outside the area likely to be inundated by sea level rise in 2100 and outside of the area in which wetlands and aquatic vegetation will likely migrate during that time. The part of the ownership waterward of the buildable portion may be used as required open space.</u></p> <p>B. <u>Where lots are large enough, new structures and buildings shall be located a minimum of two feet above the OHWM so that they are outside the area likely to be inundated by sea level rise in 2100 and outside of the area in which wetlands and aquatic vegetation will likely migrate during that time.</u></p> <p>C. <u>New and substantially improved structures shall be elevated above the likely sea level rise elevation in 2100 or for the life of the building, whichever is less.</u></p> <p><b>How the language will work in practice</b> Currently new shoreline development must locate the ordinary high-water mark as part of the application for a shoreline exemption or shoreline permit. The proposed policy and regulations simply require the applicant to locate the buildable area for</p>	<p>This is a revised proposal after speaking with staff about our implementation concerns. Though this tact may be implementable, staff still takes the position that we should await the CoSMoS model to be completed for Whatcom County.</p> <p>There isn't a requirement to address climate change/sea level rise in the SMA, though we could if Council desires. However, what we understand from the DOE is that any such regulations should be built on data, which is what PS-CoSMoS will be providing. Furthermore, once the data is available, we should perform vulnerability and risk assessments to see what kind and where the problems might be, and update our shoreline inventory and characterizations. Without such science, we would be open to challenges.</p>



Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					<p>new lots or the new development two feet above the ordinary high-water mark. Where existing lots are not large enough to accommodate this requirement, the new structures or buildings can be elevated. Determining the location of the area two feet above the ordinary high-water mark will require little addition time or expense.</p> <p><b>Why two feet of elevation?</b> The two feet of elevation is based on the Projected Sea Level Rise for Washington State – A 2018 Assessment for Whatcom County. These science-based projections were prepared by a collaboration of Washington Sea Grant, the University of Washington Climate Impacts Group, Oregon State University, the University of Washington, and the US Geological Survey.<sup>3</sup> These projections incorporate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New science showing the potential for higher sea level rise in the 21st century.</li> <li>• The projections are “community-scale.” They were prepared for 171 locations distributed along Washington’s coastline including Puget Sound. The projections account for variations “in the rate of vertical land movement across the state.”<sup>5</sup> That is: the projections include whether an area is uplifting or subsiding.</li> <li>• The report was peer-reviewed.</li> </ul> <p>Sea level rise is a real problem that is happening now. Sea level is rising and floods and erosion are increasing. The National Research Council concluded that global sea level had risen by about seven inches in the 20th century. A recent analysis of sea-level measurements for tide-gage stations, including the Astoria, Oregon and Seattle Washington tide-gauges, shows that sea level rise is accelerating. The Virginia Institute of Marine Science (VIMS) “emeritus professor John Boon, says “the key message from the 2019 report cards is a clear trend toward acceleration in rates of sea-level rise at 25 of our 32 tide-gauge stations. Acceleration can be a game changer in terms of impacts and planning, so we really need to pay heed to these patterns.” We hope the P/C agrees that it is time to address this</p>	

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					accelerating problem.	
KC02	Kim Clarkin	1/10/21	D	23.50.010(E)	<p>I support the proposed changes to regulations of non-conforming uses, structures, etc. that are to be replaced.<sup>1</sup> I do not believe we should approve replacements that are non-conforming. We are attempting to improve--not just maintain--the habitat and other conditions of our shorelines. Replacement should be an opportunity for bring shorelines up to our current standards and guidelines. Please vote to modify title 23 to accord with this goal.</p> <p>[<sup>1</sup> Note: Staff believes Ms. Clarkin is referring to Commissioner Hansen's proposal to delete the ability of a nonconforming use to change to another type of nonconforming use.]</p>	<p>Whatcom County has some of the most lenient nonconforming regulations around, and allowing a nonconforming use to switch to another type of nonconforming use is rather rare. Nonetheless, this is what our existing nonconforming use regulations in WCC Title 20 (Zoning) allow, so staff has prepared this section of the SMP to mimic those regulations.</p>
PB02	Pam Borso	1/11/21	D	23.40.140	<p>Please approve the following amendment to the Shoreline Management Act as presented by Jim Hansen:</p> <p>Chapter 23.40.140 Mining: Changes to Prohibit Commercial Gravel Bar Scalping</p>	<p>Gravel mining in our rivers is currently allowed. However, it is difficult to permit given other state and federal regulations, especially the Endangered Species Act (which is why we don't see much of this activity). However, Council has indicated a desire to allow some gravel mining. This desire is expressed in their docketed item PLN2019-00011:</p> <p>"Amend the Whatcom County Comprehensive Plan and Whatcom County Code to allow the seasonal extraction of sand and gravel from dry upland areas located within the 1,000 year meander zone of the Nooksack River, provided that such extraction has no negative impact on salmon spawning habitat.</p> <p>The intent is to (a) reduce the conversion of land currently used for farming, forestry and wildlife habitat into gravel pits, and (b) safely remove some of the significant sediment load that enters the Nooksack every year in an effort to re-</p>

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
						duce flooding and the need to build higher flood prevention berms along the river as the climate continues to change."
PB03	Pam Borso	1/11/21	D	23.50.010(E)	<p>Please approve the following amendment to the Shoreline Management Act as presented by Jim Hansen:</p> <p>Nonconforming Uses: Jim will propose a change that will no longer allow the replacement of one shoreline nonconforming use (Grandfathered) with another different nonconforming use.</p>	See response to KC02
MM06	Mike MacKay	1/1/21	D	23.40.140	<p>Please consider language which would prohibit mining (gravel scalping) in the Channel Migration Zone.</p> <p>I have firsthand experience how this activity can seriously impact endangered Chinook salmon in the Nooksack River. I was doing field surveys at the time as a fisheries biologist with the Lummi Tribe. These were spawner surveys documenting locations of Chinook and Chum redds (salmon nests). This took place in late September in the 1980s at a sandbar downstream of the Everson Bridge on the right bank (North side).</p> <p>At that time it was not widely known about Chinook spawning in that part of the lower river. I had talked to several gravel scalping company employees during this activity and they vehemently denied seeing any salmon spawning at these excavation sites. WA Fish and Wildlife had reluctantly issued permits for gravel scalping activities. Operators were required by WDFW to re-grade areas they excavated at the end of each day. Unfortunately this was routinely ignored.</p> <p>In this case of the Everson sandbar, the bar was dredged and the sand/silt/gravel material was stockpiled in large heaps immediately upstream of several active Chinook redds that I observed being constructed. A few days later there was a high flow event, as is common this time of year during rainstorms (late September). The stockpiled mounds were eroded away and essentially covered the redds downstream I had observed earlier. I carefully documented this with a report and photos which</p>	See response to PB02

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					<p>was sent to WDFW permit writers. Since this time WDFW has been reluctant to issue new permits for this activity on the Nooksack River.</p> <p>I have researched the effects of fine sediments on salmon redds in the literature. What occurs is that the fines less than 0.5 mm are driven down into the stream bed by the swift water into the newly built redd(s) and form a layer which effectively suffocates the eggs. This fine sediment impedes the flow of oxygenated water around the egg pockets. Adult female salmon are careful to remove fine sediments from the redd during their excavation and egg laying. While some natural occurring fines accumulate in the egg pockets as the result of high flow events, this amount usually doesn't restrict flows of circulating water to any large extent, and certainly not to the degree that an eroded nearby source of newly excavated sediment would.</p> <p>There are numerous sandy/gravel areas in the lowlands of Whatcom County not adjacent to the river available for gravel extraction. Gravel scalping should not be an allowed activity in the Channel Migration Zone or next to any flowing rivers or streams.</p>	
KC03	Kim Clarkin	1/12/21	D	23.30.080	I support the additional policy and regulation proposed by Futurewise, RE-Sources, and WEC regarding limiting new and expanded near-shore building to 2' above the OHWM. Given the projected sea levels in future, and the uncertainty surrounding the exact figure, 2' seems to me an excellent choice. We should definitely not permit people to build right at current OHWM if we want to protect their safety and investment. Please incorporate the additions to Chapter 11 of the Comprehensive Plan, and WCC 23.30.	See response to RFW11.
NTNR01	Michael Maudlin, Nooksack Tribe Natural Resources staff	1/13/21	D	23.30.070	<p><b>Public Access</b> Trail construction within the shorelines buffer is a long-term, permanent impact to instream habitat. The loss of wood recruitment to the channel due to the removal of hazard trees and maintenance of downed wood across the trail needs to be considered in the assessment of trail impacts. The interruption of the process of natural wood delivery to the channel is largely</p>	While the writer's point may be valid, the SMA identified public access to the shorelines as a preferred use (and one of the driving forces in its adoption). While WCC Ch. 16.16 contains numerous standards for where trails may be located in critical areas and how they're built,

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					responsible for the degraded instream habitat conditions for threatened fish stocks and has led to local salmon recovery partners spending millions of dollars installing artificial logjams to offset this impact. Where trails align with existing roads or levees that already receive maintenance this is less of an additional impact, but siting recreational development within the shorelines buffer should be discouraged to be consistent with other general regulation sections.	WCC 16.16 does not address maintenance. We suggest you work w/ Whatcom County Parks Department to address this issue.
NTNR02	Michael Maudlin, Nooksack Tribe Natural Resources staff	1/13/21	D	23.40.140	<b>Mining</b> The Nooksack Natural Resources Department strongly opposes gravel mining in the active channel area and bars of the river. The history of instream habitat degradation associated with past mining operations has been well documented by the Lummi Nation and with the subsequent listing of fish stocks under the Endangered Species Act gravel removal from the channel is not a viable commercial activity. The disturbance from gravel mining can directly impact salmon habitat, disrupt the aquatic food web, degrade water quality, disturb emergent vegetation and alter the natural process of sediment transport and storage- all of which the SMP is designed to protect. It is simply not possible to design and conduct in-channel mining activities that will not lead to a loss of ecological function and natural process. Any sediment management activities in the river, including removal for flood management, need to maintain consistency with the WRIA 1 Salmon Recovery Plan and the on-going integrated floodplain management planning effort. This section should be edited to prohibit gravel mining from the river.	Your comments will be provided to the P/C & Co/C.
NTNR03	Michael Maudlin, Nooksack Tribe Natural Resources staff	1/13/21	D	23.40.160	<b>Recreation</b> As previously mentioned, trails can be a permanent impact to critical area buffers. It is important to make sure that trail location is not degrading riparian function. Limiting trails to the outer 25% of the buffer will help preserve potential wood recruitment to the channel. Ideally, recreational infrastructure would be cited outside of buffer areas to the fullest extent possible.	We agree, and WCC 16.16 does limit trail construction to the outer 25% of the buffer (except in certain limited circumstances) and mitigation is required.
MES27	Ed Miller, Miller Environmental Services	2/19/21	F	16.16.225(D)	Replace "associated with marine, river, or lake shorelines and wetlands" with "within designated critical areas and/or buffers." The term "associated with marine, river or lake shorelines and	This new section is intended to address the SMA's requirement to preserve native plant communities associated with shore-

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					wetlands" is vague. This could imply any native plant communities any distance from a marine area, river, lake or wetland. It seems the intent should be to prioritize native plant communities within designated critical areas and/or buffers – that are specifically covered within this chapter of the CAO. Otherwise, it seems the code would be directing applicants to design projects based on plants and plant communities not covered by the CAO.	lines. Though shorelines are considered critical areas pursuant to 16.16.710, staff thought it would be easier for people to understand this rule by if we just call them out. Thus, this wouldn't expand CAO requirements outside of intended areas. Though it could be changed to read as suggested, it wouldn't have any effect on the regulation. The term "associated" refers to associated with... shorelines, as detailed in the WAC.
MES28	Ed Miller, Miller Environmental Services	2/19/21	F	6.16.255(C)(3)	Strike the new added section "Critical areas assessment reports shall... identify impacts of the proposed use/development on habitat corridors, ecological connectivity, and habitat for salmon and forage fish." Currently, Biodiversity areas and corridors are a WA Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) Priority Habitat. All WDFW priority habitats are currently regulated as HCA's in the CAO. As such applicants are already required to address them. Additionally, habitat for salmon and forage fish are also HCA's covered in the code, as all streams and waters are included as HCA's. The term ecological connectivity is very general and could be widely interpreted to mean many different habitats not covered under the CAO. Otherwise, if that is not staff intent, it would appear this extends CAO jurisdiction over areas not designated as critical areas within the code.	This language, along with other additions, was added to address Council's direction in the Scoping Document to "Consider strengthening ecological connectivity and wildlife corridor requirements" and "Consider ways to improve protections for salmon and forage fish habitat" (Items #8b and 8c). Though, as Mr. Miller argues, Biodiversity areas, wildlife corridors, and WDFW Priority Habitats are designated as critical areas already, addressing them in critical areas assessments was often overlooked. The text was inserted as a reminder that – if there are any such features affected by a development proposal – they should be addressed in the assessment.
MES29	Ed Miller, Miller Environmental Services	2/19/21	F	16.16.270	This section is a complete rewrite of reasonable use procedures and would require a variance (minor and major variance) before reasonable use would apply. Strike the proposed changes and return to the prior language.	The change better aligns with Department of Commerce and Department of Ecology guidance on Reasonable Use Exceptions. The current and previous CAO did not follow the guidance from State Agencies.  The existing code does require a variance process to be completed before a reasonable use exception is granted. The

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
						<p>Hearing Examiner has questioned why he isn't the final decision maker, as the current code allows an administrative determination to be made after a quasi-judicial decision, and in the hierarchy of permitting, applicants should have to exhaust any administrative remedies before seeking a quasi-judicial decision. Thus, we have rewritten the processes and changed the order of the various mechanisms so that the more impactful cases are heard by the Hearing Examiner.</p> <p>Please see the staff report to the P/C dated 4/12/21 for a more detailed explanation as to why staff is proposing this new schema.</p>
MES30	Ed Miller, Miller Environmental Services	2/19/21	F	16.16.270(j)	Add the italicized text at the end of the sentence, "The project includes mitigation for unavoidable critical area and buffer impacts in accordance with the mitigation requirements of this chapter <i>or if the mitigation requirements cannot be met, to the maximum extent feasible on the property.</i>	The section to which Mr. Miller refers is language proposed for deletion. Nonetheless, under the proposed RUE rules, his suggestion would be already be the case.
MES31	Ed Miller, Miller Environmental Services	2/19/21	F	16.16.270(C)(12)	<p>We also propose adding language for the reasonable use section to allow for a development footprint of up to 4,000 square feet for reasonable use single-family residential development. Buffer mitigation should be proposed to offset impacts from reasonable use development as much as possible, but development shall not be denied if the minimum 1:1 mitigation ratio cannot be achieved on the subject property. This would not apply to direct impacts to critical areas themselves, as is the case in the current code.</p> <p>The proposed change is a significant alteration to the code. A significant number of previously designated reasonable use projects, processed administratively, would need to go to the hearing examiner. This will significantly increase costs and time to applicants for simple single-family construction or projects with only buffer impacts – as the current code requires an open</p>	<p>The P/C has already tentatively voted to leave the allowable disturbed area as 4,000 sf.</p> <p>Please see the staff report to the P/C dated 4/12/21 for a more detailed explanation as to why staff proposed to go back to the 2,500 sf under our proposed new schema.</p>

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					public hearing for anything more complex. The change to section j is included so that applicants aren't required to purchase another property for mitigation – which has been required in some cases, precluding any development at all (even for buffer impacts).	
MES32	Ed Miller, Miller Environmental Services	2/19/21	F	16.16.620(D) & .720(D)	Strike the change to “existing legal lots” and keep the current language of “private development sites” in both wetland and HCA sections. This section as modified implies that no new lots could be created (subdivided) if a road would be needed to cross through a wetland or buffer or habitat conservation areas. Access to acres of unencumbered property could be restricted if one small wetland or its buffer would need to be impacted to access a development area.	We believe that Mr. Miller was reviewing an older draft, as this language has already changed. Furthermore, subsection (C) continues to allow for stream crossings to undeveloped land.
MES33	Ed Miller, Miller Environmental Services	2/19/21	F	16.16.630(B) & 6.16.740(A)(1)	Retain the existing language stating that “buffers shall not include areas that are functionally and effectively disconnected from the wetland (or HCA) by an existing, legally established road or other substantial developed surface,” rather than the proposed “buffers shall not include areas of existing, legally established substantially developed surface”. The proposed change would allow buffers to include disconnected area on the opposite side of roads or developed surfaces (such as buildings).	The amendment is proposed so as to be completing consistent with DOE’s guidance and not just the portion about functional disconnect. (See Ecology Wetland Science Volume 2.)
MES34	Ed Miller, Miller Environmental Services	2/19/21	F	16.16.640(A)(5)	Regarding Buffer Width Increasing, strike this added section, which is not in the current code and allows staff to extend any Category II wetland buffers out to 300 feet if another wetland or HCA is within 300 feet. HCA’s include mature forest, priority snags (logs on the ground, 20 feet long, 12 inches wide), streams, etc. The intent of this appears to be to increase buffers if adjacent critical areas are present. However, this is already accounted for in the wetland rating form. The habitat score, which drives the buffer width, is scored higher if habitat conservation areas are within 330 feet. The proposed draft change seems redundant when these factors are already utilized in determining the buffers in the current code - based on the wetland rating form.	The existing code already allows the Director to increase buffer widths, but with less guidance, which consultants are usually clamoring for. Thus, we “borrowed” language from Skagit County, which provides better detail on when the Director can do so. We don’t see how this would result in a double counting towards buffer requirements
MES35	Ed Miller, Miller Environmental Services	2/19/21	F	16.16.640(B)(2) & 16.16.745(B)(2)	Regarding Buffer Width Averaging, strike the proposed language “In the specified locations where a buffer has been re-	In 2005 the Department of Ecology released two volumes of Best Available



Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					<p>duced to achieve averaging, the Director may require enhancement to the remaining buffer to ensure no net loss of ecologic function, services, or value.”</p> <p>This new language effectively eliminates the intent of buffer averaging and converts it to buffer reduction by requiring mitigation. Buffer averaging is an important and simple way to allow more flexibility for property owners that need to make minor buffer adjustments. This section will also reduce consistency and predictability (each staff member could apply this differently), and will increase the cost for simple projects by requiring plantings, monitoring, bonding, etc. by thousands of dollars. Additionally, the Director already has the ability to require plantings in a wetland or HCA buffer where it lacks adequate vegetation under 16.16.630.D or 16.740.B.1 – making this code addition redundant.</p>	<p>Science: <a href="#">Volume 1</a> was a synthesis of knowledge to date, and <a href="#">Volume 2</a> addressed management recommendations. Ecology addresses buffer averaging in two locations, the first is in Volume 2 section 8.3.8.3 (Buffer Averaging) and the second, in greater detail, in <a href="#">Appendix 8-C</a> (Guidance on Widths of Buffers and Ratios for Compensatory Mitigation for Use with the Western Washington Wetland Rating System). In Volume 2, Section 8.3.8.3, Ecology explains three reasons why buffer averaging is in the tool kit for protection of wetlands. The first and typical reason is to allow development to occur closer than usual to the wetland in order to fit a particular development “footprint” onto a given site. The second reason is protect a natural feature (e.g., a stand of trees or snags) that otherwise would fall outside of the standard buffer. And the third reason is to provide connections with adjacent habitats or to address those situations where pre-existing development has reduced a buffer area to a width less than the required standard.</p> <p>In Appendix 8-C Ecology states “widths of buffers may be averaged if this will improve the protection of wetland functions or if it is the only way to allow for reasonable use of a parcel. There is no scientific information available to determine if averaging the widths of buffers actually protects functions of wetlands.” Ecology then proceeds to provide criteria for averaging a buffer: 1) It should not be reduced by more than ¼; 2) the area of the standard</p>

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
						<p>and averaged buffer are the same; and 3) the buffer is increased adjacent to the higher functioning buffer, and there is a distinct difference between the higher functioning and lower functioning buffers. The requirement for a high function and lower function buffer eliminates the use of averaging when the buffer is entirely degraded.</p> <p>Thus, staff recommends that we amend the draft language to allow buffer averaging only when there is fully functioning and degraded habitat and add language that supports Ecology's Guidance for allowing averaging to protect ecologically significant areas outside of the buffer or habitat connectivity. Section (B)(2) would read:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Averaging of required buffer widths will be allowed for the following when the dimensional standards of subsection (B)(1) are met: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. To protect a natural feature (e.g., a stand of trees or snags) that otherwise would fall outside of the standard buffer.</li> <li>b. To provide connections with adjacent habitats or to address those situations where pre-existing development has reduced a buffer area to a width less than the required standard.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>
MES36	Ed Miller, Miller Environmental Services	2/19/21	F	16.16.640(C)(1)(c)	Regarding Buffer Width Reduction, retain the existing language that allows for up to 50% reduction (or 25 feet) for Category IV wetlands, rather than the proposed "The buffer shall not be re-	The maximum reduction of 75% through buffer averaging is based on DOE guid-

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					<p>duced to less than 75% of the standard buffer.</p> <p>The existing code section allows for up to a 50% (or minimum of 25 feet) reduction of a Category IV wetland buffer, while higher category wetlands are restricted to a 25% reduction. Under the draft buffer averaging section, Category IV wetlands are still allowed up to a 50% reduction. This will just remove some flexibility for property owners for the lowest category of wetlands.</p>	<p>ance.</p>
MES37	Ed Miller, Miller Environmental Services	2/19/21	F	16.16.640(C)(1)(e)(iii)	<p>Regarding Buffer Width Reduction, strike the new added section requiring "Retention of existing native vegetation on other portions of the site in order to offset habitat loss from buffer reduction."</p> <p>This added code section appears to increase CAO authority to other areas of the property and other project components outside of critical areas. Staff already has authority to deny proposed buffer reductions, under parts D, F and G of this code section. Part G of this section already requires mitigation for buffer reduction impacts and result in equal or greater protection for the wetland.</p>	<p>This section does not expand CAO authority to areas outside of critical areas; it only provides a pathway to having narrower buffers (see response to item 5, above). The proposed subsections (e) &amp; (f) provide three ways to for an applicant to minimize impacts and provide equivalent functions and values. Subsection (iii) of these subsections lists just one of the ways an applicant of a moderate impact land use project may apply low intensity buffer widths, which are narrower. An applicant need not do this if they don't want to reduce their buffers (the wider buffers would then apply).</p>
MES38	Ed Miller, Miller Environmental Services	2/19/21	F	16.16.640(C)(3) & 16.16.745(C)(2)	<p>Regarding Buffer Width Reduction, strike the draft added section "where a portion of the remaining buffer is degraded, the buffer reduction plan shall include replanting with native vegetation in the degraded portions of the remaining buffer area."</p> <p>The new language appears to be redundant; C.2.g of the wetland section and C.1.g of the HCA section already requires mitigation and no net loss of function for any buffer reduction. Additionally, Section 16.16.630.D and 16.16.740.A.2 also gives the Director authority to require planting in degraded buffer if needed. The draft language implies any amount of degraded buffer could be required to be planted for buffer impacts, no matter how small. This would penalize applicants who own agricultural property and/or grass/hayfields.</p>	<p>The planting of degraded buffers has been a part of our CAO since 2005 and is based on Best Available Science and DOE guidance. Based on case history, we are only clarifying that the area that might be enhanced is limited to the specific portions of the buffer being reduced, not anywhere on the lot, and certainly not outside critical area buffers (and thus does not "grant unlimited potential for mitigation requirements"). Per DOE guidance, "degraded" is any portion of a buffer that is not in a densely vegetated community. Ecology provides this re-</p>

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
						quirement in Appendix 8C, Section 8C.2.5 to either increase the buffer or enhance with native vegetation. Ecology's guidance for buffer size is based on science with a densely planted vegetative buffer.
MES39	Ed Miller, Miller Environmental Services	2/19/21	F	16.16.680(H)	<p>Regarding Wetland Mitigation Ratios, maintain the existing language and strike the proposed language that requires a higher ratio of mitigation when it's done after the impact occurs.</p> <p>Generally, applicants do not conduct mitigation activities prior to permit approval, and generally go to construction as soon as permits are issued. Additionally, mitigation planting is often tied to the planting season – which is preferably fall through spring to increase survivability. This added code language would appear to add a year to applicants' timeline or penalize them with up to 25% more buffer mitigation. Additionally, no net loss of buffer function already required under 16.16.640(C)(2)(g).</p>	This proposed requirement comes from DOE guidance to account for temporal loss.
MES40	Ed Miller, Miller Environmental Services	2/19/21	F	16.16.710(C)(1)(a)(vi) & 16.16.740(B)	<p>Strike this addition of Type O waters and associated 25-foot buffer. Return the prior designation of Natural Ponds to the buffer Table requiring a 50-foot buffer.</p> <p>The definition of Type O waters is vague and could potentially include ditches and artificial ponds. Type O waters do not correlate with Washington State water typing. If the intent is to include ponds as an HCA, we recommend restoring previous code language that included a 50-foot buffer for natural ponds and lakes under 20 acres in size and no buffer for artificial ponds.</p>	The amendment to create Type O water is proposed so as to align Ch. 16.16 with the County's Manure and Agricultural Nutrient Management regulations (WCC Ch. 16.28), which prohibit "the spreading of manure within 50 feet of drainage ditches leading to rivers and streams." This is the code that our Pollution Identification and Correction (PIC) program uses to curtail the introduction of agricultural runoff into our waterways, thereby protecting our shellfish resources. Creating a Type O water with a 25-foot buffer was suggested by our PIC managers, the Whatcom Conservation District, the Department of Agriculture, and other partner agencies so that there's a buffer between where manure might be spread and our waterways. It was determined that 25-feet

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
						would be adequate for this function. Were we to revert to the existing code, then such waterways/ditches might be considered one of the other types with a larger buffer.
MES41	Ed Miller, Miller Environmental Services	2/19/21	F	16.16.745(A)	Regarding Buffer Width Increasing, strike the new added section 16.16.745(A)(2), allowing the Director to increase HCA buffers under certain conditions.  This is a new provision to the code that allows the Director to extend Type S or F buffers to resources within 300 feet – including Category III wetlands, other HCA's or other waters. Again, this is an exceptionally broad provision to add in additional regulated areas that are not currently designated as critical areas or buffers in the existing or even the proposed amended code. The extension of every fish stream or lake buffer to another resource within 300 feet is essentially extending most of the buffer areas to 300 feet.	The existing code already allows the Director to increase buffer widths, but with less guidance, which consultants are usually clamoring for. Thus, we “borrowed” language from Skagit County, which provides better detail on when the Director can do so. We don't see how this would result in a double counting towards buffer requirements
MES42	Ed Miller, Miller Environmental Services	2/19/21	F	16.16.760(B)(8)	Regarding HCA Buffer Mitigation Ratios, maintain the existing language and strike the proposed language that requires a higher ratio of mitigation when it's done after the impact occurs.  Generally, applicants do not conduct mitigation activities prior to permit approval, and generally go to construction as soon as permits are issued. Additionally, mitigation planting is often tied to the planting season – which is preferably fall through spring to increase survivability. This added code language would appear to add a year to applicants' timeline or penalize them with up to 25% more buffer mitigation. Additionally, no net loss of buffer function already required under 16.16.760.	This proposed requirement comes from DOE guidance to account for temporal loss.
LNTHPO02	Tamela Smart, Lummi Nation Tribal Historic Preservation Office	3/1/21	D	23.30.060(A)(2)	A Cultural Resources <u>survey and</u> report. The current language does not include the word survey.	“Survey and” has been added to this section.
LNTHPO02	Tamela Smart, Lummi Nation Tribal Historic Preservation Office	3/1/21	D	23.30.060(A)(3)	The LNTHPO would like to be consulted whether or not cultural resources were encountered during the survey.	This section directs the County to provide the cultural resource report to DAHP—and if Native American cultural resources are addressed—to the Tribes. Staff isn't sure why such reports would need to be

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
						provided to the LNTHPO if N.A. resources aren't involved. Nonetheless your comment will be provided to the P/C and Co/C.
LNTHPO02	Tamela Smart, Lummi Nation Tribal Historic Preservation Office	3/1/21	D	23.30.060(A)(5)	<p>The LNTHPO recommends that the permit also be conditioned based on the County's consultation with the affected tribes and the Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation.</p> <p>If no cultural resources are encountered and the consulting parties concur with the findings, the Whatcom County Inadvertent Discovery Plan for cultural resources should be on-site and followed if cultural resources or human remains are encountered.</p>	<p>This section states that "any permit issued shall be conditioned on meeting the approved report's management recommendations." Given that the report, including the management recommendations, would be approved by DAHP and the Tribe(s) through consultation, then this would already be the case.</p> <p>And subsection (6) already states that any activities would still subject to the state and federal regulations regarding inadvertent discoveries regardless of whether any cultural resources are identified or not, so this, too, would already be the case.</p>
LNTHPO02	Tamela Smart, Lummi Nation Tribal Historic Preservation Office	3/1/21	D	23.30.060(A)(6)	The LNTHPO recommends that this point be made broader to state that any activities are still subject to state and federal laws and regulations regarding cultural resources and human remains.	Regardless of whether we state that any activities are still subject to the state and federal regulations, it would still be the case. Nonetheless, we have broadened the language as suggested.
RFW12	Karlee Deatherage (RE Sources), Danielle Shaw (WEC), and Tim Trohovich (Futurewise)	3/4/21	F	16.16.270	Restore Reasonable Use language in Dec 4, 2020 draft. We urge the Commission to revisit their proposed change to expand the maximum impact area for single-family residences to be no larger than 2,500 square feet in 16.16.270.C.12. The purpose of the reasonable use provision is to allow only the minimal "reasonable" use of property to avoid a constitutional taking when fully applying the standards of critical areas regulations. The courts generally decide the concept of reasonable; however, reasonable use is often interpreted as a modest single-family home. A home with a footprint 4,000 square feet is excessive. A median size house built in 2019 has 2,301 square feet of floor area. We can assume that to be less than footprint 1,500 square	Your comment will be provided to the P/C & Co/C for consideration.

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					<p>feet.</p> <p>Additionally, we strongly urge the Commission to maintain the new language in the code for the processing of reasonable use exceptions. We understand this is a departure from the current code which allows administrative approval of reasonable use exceptions; however, the way Whatcom County has been processing this is contrary to the intent of reasonable use. Quasi-Judicial bodies like the Hearing Examiner should be making the final call as opposed to staff. All feasible measures to derive use of the property must also be exhausted, which includes pursuing a variance. This mirrors language used in both Skagit County and Snohomish County.</p>	
RFW13	Karlee Deatherage (RE Sources), Danielle Shaw (WEC), and Tim Trohovich (Futurewise)	3/4/21	F	16.16.640(A)(5) and 16.16.745(A)(2)	<p>Regarding Buffer Width Increasing, maintain staff proposed changes.</p> <p>The Commission received a suggestion from Miller Environmental Services, Inc. requesting this section to be removed. We disagree. The wetland rating form is not a part of the CAO and this language should be kept in code. Also, this decision could be made by the Director on a case by case basis to increase the size of the required buffer in specific instances. Striking this from the code could deprive the Director of an important tool to better protect the few remaining areas in the county that are vital for wildlife and water quality functions of wetlands and streams. The Department of Ecology's wetland guidance recommends this as an important tool as well: "Ecology's buffer recommendations are also based on the assumption that the buffer is well vegetated with native species appropriate to the ecoregion. If the buffer does not consist of vegetation adequate to provide the necessary protection, then either the buffer area should be planted or the buffer width should be increased."</p>	Your comment will be provided to the P/C & Co/C for consideration.
RFW14	Karlee Deatherage (RE Sources), Danielle Shaw (WEC), and Tim Trohovich (Futurewise)	3/4/21	F	16.16.640(C)(1)(e)(iii)	Regarding Buffer Width Reduction, maintain staff proposed changes. This change proposed by staff allows the Director to provide flexibility in making buffer reductions while still managing and protecting landscape-scale functions and values. We could see how this could benefit a parcel if buffer reduction is occurring in an area with older stands of native trees and there	Your comment will be provided to the P/C & Co/C for consideration.

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					are other trees of similar age onsite that could be preserved and protected from unnecessary clearing. Mature trees serve critical habitat, stormwater control, and water quality functions even if they are not part of a formal buffer for a critical area.	
RFW15	Karlee Deatherage (RE Sources), Danielle Shaw (WEC), and Tim Trohovich (Futurewise)	3/4/21	F	16.16.710(C)(1)(a)(v) and 16.16.740(B)	Regarding Type O Waters and buffer, maintain staff proposed changes.  Miller Environmental Services, Inc. proposes to delete the definition and buffer requirements for Type O waters which connect directly to either waters of the state (Type S waters) or fish habitat (Type F waters) via channel, pipe, culvert, stream, or wetland. We support the staff's proposal to include this because all waters are connected and we must be providing some level of protection from a water quality perspective. Ongoing Agriculture is exempt from this requirement.	Your comment will be provided to the P/C & Co/C for consideration.
RFW16	Karlee Deatherage (RE Sources), Danielle Shaw (WEC), and Tim Trohovich (Futurewise)	3/4/21	F	16.16.745(A)	Regarding Buffer Width Increasing, maintain staff proposed changes.  Having the ability to increase fish and wildlife habitat conservation area buffers is crucial to lend more protection to areas that serve multiple ecosystem functions. This change may only apply to shorelines of the state (Type S waters), fish-bearing waters (Type F waters), or high value wetlands (Category I, II, or III). Again, this is a discretionary decision from the Director which means it may not always happen.	Your comment will be provided to the P/C & Co/C for consideration.
MES43	Ed Miller, Miller Environmental Services	4/12/21	F	16.16.270 & 16.16.273	These sections are a complete rewrite of reasonable use procedures and would require a variance (minor and major variance) before reasonable use would apply.  Current Code: Reasonable use provisions are currently considered prior to a variance application. A variance application is time-consuming, more expensive, and requires review/approval by the hearing examiner with a public hearing. Per 16.16.270.C.1 only reasonable use exceptions for single-family residential building or for other development proposals that would affect only buffers, but not critical areas themselves (e.g., wetlands and streams), shall be processed administratively. Other applications that directly impact critical areas, with the	Our Hearing Examiner has questioned our current schema, in particular why he isn't the final decision maker, as the current code allows an administrative determination to be made after a quasi-judicial decision, and in the hierarchy of permitting, applicants should have to exhaust any administrative remedies before seeking a quasi-judicial decision. Staff is proposing that reasonable use exceptions be the last method of altering standards to allow reasonable economic use of constrained property, and that they be decid-



Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					<p>exception of single-family residential, currently have to apply for a variance application. If an applicant currently wants to propose a larger footprint than the allowed 4,000 square feet under reasonable use, they could also apply for a variance.</p> <p><i>Suggested Change:</i> Strike the proposed changes to reasonable use and variance procedures. Return to the current language. Also, add bolded language to section 16.16.270.j. The project includes mitigation for unavoidable critical area and buffer impacts in accordance with the mitigation requirements of this chapter – <b>or if the mitigation requirements cannot be met, to the maximum extent feasible on the property.</b></p> <p><i>Rational for suggested change:</i> The proposed change is a significant alteration to the code and process. A significant number of previously designated reasonable use projects, processed administratively, would need to go to the hearing examiner. This will significantly increase costs and time to applicants for simple single-family construction or projects with only buffer impacts – as the current code requires an open public hearing for anything more complex. This will also create more uncertainty as to what will be allowed when a property is encumbered with critical areas and buffers. It should also be remembered, that reasonable use scenarios have increased significantly over the last four years as the result of larger buffers occurring on properties since 2017 – the result of utilization of updated Ecology wetland rating forms and guidance. Generally, critical areas, primarily wetlands, have not changed but buffers have become significantly larger.</p> <p>The change to section j is included so that applicants aren't required to purchase another property for mitigation – which has been required in some cases, precluding any development at all (even for buffer impacts).</p>	<p>ed upon by the Hearing Examiner (see 16.16.270 Reasonable Use Exceptions).</p> <p>In this schema, the degree to which one can vary standards while providing the least amount of mitigation moves up a level at each step, with the Hearing Examiner making the tougher decisions through a quasi-judicial process. This would return the reasonable use exception to truly the last effort of avoiding a taking.</p> <p>However, to counter the additional time and cost of this process, staff is also proposing to create a new category of variances, called minor variances (16.16.273 Variances). They would be limited to variances for a 25% to 50% reduction of critical area buffers (when mitigated and they meet certain criteria) but would address most of the instances that reasonable use exceptions are currently applied for. We believe that overall, these changes would significantly reduce the number of cases having to go to the Hearing Examiner and cost less to the citizens of Whatcom County overall.</p>
MES44	Ed Miller, Miller Environmental Services	4/12/21	F	16.16.620(D) & 16.16.720(D)	<p><i>Draft Code:</i> Private Access. Access to <u>existing legal lots</u> may be permitted to cross Category II, III or IV wetlands or their buffers, provided the access meets the following... And. Private Access. Access to existing legal lots may be permitted to cross habitat</p>	<p>This formerly proposed language has already been stricken and reverted to the original language in the more recent ver-</p>

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					<p>conservation areas if there are no feasible alternative alignments.</p> <p><i>Current Code:</i> <u>Access to private development sites</u> may be permitted to cross Category II, III or IV wetlands or their buffers, provided...</p> <p><i>Suggested Change:</i> Strike the change and keep the current language, both wetland and HCA sections.</p> <p><i>Rationale for suggested change:</i> This section as modified implies that no new lots could be created (subdivided) if a road would be needed to cross through a wetland or buffer or habitat conservation areas. Access to large areas of unencumbered property could be restricted if one small wetland or its buffer would need to be impacted to access a development area. For example, creating new lots in unencumbered areas (no critical areas) per the underlying zoning might not be allowed on a 40 acre property if the crossing of a non-fish stream or the outer portion of a buffer was required.</p>	<p>sions of Exhibit F (4/5/21)</p>
MES45	Ed Miller, Miller Environmental Services	4/12/21	F	16.16.640(A)(5)	<p><i>Draft Code:</i> Buffer Width Increasing: The Director may require <u>the standard buffer width to be increased by the distance necessary to protect wetland functions and provide connectivity to other wetland and habitat areas for one of the following:</u></p> <p><u>(5) When a Category I or II wetland is located within 300 feet of:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <u>Another Category I, II or III wetland; or</u></li> <li>b. <u>A fish and wildlife HCA; or</u></li> <li>c. <u>A type S or F stream; or</u></li> <li>d. <u>A high impact land use that is likely to have additional impacts.</u></li> </ol> <p><i>Suggested Change:</i> Strike the new, added section (5).</p> <p><i>Rationale for suggested change:</i> This added provision, not in the current code, allows staff to extend any Category II wetland buffers out to 300 feet – if another wetland or HCA is within 300 feet. HCA's include mature forest, priority snags (logs on the ground, 20 feet long, 12 inches wide), streams, etc.</p> <p>The intent of this appears to be to increase buffers if adjacent</p>	<p>Staff believes this addition better reflects DOE guidance and Council's direction to improve connectivity.</p>

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					critical areas are present. However, this is already accounted for in the wetland rating form. The habitat score, which drives the buffer width, is scored higher if habitat conservation areas are within 330 feet. The proposed draft change seems redundant when these factors are already utilized in determining the buffers in the current code - based on the wetland rating form. If the intent is also to protect habitat corridors, then it is also redundant, as these are already protected in the habitat conservation section of the code – State priority habitat “Biodiversity areas and corridors”.	
MES46	Ed Miller, Miller Environmental Services	4/12/21	F	16.16.640(B)(2) & 16.16.745(B)(2)	<p><i>Draft code.</i> Buffer Width Averaging: <u>In the specified locations where a buffer has been reduced to achieve averaging, the Director may require enhancement to the remaining buffer to ensure no net loss of ecologic function, services, or value.</u></p> <p><i>Suggested Change:</i> Strike the proposed change.</p> <p><i>Rationale for Suggested Change:</i> This section effectively eliminates the intent of buffer averaging and converts it to buffer reduction by requiring mitigation in the form of added plantings. Buffer averaging is an important and simple way to allow more flexibility for property owners that need to make minor buffer adjustments. This section will also reduce consistency and predictability (each staff member could apply this differently), and will increase the cost for simple projects by requiring plantings, monitoring, bonding, etc. by thousands of dollars. Additionally, the Director already has the ability to require plantings in a wetland or HCA buffer where it lacks adequate vegetation under 16.16.630.D or 16.740.B.1, making this code addition redundant.</p>	This formerly proposed language has already been stricken and reverted to the original language in the most recent version of Exhibit F (4/5/21)
MES47	Ed Miller, Miller Environmental Services	4/12/21	F	16.16.640(C)(1)(c)	<p><i>Buffer Width Reduction draft code:</i> <u>The buffer shall not be reduced to less than 75% of the standard buffer.</u></p> <p><i>Current Code:</i> Allows for a Category IV wetland buffer to be reduced by up to 50% or 25 feet, whichever is greater.</p> <p><i>Suggested Change:</i> Restore prior language to allow for up to 50% reduction (or 25 feet) for Category IV wetlands.</p>	Staff believes this amendment better reflects DOE guidance.

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					<p><i>Rationale for Suggested Change:</i> The existing code section allows for up to a 50% (or minimum of 25 feet) reduction of a Category IV wetland buffer, while higher category wetlands are restricted to a 25% reduction. Under the draft buffer averaging section, Category IV wetlands are still allowed up to a 50% reduction. This proposed change will remove flexibility for property owners for the lowest category of wetlands.</p>	
MES48	Ed Miller, Miller Environmental Services	4/12/21	F	16.16.710(C)(1)(a)(v) & 16.16.740(B)	<p><i>Draft Code:</i> Type O waters include all segments of aquatic areas that are not type S, F, or N waters and that are physically connected to type S or F waters by an above-ground channel, system, pipe, culvert, stream or wetland. And 16.16.740.B. Type O Buffer = 25 feet.</p> <p><i>Current Code:</i> Not present in the current code.</p> <p><i>Suggested Change:</i> Strike this addition of Type O waters and associated 25-foot buffer. Return the prior designation of Natural Ponds to the buffer Table requiring a 50 foot buffer.</p> <p><i>Rationale for Suggested Change:</i> The definition of Type O waters will include ditches and artificial ponds that eventually drain to a fish stream. This will include most of the ditching and artificial ponds in Whatcom County. This will in effect place 25-foot buffers in any front yard along a road with a County ditch – creating protected critical areas buffers along most property road frontage. Any time the County public works excavated new ditching, or extended existing new ditching, they would also be creating new critical areas and encumbering adjacent properties with a buffer for a resource that the County created. This seems problematic and overreaching. Ditching provides a function to control and direct stormwater. The department of Ecology has no recommendations designating artificial ditches as critical areas or for placing buffers on artificial ditching. This would create a new critical area, most of which are within County rights-of-way. Additionally, most of the ditches outside of road right of ways are agricultural in nature and created prior to the growth management act and the clean water act. Additionally, Type O waters do not correlate with Washington State water typing.</p>	This formerly proposed language has already been stricken and amended in the most recent version of Exhibit F (4/5/21)

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
MES49	Ed Miller, Miller Environmental Services	4/12/21	F	16.16.710(C)(b)(i)	<p><i>Draft Code:</i> Ditches or other artificial water courses are considered streams for the purposes of this chapter when: i. used to convey <u>waters of the state</u> existing prior to human alteration; and/or...</p> <p><i>Current Code:</i> Ditches or other artificial water courses are considered streams for the purposes of this chapter when: i. used to convey <u>natural streams</u> existing prior to human alteration; and/or...</p> <p><i>Suggested Change:</i> Strike the change and replace the current language.</p> <p><i>Rationale for suggested change:</i> This change seems to make the section more confusing. State definitions (italics added):</p> <p>"Waters of the state includes all lakes, rivers, ponds, streams, inland waters, underground waters, salt waters and all other surface waters and watercourses located within the jurisdiction of the state of Washington (RCW 90.48.020)."</p> <p>"WAC 220-660-030(153) Watercourse, river or stream means any portion of a stream or river channel, bed, bank, or bottom waterward of the ordinary high water line of waters of the state. Watercourse also means areas in which fish may spawn, reside, or pass, and tributary waters with defined bed or banks that influence the quality of habitat downstream. Watercourse also means waters that flow intermittently or that fluctuate in level during the year, and the term applies to the entire bed of such waters whether or not the water is at peak level. A watercourse includes all surface-water-connected wetlands that provide or maintain habitat that supports fish life. This definition does not include irrigation ditches, canals, stormwater treatment and conveyance systems, or other entirely artificial watercourses, except where they exist in a natural watercourse that has been altered by humans."</p> <p>Per state definition, waters of the state (that might be found in a ditch) have an ordinary high water mark and are not artificial – essentially a "natural stream". It seems the current language is</p>	Based on public comment and direction from the P/C, staff has rewritten this section to be clearer and allow lesser buffers on modified waterways that are not regulated by WDFW. See 16.16.710(C) & (D)(2) in the most recent version of Exhibit F (4/5/21).

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
MES50	Ed Miller, Miller Environmental Services	4/12/21	F	16.16.745(A)(2)	<p>consistent with state definitions and is clearer.</p> <p><i>Draft Code:</i> Buffer Width Increasing. The Director may require the standard buffer width to be increased or to establish a non-riparian buffer, when such buffers are necessary for one of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) To protect priority fish or wildlife using the HCA</li> <li>2) <u>To provide connectivity when a Type S or F water body is located within 300 feet of:</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <u>Another Type S or F water body; or</u></li> <li>b. <u>A fish and wildlife HCA; or</u></li> <li>c. <u>A Category I, II or III wetland.</u></li> </ol> </li> </ol> <p><i>Current Code:</i> 16.16.745.A.2 - language added, not in the current code.</p> <p><i>Suggested Change:</i> strike the new added section 16.16.745.A.2.</p> <p><i>Rationale for suggested change:</i> This is a new provision to the code that allows the Director to extend Type S or F buffers to resources within 300 feet – including Category III wetlands, other HCA's or other waters. Again, this is an exceptionally broad provision to add in additional regulated areas that are not currently designated as critical areas or buffers in the existing or even the proposed amended code. The extension of every fish stream or lake buffer to another resource within 300 feet is essentially extending most of the buffer areas to 300 feet. If the intent is also to protect habitat corridors, then it is also redundant, as these are already protected in the habitat conservation section of the code – State priority habitat “Biodiversity areas and corridors”.</p>	Staff believes this addition better reflects DOE guidance and Council’s direction to improve connectivity.
RFW17	Karlee Deatherage (RE Sources), Rein Attemann (WEC), and Tim Trohimovich (Futurewise)	4/12/21	D		<p>Incorporate regulations to prepare for accelerating sea level rise impacts.</p> <p>The SMA and SMP Guidelines require shoreline master programs to address the flooding that will be caused by sea level rise. RCW 90.58.100(2)(h) requires that shoreline master programs “shall include” “[a]n element that gives consideration to the statewide interest in the prevention and minimization of flood damages ...” WAC 173-26-221(3)(b) provides in part that “[o]ver</p>	There isn't a requirement to address climate change/sea level rise in the SMA, though we could if Council desires. However, what we understand from the DOE is that any such regulations should be built on data, which is what PS-CoSMoS will be providing. Furthermore, once the data is available, we should perform vul-

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					<p>the long term, the most effective means of flood hazard reduction is to prevent or remove development in flood-prone areas ...” “Counties and cities should consider the following when designating and classifying frequently flooded areas ... [t]he potential effects of tsunami, high tides with strong winds, sea level rise, and extreme weather events, including those potentially resulting from global climate change ....” The areas subject to sea level rise are flood prone areas just the same as areas along bays, rivers, or streams that are within the 100-year flood plain. RCW 90.58.100(1) and WAC 173-26-201(2)(a) also require “that the ‘most current, accurate, and complete scientific and technical information’ and ‘management recommendations’ [shall to the extent feasible] form the basis of SMP provisions.” This includes the current science on sea level rise.</p> <p>Sea level rise is a real problem that is happening now. Sea level is rising and floods and erosion are increasing. In 2012 the National Research Council concluded that global sea level had risen by about seven inches in the 20th Century. A recent analysis of sea-level measurements for tide-gage stations, including the Seattle, Washington tide-gauge, shows that sea level rise is accelerating.<sup>5</sup> Virginia Institute of Marine Science (VIMS) “emeritus professor John Boon, says ‘The year-to-year trends are becoming very informative. The 2020 report cards continue a clear trend toward acceleration in rates of sea-level rise at 27 of our 28 tide-gauge stations along the continental U.S. coastline.’” “Acceleration can be a game changer in terms of impacts and planning, so we really need to pay heed to these patterns,’ says Boon.” The Seattle tide gage was one of the 27 that had an accelerating rate of sea level rise. The report Projected Sea Level Rise for Washington State – A 2018 Assessment projects that for a low greenhouse gas emission scenario there is a 50 percent probability that sea level rise will reach or exceed 1.2 feet by 2100 around Sandy Point and the west side of the Lummi Peninsula. Projected Sea Level Rise for Washington State – A 2018 Assessment projects that for a higher emission scenario there is a 50 percent probability that sea level rise will reach or exceed 4.5 feet by 2100 for the same area. Projections are</p>	<p>nerability and risk assessments to see what kind and where the problems might be, and update our shoreline inventory and characterizations. Without such science, we would be open to challenges.</p>

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					<p>available for all of the marine shorelines in Whatcom County and Washington State.</p> <p>The extent of the sea level rise currently projected for Whatcom County can be seen on the NOAA Office for Coastal Management Digitalcoast Sea Level Rise Viewer available at: <a href="https://coast.noaa.gov/digitalcoast/tools/slr.html">https://coast.noaa.gov/digitalcoast/tools/slr.html</a>. Please see map images at the bottom of this letter detailing the changes in water elevation from the current mean higher high water (MHHW) to four feet of sea level rise.</p> <p><b>Projected sea level rise will substantially increase flooding. As Ecology writes, “[s]ea level rise and storm surge[s] will increase the frequency and severity of flooding, erosion, and seawater intrusion—thus increasing risks to vulnerable communities, infrastructure, and coastal ecosystems.”</b> Not only our marine shorelines will be impacted, as Ecology writes “[m]ore frequent extreme storms are likely to cause river and coastal flooding, leading to increased injuries and loss of life.”</p> <p>Zillow recently estimated that 31,235 homes in Washington State may be underwater by 2100, 1.32 percent of the state’s total housing stock. The value of the submerged homes is an estimated \$13.7 billion. Zillow wrote:</p> <p>“It’s important to note that 2100 is a long way off, and it’s certainly possible that communities [may] take steps to mitigate these risks. Then again, given the enduring popularity of living near the sea despite its many dangers and drawbacks, it may be that even more homes will be located closer to the water in a century’s time, and these estimates could turn out to be very conservative. Either way, left unchecked, it is clear the threats posed by climate change and rising sea levels have the potential to destroy housing values on an enormous scale.”</p> <p><b>Sea level rise will have an impact beyond rising seas, floods, and storm surges. The National Research Council wrote that:</b></p> <p>“Rising sea levels and increasing wave heights will exacerbate coastal erosion and shoreline retreat in all geomorphic environ-</p>	



Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					<p>ments along the west coast. Projections of future cliff and bluff retreat are limited by sparse data in Oregon and Washington and by a high degree of geomorphic variability along the coast. Projections using only historic rates of cliff erosion predict 10–30 meters [33 to 98 feet] or more of retreat along the west coast by 2100. An increase in the rate of sea-level rise combined with larger waves could significantly increase these rates. Future retreat of beaches will depend on the rate of sea-level rise and, to a lesser extent, the amount of sediment input and loss.”</p> <p>These impacts are why the Washington State Department of Ecology recommends “[l]imiting new development in highly vulnerable areas.”</p> <p>Unless wetlands and shoreline vegetation can migrate landward, their area and ecological functions will decline. If development regulations are not updated to address the need for vegetation to migrate landward in feasible locations, wetlands and shoreline vegetation will decline. This loss of shoreline vegetation will harm the environment. It will also deprive marine shorelines of the vegetation that protects property from erosion and storm damage by modifying soils and accreting sediment. WEC and Futurewise’s Sept. 16, 2020 letter included maps that show the extent of this amount of sea level rise in Whatcom County and wetland migration in part of the County if the wetlands are not blocked by development. Additional maps are also enclosed with this letter.</p> <p>Flood plain regulations are not enough to address sea level rise for three reasons. Projected Sea Level Rise for Washington State – A 2018 Assessment explains two of them:</p> <p>“Finally, it is worth emphasizing that sea level rise projections are different from Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) flood insurance studies, because (1) FEMA studies only consider past events, and (2) flood insurance studies only consider the 100-year event, whereas sea level rise affects coastal water elevations at all times.”</p>	

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					<p>The third reason is that floodplain regulations allow fills and pilings to elevate structures and also allow commercial buildings to be flood proofed in certain areas. While this affords some protection to the structure, it does not protect the marshes and wetlands that need to migrate.</p> <p>Because of these significant impacts on people, property, and the environment, “[n]early six in ten Americans supported prohibiting development in flood-prone areas (57%).” It is time for Washington state and local governments to follow the lead of the American people and adopt policies and regulations to protect people, property, and the environment from sea level rise. We recommend the addition of the following regulations as part of the shoreline master program periodic update:</p> <p>X. New lots shall be designed and located so that the buildable area is outside the area likely to be inundated by sea level rise in 2100 and outside of the area in which wetlands and aquatic vegetation will likely migrate during that time.</p> <p>X2. Where lots are large enough, new structures and buildings shall be located so that they are outside the area likely to be inundated by sea level rise in 2100 and outside of the area in which wetlands and aquatic vegetation will likely migrate during that time.</p> <p>X3. New and substantially improved structures shall be elevated above the likely sea level rise elevation in 2100 or for the life of the building, whichever is less.</p>	
RFW18	Karlee Deatherage (RE Sources), Rein Attemann (WEC), and Tim Trohovich (Futurewise)	4/12/21	F	16.16.270	<p>Restore Reasonable Use impact area language in the Dec 4, 2020 draft Exhibit F, WCC 16.16.270 Reasonable Use Exceptions.</p> <p>We urge Whatcom County to restore the proposed change from the P/C to expand the maximum impact area for single-family residences from 4,000 square feet to 2,500 square feet in 16.16.270.C.12. The purpose of the reasonable use provision is to allow only the minimal “reasonable” use of property to avoid a constitutional taking when fully applying the standards of critical</p>	Your comment will be provided to the P/C & Co/C for consideration.

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					<p>areas regulations.</p> <p>The courts generally decide the concept of reasonable; however, reasonable use is often interpreted as a modest single-family home. A home with a footprint of 4,000 square feet is excessive. A median size house built in 2019 has 2,301 square feet of floor area. We can assume that to be less than footprint 1,500 square feet.</p>	
RFW19	Karlee Deatherage (RE Sources), Rein Attemann (WEC), and Tim Trohimovich (Futurewise)	4/12/21	F	16.16.730 , Table 4	<p>Incorporate the State of Washington Department of Fish &amp; Wildlife's new riparian buffers guidance.</p> <p>As has been reported in media and scientific reports, the southern resident orcas, or killer whales, are threatened by (1) an inadequate availability of prey, the Chinook salmon, "(2) legacy and new toxic contaminants, and (3) disturbance from noise and vessel traffic." "Recent scientific studies indicate that reduced Chinook salmon runs undermine the potential for the southern resident population to successfully reproduce and recover." The shoreline master program update is an opportunity to take steps to help recover the southern resident orcas, the Chinook salmon, and the species and habitats on which they depend.</p> <p>The SMP Guidelines, in WAC 173-26-221(3)(c), provides in part that "[i]n establishing vegetation conservation regulations, local governments must use available scientific and technical information, as described in WAC 173-26-201 (2)(a). At a minimum, local governments should consult shoreline management assistance materials provided by the department and Management Recommendations for Washington's Priority Habitats, prepared by the Washington state department of fish and wildlife where applicable."</p> <p>The State of Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife has recently updated the Priority Habitat and Species recommendations for riparian areas. The updated management recommendations document that fish and wildlife depend on protecting riparian vegetation and the functions this vegetation performs such as maintaining a complex food web that supports salmon and maintaining temperature regimes to name just a few of the</p>	<p>Pursuant to 23.230.010(B)(4) floodways and contiguous floodplain areas landward two hundred feet from such floodways are within the shoreline jurisdiction.</p> <p>And pursuant to 16.16.730 Table 4, Type S – Freshwater HCAs are proposed to have a 200-foot buffer based on National Wildlife Federation v. FEMA (Federal District Court Case No. 2:11cv-02044-rsm; NMFS Doc. #2006-00472)</p>

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					<p>functions.</p> <p>The updated Riparian Ecosystems, Volume 1: Science synthesis and management implications scientific report concludes that the "[p]rotection and restoration of riparian ecosystems continues to be critically important because: a) they are disproportionately important, relative to area, for aquatic species, e.g., salmon, and terrestrial wildlife, b) they provide ecosystem services such as water purification and fisheries (Naiman and Bilby 2001; NRC 2002; Richardson et al. 2012), and c) by interacting with watershed-scale processes, they contribute to the creation and maintenance of aquatic habitats." The report states that "[t]he width of the riparian ecosystem is estimated by one 200-year site-potential tree height (SPTH) measured from the edge of the active channel or active floodplain. Protecting functions within at least one 200-year SPTH is a scientifically supported approach if the goal is to protect and maintain full function of the riparian ecosystem." These recommendations are explained further in Riparian Ecosystems, Volume 2: Management Recommendations A Priority Habitats and Species Document of The Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife.</p> <p>Based on these new scientific documents, we recommend that shoreline jurisdiction should include the 100-year floodplain and that the buffers for rivers and streams in shoreline jurisdiction be increased to use the newly recommended 200-year SPTH and that this width should be measured from the edge of the channel, channel migration zone, or active floodplain whichever is wider. New development, except water dependent uses should not be allowed within this area. This will help maintain shoreline functions and Chinook habitat.</p>	
TSF01	Diani Taylor, General Counsel, Taylor Shellfish Farms	4/12/21	D	23.40.010	Table 1 of the draft proposes to revise the shoreline use table to prohibit general aquaculture (aquaculture other than commercial geoduck and salmon net pen facilities) in aquatic areas adjacent to the Natural shoreline environment designation (SED). This proposed revision should not be adopted. No scientific or technical information is identified in the Draft Amendment that would support this revision. As recognized by the GMHB, prohibiting	The purpose of the natural shoreline area is to "ensure long-term preservation of ecologically intact shorelines" and "preservation of the area's ecological functions, natural features and overall character must receive priority over any other potential use." The Natural SED is

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					aquaculture in the Natural SED absent such support is impermissible. Allowing aquaculture in the Natural SED is consistent with the purpose and policies of the Natural SED.	only applied in a few areas of the county, primarily the headwaters of the 3 upper Nooksack branches and around state or locally controlled nature preserves. None of these areas would likely be used for aquaculture.
TSF02	Diani Taylor, General Counsel, Taylor Shellfish Farms	4/12/21	D	23.40.050(A)(1)	<p><del>Strike A.1. Aquaculture that involves little or no substrate modification shall be given preference over those that involve substantial modification. The applicant/proponent shall demonstrate that the degree of proposed substrate modification is degree of proposed substrate modification is aquaculture operations at the site.</del></p> <p>The first sentence of this provision is unsuitable for a regulation, as it merely expresses a preference for certain activities over others. Moreover, it is inadequately defined and unsupported by scientific and technical information. To the extent that it would disfavor common shellfish aquaculture practices that have been proven to have insignificant impacts on species and habitat (e.g., those covered by the Programmatic Consultation or analyzed by Washington Sea Grant), it runs directly counter to such information in violation of the SMA and Guidelines. It would also fail to give preference to and foster shellfish aquaculture contrary to state law.</p> <p>The second sentence appears to impose a substantive requirement that any substrate modifications must be the minimum necessary for feasible operations. This restriction is similarly unsupported by scientific and technical information and fails to give preference to and foster shellfish aquaculture. In an analogous context, the GMHB held that an aquaculture regulation requiring gear use be limited to the minimum necessary for feasible operations violated state law and must be stricken.</p>	<p>Though the language is existing, the commenter may be correct regarding the 1<sup>st</sup> sentence, as it does read more like a policy rather than a regulation. And Policy 11CC-3 basically says the same thing, so that 1<sup>st</sup> sentence could be deleted (though it wouldn't have much effect on the regulation).</p> <p>Regarding the 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence (again, existing language), staff sees no legal issue in requiring methods used minimize impacts to shoreline functions. The regulation only states that the applicant demonstrate that the degree of proposed substrate modification is the minimum necessary. We would think that Taylor Shellfish Farms already uses the least impactful methods given how environmentally friendly they purport to be. Nonetheless, your comments will be provided to the P/C and Co/C for their consideration.</p>
TSF03	Diani Taylor, General Counsel, Taylor Shellfish Farms	4/12/21	D	23.40.050(A)(2)	<p><del>Strike A.2 The installation of submerged structures, intertidal structures, and floating structures shall be allowed only when the applicant/proponent demonstrates that no alternative method of operation is feasible.</del></p>	Again, existing language, and it's only asking that the applicant demonstrate that any proposed structures be the least impactful to shoreline functions. Nonetheless,

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					Similar to the previous provision, this provision is not only unsupported by scientific and technical information, but such information demonstrates aquaculture structures do not have unacceptable impacts. This provision imposes unjustifiable use restrictions and fails to give preference to and foster aquaculture, and hence it should be deleted.	less, your comments will be provided to the P/C and Co/C for their consideration.
TSF04	Diani Taylor, General Counsel, Taylor Shellfish Farms	4/12/21	D	23.40.050(A)(3)	<p><del>Strike A.3 Aquaculture proposals that involve substantial substrate modification or sedimentation through dredging, trenching, digging, mechanical clam harvesting, or other similar mechanisms, shall not be permitted in areas where the proposal would adversely impact critical saltwater habitat, or other fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas.</del></p> <p>This provision is insufficient in scope and detail to ensure proper implementation, as several key terms are undefined. Moreover, this regulation appears to articulate a zero-impact standard inconsistent with the SMA and the Guidelines, which acknowledge that activities will have some impacts and calls for those impacts to be minimized. This provision is particularly inappropriate given commercial shellfish beds are themselves critical saltwater habitat.</p>	Staff disagrees with the commenters conclusions. The key words are either defined or their common usage is understood, and the regulation does not articulate a zero-impact standard: It only limits certain types of practices that might have significant impacts on critical saltwater habitats.
TSF05	Diani Taylor, General Counsel, Taylor Shellfish Farms	4/12/21	D	23.40.050(B)(9)	<p>"Where aquaculture activities are authorized to use <del>public County</del> facilities, such as boat launches or docks, the County shall reserve the right to require the applicant/proponent to pay a portion of the cost of maintenance and any required improvements commensurate with the use of such facilities."</p> <p>This revision provides important clarification that the authority to require a project proponent pay a portion of maintenance costs and required improvements applies to County, rather than any public (e.g., state or federal), facilities. Use and maintenance of non-County public facilities are properly addressed by the entities or agencies that own or control those facilities.</p>	Staff agrees with the commenter and has made this suggested edit.
TSF06	Diani Taylor, General Counsel, Taylor Shellfish Farms	4/12/21	D	23.40.050(F)(1)	In addition to the minimum application requirements specified in WCC Title 22 (Land Use and Development), applications for aquaculture use or development shall include all information necessary to conduct a thorough evaluation of the proposed aquaculture activity, including but not limited to the following, if	Staff agrees with the commenter, but none of the language prohibits the applicant from submitting materials used in or produced by other permitting processes. Regardless of whether another agency

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					<p><u>not already provided in other local, state, or federal permit applications or equivalent reports:</u></p> <p>Aquaculture operations are subject to numerous laws and regulatory programs. Applicants for new aquaculture projects must obtain several federal and state approvals in addition to shoreline permits. The County should allow aquaculture applicants to utilize information provided in other local, state, or federal permit applications or equivalent reports in order to satisfy shoreline permit application requirements. This allowance will not hinder the County's interest in ensuring it has all information necessary to conduct a thorough evaluation of aquaculture proposals, and it is critical to avoid unnecessary burdens on applicants and streamline permitting consistent with the laws and policies discussed above.</p>	<p>has made a decision on a permit, the County is still required to maintain a record of our decision making and would need copies of those materials to come to a rational conclusion.</p>
TSF07	Diani Taylor, General Counsel, Taylor Shellfish Farms	4/12/21	D	23.40.050(F)(2)	<p>Applications for aquaculture activities must demonstrate that the proposed activity will be compatible with surrounding existing and planned uses.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Aquaculture activities shall comply with all applicable noise, air, and water quality standards. All projects shall be designed, operated and maintained to minimize odor and noise.</li> <li>b. Aquaculture activities shall <del>be restricted to reasonable hours and/or days of operation when necessary to</del> minimize substantial, adverse impacts from noise, light, and/or glare on nearby residents, other sensitive uses or critical habitat.</li> <li>c. Aquaculture facilities shall not <del>introduce incompatible visual elements or substantially degrade</del> <u>significantly impact</u> the aesthetic qualities of the shoreline. Aquaculture structures and equipment, except navigation aids, shall be designed, operated and maintained to blend into their surroundings through the use of appropriate colors and materials.</li> </ol> <p>Taylor Shellfish, along with other responsible farmers, employ numerous practices to avoid and minimize potential noise and light impacts on other shoreline users. However, to help protect</p>	<p>Staff agrees with the commenter and has amended this section as suggested.</p>

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					<p>the safety of its crews and provide marketable products, shellfish operators frequently need to conduct activities during nights or on weekends when there are low tides. This is recognized in the Guidelines, which state: "Commercial geoduck aquaculture workers oftentimes need to accomplish on-site work during low tides, which may occur at night or on weekends. Local governments must allow work during low tides but may require limits and conditions to reduce impacts, such as noise and lighting, to adjacent existing uses." Restricting operations to certain hours or days may compromise the safety of farm crews and/or render operations infeasible. This requirement in 2.b is incompatible with the SMA and Guidelines, and it should be removed.</p> <p>The requirement in 2.c that aquaculture facilities not introduce incompatible visual elements or substantially degrade the aesthetic qualities of the shoreline is inconsistent with the Guidelines, which instead require that that aquaculture not significantly impact aesthetic qualities. The requirement that aquaculture activities not introduce incompatible visual elements is insufficient in scope and detail to ensure proper implementation. This subsection should be aligned with state law.</p>	
TSF08	Diani Taylor, General Counsel, Taylor Shellfish Farms	4/12/21	D	23.40.050(H)(2)	<p>In the Natural shoreline environment, aquaculture activities that do not require structures, facilities, or mechanized harvest practices and that will not result in the alteration of <u>substantially degrade</u> natural systems or features are permitted.</p> <p>The prohibition on structures, facilities, or mechanized harvest in the Natural environment is unsupported by scientific and technical information and is accordingly inconsistent with the SMA and Guidelines. As discussed above, there is extensive scientific and technical information that demonstrates shellfish aquaculture activities, some of which include these proscribed items, have minimal impacts that are consistent with the Natural environment. The revised language shown here remedies these failures and aligns this regulation with the management policies in the Guidelines for the Natural environment.</p>	Staff disagrees with the commenter. The Natural SED is intended to remain natural and is the only SED where such structures are prohibited. It is not a general prohibition, just one for one certain SED. The Natural SED is only applied in a few areas of the county, primarily the headwaters of the 3 upper Nooksack branches and around state or locally controlled nature preserves. None of these areas would likely be used for aquaculture.
BIAWC08	Robert Lee, BIAWC	4/12/21	F	16.16.273	<b>Reasonable Use and Variances:</b> Staff has proposed major changes to the procedures and criteria for both. The current	Please see the responses provided for Comments GCD14, NES02, NWC02,



Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					<p>2017 CAO allows PDS staff to grant reasonable use (RU) permits for one single family house under very strict criteria if CAO rules alone would deny "all reasonable and economically viable use" of the property.</p> <p><b>A. Variances:</b> They now require a public hearing and approval by the Hearing Examiner (HE). The applicant must demonstrate "undue hardship" due to CAO "dimensional requirements". Frankly, it's not clear what the difference is between the scope of these and RU applications in current code.</p> <p>Per draft Section 16.16.270.A, p 30-31, Exh. F, if a person only needs a 25 to 50% CAO buffer reduction, they would apply for a Minor Variance, instead of a RU Exception per current code.</p> <p>The draft does not say whether this value is total area, width, or both. Staff decides these permits; notice to neighbors is required. We do appreciate the new minor variance idea allowing staff approval, but why they also have to provide notice to adjacent land owners?</p> <p>A Major Variance is required for any other CAO exceptions. See Section 16.16.273, p 34. Either level of variance will be a costly process; the fee is \$2750, plus critical area reports, possibly consultants and any legal costs.</p> <p>One could only apply for a Reasonable Use Exception RU if their variance app is denied. This means if you don't get adequate relief with a variance approval, one must repeat the permit process to apply for an RU, and pay double fees and costs. A person may also face an appeal to Superior Court from someone.</p>	<p>NWC05, BIA04, MES11, MES29, MES31, MES43, RFW12, &amp; RFW18.</p> <p>In addition, variances have always required a public hearing and approval by the H/E using the same criteria. We have now introduced a "minor" variance (the creation of which has already been approved by Co/C) for minor buffer reductions. An all variances always require public notice, as we're potentially letting applicants use lesser standards than what the code prescribes, which might have impacts on neighbors.</p> <p>We have also put in a request to have a much lower fee for minor variances.</p>
BIAWC09	Robert Lee, BIAWC	4/12/21	F	16.16.270(C)(12)	<p><b>B. Reasonable Use Exception (RU)</b></p> <p>1. Footprint Size:</p> <p>Re draft Sections 270, Item C, p 31, we support the increase in the allowed "impact area" for a house via the RU process to 4,000 sq. ft., from 2,500, recently accepted by the P/C. This limit is a minimally reasonable value when you consider most of the</p>	<p>Please see the responses provided for Comments BIA04, GCD09, GCD14, MES09, MES11, MES31, NES01, RFW12, RFW13, &amp; RFW18.</p> <p>And remember, RUEs are for lots totally constrained by critical areas. Lots that aren't so constrained can build to what-</p>

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					<p>sites will be 2 acres or larger, and many rural land owners will want barns, corrals, shops, etc.</p> <p>Also, these and all other CAO rules apply in the county's two Urban Growth Areas: Birch Bay and Columbia Valley, where lot sizes are usually much smaller, and on public sewer and water systems.</p> <p>However, "impact area" is not defined in the draft CAO. We suggest this term be defined to include only artificial impervious surfaces. We support the driveway exception as written, and ask that drainfield areas be listed as excepted too.</p> <p>There appears to be no scientific basis for either value. The 4,000 sf value will often be generally reasonable in this context for smaller lots, e.g., 1 to 5 acres. But several large rural areas are zoned 10 acre minimum. We think consideration should be given to a "sliding scale" proposal, for parcels 5 acres and larger, based on zoning, platting options, availability of drinking water, soils for septic, etc.</p> <p>Many rural residents are horse enthusiasts, and want training rings, which will push the total footprint over the 4,000 sf limit.</p>	<p>ever size the code allows for their zone. We would think that someone who wants barns, training rings, and other large structures would choose a lot not so constrained.</p>
BIAWC10	Robert Lee, BIAWC	4/12/21	E	22.05.020	<p><b>2. RU Process:</b> We believe the RU decision should be made by staff instead of the Hearing Examiner (HE), a far less costly, time consuming and legalistic process.</p> <p>We believe these decisions should be based mainly on a scientific analysis of the particular situation; that is: the functions and values of the resource, and adjacent site character, mainly its natural features: e.g., soils and geology, topography, native vegetation etc.</p> <p>An important question: is there any state law, court decision or code that requires that RU's be decided by the HE, a quasi-judicial official? Or that bars professional and qualified staff from making these mainly technical and science kind of decisions?</p>	<p>Please see the responses provided for Comments GCD14, NES02, NWC02, NWC05, BIA04, MES11, MES29, MES31, MES43, RFW12, &amp; RFW18.</p>
BIAWC11	Robert Lee, BIAWC	4/12/21	F	16.16.270(C)	<p><b>3. RU Criteria:</b></p> <p>a. We also have concerns over the fairness of some of the key</p>	<p>The RUE criteria are basically the same as the existing criteria (old (B)(2)), which come from state law and courts cases on</p>

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					<p>words/phrases/values related in the RU code, such as:</p> <p>16.16.270 A, C.2, C.3, etc.: "all reasonable and economically viable use of a property".</p> <p>The words "all" and "viable" seem more arbitrary and subjective than logical and objective. Does staff have a reliable, credible source for this language?</p> <p>The current, 2018, State Department of Commerce guidance on critical areas and this topic states, in part:</p> <p>The reasonable use permit criteria should allow for "reasonable" uses. If the criteria state that the applicant must demonstrate that no other use "is possible," or that there are "no feasible alternatives," it would conflict with the concept of a "reasonable" use as other "possible" alternatives may be so costly as to be unreasonable.</p> <p>Their 3-page excerpt on RU is attached, and a link to the complete report. The Department of Commerce has primary regulatory authority over all GMA elements, including all 5 critical areas.</p> <p>In reviewing the long list of complex criteria, all 12, for approval of a RU application (Section 270.C, almost all of p 31), we note the links in several of "reasonable" with "economics", and use of "all". Why is economics a critical factor here? The test is supposed to be "reasonable".</p> <p>See items C.2, 3, 4 and 5. It appears staff is trying to make it as difficult as possible for a person to obtain a RU exception, and obtain fair relief from the arbitrary buffers per Department of Ecology guidance on wetlands and habitat buffers.</p> <p>We say the buffers are arbitrary because they are not based on a staff accepted scientific assessment of a site's critical area resources and relevant local conditions.</p>	<p>this matter.</p> <p>And if you're going to quote the <a href="#">CAO handbook</a>, might as well quote more of it, for it also says, "Unlike variances, the purpose of a reasonable use exception permit is not to allow general development within critical areas, but to allow only the minimal "reasonable" use of the property so as to avoid a constitutional taking. Four scenarios are provided to illustrate situations where a reasonable use exception might or might not be applicable:</p> <p>A – No reasonable use exception would be granted because there is sufficient space outside the critical area clearing limits.</p> <p>B – A reasonable use exception might be granted since there is insufficient space for a reasonable use. The development area would need to be limited or scaled back in size and located where the impact is minimized. The jurisdiction might consider a variance to the required setback to minimize intrusion into the protection area.</p> <p>C – A reasonable use exception would be granted for a minimal development if the property is completely encumbered and mitigation methods are applied.</p> <p>D – The jurisdiction might consider modifications to the required setback to prevent intrusion into the protection area.</p>

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
						<p>The criteria for reasonable use permits need to be consistent with case law to reduce the potential for appeals and overturned decisions. Key to being consistent with case law is careful use of the term "reasonable." Generally, the concept of "reasonable" has been left to the courts to decide, thereby making it difficult for cities to rule on whether or not a project qualifies. A reasonable use is often thought to be a modest single-family home, although some other structure might be "reasonable" depending on zoning, adjacent uses, and the size of the property.</p> <p>Some jurisdictions have allowed a reasonable use exception in only those situations where <i>all</i> economic use of a property would be denied by the critical areas regulations. Criteria that might be used to allow approval of a reasonable use exception include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No other reasonable economic use of the property has less impact on the critical area;</li> <li>• The proposed impact to the critical area is the minimum necessary to allow for reasonable economic use of the property;</li> <li>• The inability of the applicant to derive reasonable economic use of the property is not the result of actions by the applicant after the effective date of this regulation, or its predecessor;</li> <li>• The proposal does not pose an unreasonable threat to the public health, safety, or welfare on or off the devel-</li> </ul>

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
						<p>opment proposal site;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal will result in no net loss of critical area functions and values consistent with the best available science; or</li> <li>• The proposal is consistent with other applicable regulations and standards.”</li> </ul>
BIAWC12	Robert Lee, BIAWC	4/12/21	F	Articles 6 and 7	<p>2. Wetland and Habitat Conservation Area Buffers:</p> <p>A. General Comments: Such buffers are usually the most constraining, and thus costly, elements of compliance with local CAOs for landowners and land users. They often end up consuming more usable land than the area of the wetland they are supposed to protect. We have seen many examples of this, large and small.</p> <p>We're familiar with many situations where buffer requirements appear arbitrary and excessive. In one situation, where a qualified private scientist classified a 6 acre area that has been hayed for at least 75 years a Category IV wetland, the lowest value. He used the 2014 DoE Rating form, 17 pages of detailed questions, some a bit subjective. The PDS staff person said he thought it was a Cat. III. This meant the buffer increased from 60 ft. to 110 ft. of hayfield, almost doubling!</p> <p>Per the draft, DoE and staff don't think that's enough. The new Wetland Buffer table, Sec. 630.E, p 67, based on DoE guidance, will require more than a doubling, from 110 to 225 ft., for a Cat. III of any size, whether the parcel is 10,000 sf or 100 acres. We think this is excessive regulation, and it's quite commonplace in the CAO.</p> <p>The County does not have to adopt DoE staff's arbitrary and excessive buffers. They are not based on the WACs. Remember, the state Department of Commerce is the only state agency with rule making authority on GMA obligations, including critical areas. DoE's main authority on wetlands is limited to controlling the filling or alterations of wetlands through the federal Clean</p>	<p>In July 2018 the Washington Department of Ecology (DOE) modified the habitat score ranges and recommended buffer widths in their wetland buffer tables in the DOE guidance, with some minor text changes to ensure consistency. Some citizens, local environmental consulting firms, and <i>the Building Industry Association of Whatcom County</i> then requested that we amend our code to meet this new guidance, and it was docketed as PLN2019-00008.</p> <p>The project was brought before the Planning Commission on March 14, 2019. But there was confusion as to what we actually had to do at that time and what impacts it would have on development. DOE had informed staff that, while we didn't need to amend our code at that point (having just updated Ch. 16.16 (Critical Areas) (Exhibit F) that they would review our code for consistency with their guidance when Ch. 16.16 was opened for amendment again, noting that that would occur during the 2020 SMP Periodic Update.</p> <p>So at the Commission's request, staff worked with the local wetlands consultants to review the issue and try to deter-</p>

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					Water Act.	<p>mine what effects it might have. Three consulting firms provided analyses based on data from projects they had worked on. From these analyses, it appears that many of Whatcom County's lower quality wetlands (e.g., small Category IV wetlands in agricultural fields) would end up with smaller buffers, but that our higher quality wetlands (Categories II and III) would end up with larger buffers. (But even this is speculation, as ATSI noted that the comparison results are not statistically significant.) Thus, farmers may benefit but developers/ builders may suffer, as many of our lower quality wetlands are those found in agriculture fields, while our higher quality wetlands are typically found in non-agriculture rural areas.</p> <p>Nonetheless, given the Department of Ecology's statements that they'll be monitoring the SMP Update to ensure that we meet their latest guidance (which is based on Best Available Science), and given that Comprehensive Plan Policy 10M-2 directs the County to "Develop and adopt criteria to identify and evaluate wetland functions that meet the Best Available Science standard and that are consistent with state and federal guidelines," staff is proposing to amend §16.16.630 (Wetland Buffers) Table 1 (Standard Wetland Buffer Widths) to meet DOE guidance. As indicated, these changes would lessen buffers on lower quality wetlands, and increase them on higher quality ones.</p>

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
BIAWC13	Robert Lee, BIAWC	4/12/21	F	Articles 6 and 7	<p><b>B. Buffer Details in the Draft:</b></p> <p>We have reviewed the Wetland and Habitat drafts and the detailed comments on them submitted February 19 and 25, 2019, for Jon Maberry by Ed Miller and Liliانا Hansen, both Professional Wetland Scientists (PWS). GAC members discussed these issues with Ed recently.</p> <p>We firmly agree with the scope and substance of all 14 comments in their firm's 8-page February 19 letter, including its recommendation to delete 12 of the draft changes/additions (attached). The Miller firm is highly regarded by many BIAWC members for their professional approach to complex environmental issues.</p> <p>We also agree with the reasonable and constructive suggestions in Jon Maberry's Prepared Motions submitted to the Planning Committee February 25, attached.</p> <p>Finally, it appears to us there's a pattern in these and other parts of the draft CAO of making the rules more restrictive and less balanced between the government's legitimate police power authority and the constitutional rights of private land owners and land users.</p>	Your comment will be provided to the P/C and Co/C for consideration.
P6601	David Klanica, Phillips 66	4/12/21	A	10D-11	<p>Policy 10D-11 was added that addresses climate change: "Protect ecological functions and ecosystem-wide processes of Marine Resource Lands and critical areas in anticipation of climate change impacts, including sea level rise."</p> <p>Phillips 66 is requesting further explanation and clarification whether upland property owners who propose bulkheads, armoring, or bank stabilization to prevent shoreline erosion or sloughing due to sea level rise will be subject to new limitations or requirements that could affect the current or future use of their property.</p>	The amendments regarding shoreline stabilization regulations are found in Exhibit D (Title 23). You would want to look at both 23.40.010, Table 1, and 23.40.190.
P6602	David Klanica, Phillips 66	4/12/21	B	Governing Principle (C)(2)	The Shoreline Management Act was adopted in 1971 to protect the shorelines of the state of Washington. Certain shorelines were designated as "shorelines of statewide significance" including those areas of Puget Sound and the Strait of Juan de	As explained in the comment bubble tagged on this change, the word "significant" is proposed for deletion as there is no such threshold under SMA. Under the

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					<p>Fuca and adjacent salt waters north to the Canadian line and lying seaward from the line of extreme low tide. The Act established a system where local governments would ensure that certain developments in shoreline areas would be reviewed and protected. More specifically, these agencies would review "substantial developments" which were those that would have a "significant adverse" impact on the environment including, but not limited to fish, wildlife, fish or wildlife habitat, water quality, and aesthetic values.</p> <p>Whatcom County has proposed in its Governing Principles (GPC2)) that it will include "policies and regulations that require mitigation of adverse impact in a manner that ensures no net loss of shoreline ecological functions." Phillips 66 is concerned about how this revised policy will be implemented as a practical matter. First, it appears to go beyond the County's statutory authority outlined in the SMA. Second, Phillips 66 is concerned that, without further clarification, it may be used inconsistently across the County. For instance, what is meant by "adverse" versus the original "significant adverse"? Must all land use permits affecting the shoreline now indicate what, if any adverse impacts might occur? Phillips 66 requests that the P/C provide more information as to how the removal of the word "significant" will change day-to-day shoreline management activities.</p>	<p>SMA, all adverse impacts must be mitigated in order to help achieve NNL. (The term "significant impact" comes from SEPA.)</p>
P6603	David Klanica, Phillips 66	4/12/21	B	Policies 11G-3 & 11G-4	<p>Regarding Policy 11G-3 and Policy 11G-4 addressing the County's MOU with DAHP and Lummi Nation require the County to consult with DAHP and the Tribes. Phillips 66 is requesting additional clarification for applicant/property owner responsibilities.</p>	<p>Please read 23.30.050 (Cultural Resources) in Exhibit D, as that should provide the additional clarification you seek.</p>
P6604	David Klanica, Phillips 66	4/12/21	B	Overall Goals & Policies	<p>Regarding Overall SMP Goals and Objectives for the Restoration and Enhancement Element were revised as follows: "This element provides for the timely restoration and enhancement of ecologically impaired areas in a manner that achieves a net gain in shoreline ecological functions and processes above baseline conditions as of the adoption of this program."</p> <p>Phillips 66 requests additional clarification and definition for "baseline condition" (e.g. baseline conditions at the time of application?).</p>	<p>The baseline condition was set by the comprehensive update done in 2007. As part of that update the County developed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vol. 1 - Inventory and Characterization Report</li> <li>• Vol. II - Scientific Literature Review</li> <li>• Vol. III - Restoration Plan</li> <li>• Vol. IV - Cumulative Effects Analysis</li> </ul> <p>all of which can be found on our SMP</p>



Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
						Update <a href="#">webpage</a> .
P6605	David Klanica, Phillips 66	4/12/21	B	Policies 11AA -1 through 11AA-7	Regarding General Policies for Climate Change/Sea Level Rise (Policies 11AA -1 through 11AA-7): please explain/provide detail for shoreline development applicant's responsibilities pertaining to climate change and sea level rise. Will development applications be required to address climate change and sea level rise as part of the SMP application or will there be separate analysis and document requirements (e.g. when will a study addressing sea level rise be required)?	These are only general policies; we are not developing CC/SLR regulations at this time.
P6606	David Klanica, Phillips 66	4/12/21	C	Policy 8T-1	Regarding Policy 8T-1, Phillips 66 requests clarification of the methods by which the County will coordinate with landowners to protect marine resource lands.	Well, we generally do that through email, though sometimes letters, phone calls, or meetings.
P6607	David Klanica, Phillips 66	4/12/21	C	Policy 8U-2	Regarding Policy 8U-2, Phillips 66 requests clarification of the types of non-regulatory programs, options, and incentives that owners of marine resource lands can employ to meet or exceed County environmental goals.	We can't provide you a precise list, as they haven't been developed yet, but they could include tax incentives, educational programs, volunteer groups, etc.
P6608	David Klanica, Phillips 66	4/12/21	C	Policy 8V-2	Regarding Policy 8V-2, Phillips 66 requests clarification of the process by which the County will work cooperatively with local, State, Federal and Tribal agencies, adjacent upland property owners, and the general public, as applicable, to address community concerns and land use conflicts that may affect the productivity of marine resource lands.	How would we work cooperatively? Here are 10 simply ways from entrepreneur.com to cultivate team cohesion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create a clear and compelling cause</li> <li>• Communicate expectations</li> <li>• Establish team goals</li> <li>• Leverage team-member strengths</li> <li>• Foster cohesion between team members</li> <li>• Encourage innovation</li> <li>• Keep promises and honor requests</li> <li>• Recognize, reward and celebrate collaborative behavior</li> </ul>
P6609	David Klanica, Phillips 66	4/12/21	D		The General Provisions of Title 23 indicate that shoreline development must be consistent with the SMA of 1971, the County's shoreline regulations and "other County land use regulations" (See Title 23 draft at lines 11-13). Title 23 then references certain requirements for "existing legal fossil-fuel refinery operations, existing legal transshipment facilities, expansions of these facilities, and new or expansions of renewable fuel refineries or	Yes, staff is well aware of this work and understands that changes have been made to Council's original proposal. However, at the time these documents were 1 <sup>st</sup> edited, their original proposal was all we had on which to rely, which is why the comment bubbles indicate that

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					<p>transshipment facilities". Related definitions are also provided on page 241 at lines 20-36. Expansions of existing fossil fuel and renewable fuel facilities are required to obtain conditional shoreline permits. (See Title 23, page 137 at lines 3-10).</p> <p>As the Planning Department is aware, industry, labor and environmental organization stakeholders have been working together to develop recommended changes to the County Council's October 2019 proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments. Many of the terms and definitions included in this proposal assume that the 2019 proposed Amendments will be adopted as is. Phillips 66 requests that terms borrowed from the 2019 proposal not be adopted at this time. Considerable progress has been made by the stakeholders and is being presented to the County Council for its consideration in the near future. We request that this proposal be delayed until the final work from the ongoing stakeholder effort is accepted or rejected and the "final" definitions and framework for when conditional use permits is finalized.</p>	<p>we will have to substitute in any changes based on Council's final adoption of the Cherry Point fossil fuel amendments.</p>
P6610	David Klanica, Phillips 66	4/12/21	F		<p>Article 7 Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Area was amended to now include Type 0 waters. Phillips 66 requests the addition of a definition of Type 0 waters in the Whatcom County guidance.</p>	<p>This proposal has already been dropped. We suggested you look at the most recent version of Exhibit F, dated 4/5/21.</p>
WH01	Wendy Harris	4/13/21			<p>This is in response to the question that was asked at the last Planning Commission meeting regarding "waters of the state." That is not a term used in the Shoreline Management Act. Rather, it refers to all waters under its jurisdiction as "shorelines of the state" or "shorelands of the state" and these are the appropriate terms to use for waters and exposed land under SMA jurisdiction.</p> <p>Under RCW 90.58.030, "Shorelines" means all of the waters of the state, including reservoirs, and their associated shorelands, together with the lands underlying them; except (i) shorelines of statewide significance; (ii) shorelines on segments of streams upstream of a point where the mean annual flow is twenty cubic feet per second or less and the wetlands associated with such upstream segments; and (iii) shorelines on lakes less than twen-</p>	<p>The commenter is correct, and these are all laid out in 23.20.010 (Shoreline Jurisdiction).</p>

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					<p>ty acres in size and wetlands associated with such small lakes.  <a href="https://apps.leg.wa.gov/RCW/default.aspx?cite=90.58.030">https://apps.leg.wa.gov/RCW/default.aspx?cite=90.58.030</a>.</p> <p>In other words, only waters with minimum quantifiable measurements (size, type, velocity, etc.) are a regulated state shoreline. This is often forgotten when we hear complaints about over-regulation and unreasonableness.</p> <p>Shorelines of the state are specifically set out in the WAC. In Whatcom County, all rivers and streams that are shorelines of the state are set out in WAC 173-18-410.  <a href="https://apps.leg.wa.gov/WaC/default.aspx?cite=173-18-410">https://apps.leg.wa.gov/WaC/default.aspx?cite=173-18-410</a>.</p> <p>Lakes are listed in WAC 173-20-760 and 770.  <a href="https://apps.leg.wa.gov/WaC/default.aspx?cite=173-20-770">https://apps.leg.wa.gov/WaC/default.aspx?cite=173-20-770</a>;  <a href="https://apps.leg.wa.gov/WaC/default.aspx?cite=173-20-760">https://apps.leg.wa.gov/WaC/default.aspx?cite=173-20-760</a>.</p> <p>There are two kinds of shorelines of the state. The most common shoreline under SMA jurisdiction imposes a no net loss standard of review to prevent any degradation beyond baseline conditions, informed by review of best available science.</p> <p>However, particularly large and significant rivers and lakes, as well as marine waters, are designated "Shorelines of Statewide Significance" (SSWS). These have increased protection through a prioritized preference of use, similar to how we apply mitigation standards. These are set out in statute, with preferred use for natural conditions that support the long-term interests of all state residents. RCW 90.58.020(f);  <a href="https://app.leg.wa.gov/RCW/default.aspx?cite=90.58.020">https://app.leg.wa.gov/RCW/default.aspx?cite=90.58.020</a> .</p> <p>The Whatcom County SSWS are the Nooksack River, Lake Whatcom, Baker Lake, and marine waters, including Birch Bay. R CW 90.58.030.</p> <p>The SMA also discusses "shorelands" or "shoreland areas", which includes lands extending landward for two hundred feet in all directions as measured on a horizontal plane from the ordinary high water mark; floodways and contiguous floodplain areas landward two hundred feet from such floodways; and all wet-</p>	

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					<p>lands and river deltas associated with the streams, lakes, and tidal waters which are subject to the provisions of this chapter; the same to be designated as to location by the department of ecology.</p> <p>RCW 90.58.030(2)(d), <a href="https://app.leg.wa.gov/RCW/default.aspx?cite=90.58.030">https://app.leg.wa.gov/RCW/default.aspx?cite=90.58.030</a>.</p> <p>I recommend the SMP Handbook, which is linked on DOE's website and explains how the SMP process works. Specific issues and provisions are separate chapters in the Handbook. <a href="https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/Guidance-technical-assistance/Shoreline-Master-Plan-handbook">https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/Guidance-technical-assistance/Shoreline-Master-Plan-handbook</a>; <a href="https://apps.ecology.wa.gov/publications/SummaryPages/1106010.html">https://apps.ecology.wa.gov/publications/SummaryPages/1106010.html</a>.</p> <p>P.S. If you are wondering why I have written this, it is because I do not believe that the Planning Commission and citizen committees generally are being provided with relevant and timely information on the laws and policies they are asked to review and this fails to serve public needs and public input requirements. Unless citizen-appointed committees have a comprehensive and complete understanding of the purpose and intent of the policies and laws they are asked to review, they will remain tools of the Planning Department. Please continue to ask questions and ensure that you are provided with all the information you need upfront, before beginning a large review project.</p>	
PB04	Pam Borso	4/21/21	F	16.16.270	<p>Restore Reasonable Use impact area language in the Dec 4, 2020, draft Exhibit F, WCC 16.16.270 Reasonable Use Exceptions.</p> <p>I urge Whatcom County to reject the proposed change from the Planning Commission to expand the maximum impact area for single-family residences from 2,500 sf to 4,000 sf. The purpose of the reasonable use provision is to allow only the minimal "reasonable" use of property to avoid a constitutional taking when fully applying the standards of critical areas regulations. A</p>	Your comments will be forwarded to the P/C & Co/C for their consideration.

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					4,000 sf home is excessive.	
PB05	Pam Borso	4/21/21	F		Incorporate the State of Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife's new riparian buffers guidance. The buffer requirements contained in the SMP are less than adequate to ensure no net loss of riparian and stream functions vital to fish, wildlife and our water supply.	Please see the response to comment #FW/WEC09.
PB06	Pam Borso	4/21/21	F		Incorporate regulations to prepare for accelerating sea level rise impacts. Whatcom's SMP does not incorporate protections from this peril. Not only our marine shorelines will be impacted, as Ecology writes "more frequent extreme storms are likely to cause river and coastal flooding, leading to increased injuries and loss of life." 31,235 homes in Washington State may be underwater by 2100; the value of the submerged homes is an estimated \$13.7 billion.	See responses to comments FW/WEC01, FW/WEC12, WCPW08, WCPW09, RES03, RFW07, RFW11, & RFW17.
WSPA01	Holli Johnson, Western States Petroleum Association	4/21/21			The most recent staff memorandum contains several important explanations and clarifications regarding what is meant by the "baseline" condition upon which no net loss project mitigation requirements are measured and recognizes important distinctions between what is appropriate to require for project mitigation obligations and what must be voluntary or incentive-based for restoration. These principles should be built into the language of the code itself or, at a minimum, into the language of the adopting ordinance, so as not to disappear into history once the code amendments are adopted.	Staff doesn't feel this is necessary, as this explanation is based on DOE's guidance and explanatory handouts so it true throughout the state. Nonetheless, your comment will be provided to the P/C and Co/C for consideration.
WSPA01	Holli Johnson, Western States Petroleum Association	4/21/21			The County Council is currently in the final stages of review of comprehensive plan and code amendments for fossil and renewable fuel facilities and expansions. This work is the result of many months of effort and good faith negotiations between the County and interested stakeholders, including WSPA. As noted by staff in several places in the draft shoreline master program amendments, it is imperative that these shoreline master program amendments be fully consistent with the outcome of that other County Council effort. WSPA asks for an additional opportunity to review and provide input on future revisions made by staff to achieve that consistency before these amendments to the shoreline master program are adopted.	Please refer to the response to comment P6609. The P/C's recommended amendments will be forwarded to the Co/C for their review, public hearing, and adoption (during which they may make their own amendments). We would urge you to pay attention to the SMP update page (or Council's agenda page), where new drafts are posted as decisions are made.
WSPA01	Holli Johnson, West-	4/21/21		23.40.010	The Shoreline Use and Modification Use Table establishes a	What is shown in the draft Title 23 regard-

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
	ern States Petroleum Association				shoreline conditional use permit requirement for expansions of existing legal fossil fuel refinery and transshipment facilities and new or expansion of existing legal renewable fuel refinery operations or renewable fuel transshipment facilities. Conditional use permit review requirements for these facilities are being addressed in the zoning code amendments currently under review by the County Council. A separate, duplicative and potentially inconsistent shoreline conditional use permit review for the same facilities that will undergo thorough zoning code conditional use permit review is unnecessary and should be eliminated. In particular, it is not appropriate to apply shoreline conditional use permit requirements to upland activities that will be fully evaluated under the zoning code requirements applicable to those upland activities. At a minimum, this provision should clarify that such fossil fuel facilities located outside of the shoreline jurisdiction should be evaluated under the zoning code conditional use permit criteria and not pursuant to shoreline conditional use permit requirements.	<p>ing this issue is what staff was provided over a year ago. Once Council makes a final decision on their separate Cherry Point amendments staff will rectify the differences.</p> <p>You should understand, though, that if both Title 20 and Title 23 require a CUP for a certain activity, the permits would be combined under WCC 22.05.030 (Consolidated Permit Review). Shoreline requirements would not be applied outside of the shoreline jurisdiction.</p>
DK01	David Kershner	4/22/21	N/A	N/A	<p>I have served on the Whatcom County Climate Impact Advisory Committee since its inception in 2018. While I am not writing in my capacity as a committee member, I have familiarized myself with the research on sea level rise related to climate change. The financial costs to Whatcom County taxpayers and property owners of not adequately planning for sea level rise are likely to be substantial. As you may know, the real estate company Zillow estimates that nearly \$14 billion worth of housing in Washington State could be submerged in the next 80 years under some climate change scenarios. The ecological costs will also be substantial, if we plan to prevent flooding of structures but not to allow migration of shoreline habitat. That habitat not only supports wildlife populations, it also provides economic benefits, such as recreation and fisheries.</p> <p>To reduce the economic toll of sea level rise and truly protect shorelines consistent with the intent of the Shoreline Management Act, I urge you to recommend revising regulations to ensure that newly-created lots only allow construction in areas that are not likely to be inundated in this century. Where existing lots</p>	See responses to comments FW/WEC01, FW/WEC12, WCPW08, WCPW09, RES03, RFW07, RFW11, & RFW17.

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					<p>are large enough to still allow residential, commercial, or industrial uses compatible with the zoning, I urge you to recommend a similar revision. In addition, I support revising the regulations to ensure that new or substantially changed structures be elevated above the likely sea level rise elevation for the life of the structure.</p> <p>Waterfront property that I own on Lummi Island would likely be constrained in its use due to these regulations. Nevertheless, new protections are the only responsible approach to shoreline planning, given what we know about sea level rise.</p>	
DK01	David Kershner	4/22/21			As a former commercial salmon fisher, I also support strengthening riparian buffer restrictions consistent with recommendations of the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife Riparian Ecosystems Volumes I and II. Salmon populations have declined in part due to riparian habitat degradation. We need to protect this habitat to restore healthy salmon populations.	Your comment will be forwarded to the P/C & Co/C for their consideration.
AC01	Alan Chapman	4/22/21			<p>I have been involved in fisheries management, and watershed resource issues in Whatcom County for over 30 years.</p> <p>Regardless of the level of belief one might have in projections of climate change and sea level rise and associated storm surges, it does not make sense to allow development in areas of high risk. I urge the county, in the interests in avoiding significant damage to life, property and natural resources to not allow creation of lots where reasonable use would be subject to a high risk of damage from climate change effects, sea level rise, or reduce public trust ecological benefits within the foreseeable future.</p> <p>Where existing lots are large enough to still allow residential, commercial, or industrial uses compatible with the zoning, I urge you to recommend or require a similar risk avoidance approach. In addition, I support revising the regulations to ensure that new or substantially changed structures be elevated above the likely sea level rise elevation for the life of the structure.</p>	See responses to comments FW/WEC01, FW/WEC12, WCPW08, WCPW09, RES03, RFW07, RFW11, & RFW17.
AC02	Alan Chapman	4/22/21			In the interest of protecting and achieving a net ecological gain of shoreline functions through consideration of locational relevant riparian buffer requirements that might be identified in the	Your comment will be forwarded to the P/C & Co/C for their consideration.

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife recent guidance on riparian guidance.	
PR01	Paula Rotondi	4/22/21	F	16.16.270	<p>As you consider changes to the Shoreline Master Plan (SMP), I urge you to make decisions based upon what will be best for those living here twenty years from now – rather than what is best for corporations' short term profits. Please draft more stringent SMP standards.</p> <p>First, regarding Reasonable Use Exceptions, please reject the proposed change to expand the maximum impact area for single family residences from 2,500 square feet to 4,000 square feet. "Reasonable Use" means there must be some minimal use such as a 2,500 square foot house. If those living here twenty years from now are to have natural treasures such as salmon fishing, crabbing, the sight of Orcas, the SMP cannot afford extravagances such as a 4,000 square foot house that will do more damage to our already damaged shorelines.</p>	Please see the responses provided for Comments BIAWC04, BIAWC09, GCD09, GCD14, MES09, MES11, MES31, NES01, RFW12, RFW13, & RFW18.
PR03	Paula Rotondi	4/22/21			Second, the buffer requirements in the SMP do not adequately protect riparian and stream functions which are essential for sustaining fish, wildlife and protecting our water supply. If people living here twenty or more years from now are to have the fish and wildlife treasures we enjoy today and have adequate supplies of clean water, then the SMP must incorporate the State of Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife's new riparian buffers guidance.	Please see the response to comment #FW/WEC09.
PR03	Paula Rotondi	4/22/21			Third, please do not add to the challenges of those living here twenty years or more from today who will be dealing with increasingly severe ramifications of climate change. Climate change causes sea level to rise and also causes more extreme storms with tide surge coastal flooding and also river flooding. The Washington State Department of Ecology, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, private investment companies, insurance companies, and real estate companies (Redfin most recently) warn that many thousands of homes worth billions of dollars will be lost due to climate change exacerbated flooding. Please include regulations in the SMP to prepare for accelerating sea level rise.	Please see the responses provided for Comments FW/WEC01, FW/WEC02, FW/WEC12, WCPW07, WCPW08, WCPW09, RES03, RFW02, RFW03, RFW04, RFW06, RFW07, RFW11, RFW17, & PB06.



Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
P6611	Dave Klanica, Phillips 66	4/22/21	D		<i>Extent of Jurisdiction.</i> Given the recent Department of Ecology's revocation of the Port of Kalama and Northwest Innovation Works Shoreline Conditional Use Permit, questions have been raised as to overall shoreline management authority. Whatcom County, as well as other Counties and Ecology must lawfully apply its shoreline management program requirements, particularly when seeking to require mitigation for activities that occur outside the jurisdictional shores of the State. It appears that Ecology unlawfully applied certain mitigations when the only activities within the shoreline were dredging for a new dock berth, portions of the security fence, an infiltration pond, a first-flush pond, fire suppression water storage and a containment berm for certain storage tanks. We ask that Whatcom County commit to act within its jurisdictional boundaries.	We are. Shoreline jurisdiction is addressed in §23.20.010.
P6612	Dave Klanica, Phillips 66	4/22/21			<i>Consistency with Ongoing Comprehensive Plan and Code Amendments.</i> Both WSPA and Phillip 66's previous comments request that the shoreline master program amendments be consistent with the outcome of the ongoing good faith negotiations between the County and interested stakeholders that has occurred over many months related to the Comprehensive Plan and Code Amendments. We request consistency primarily as to definitions as the development of the relevant definitions was a significant effort and even slight differences in wording across county programs could add uncertainty and confusion. Phillips 66 does not believe that all activities which will require a conditional use permit under the Code Amendments should also require a conditional use permit under the shoreline management act. The shoreline program only affects activities that are within the jurisdictional shores of the State. The Zoning requirements cover much broader non-shoreline areas. Additionally, shoreline conditional use permit requirements should not be applied to upland activities that will be fully evaluated under the zoning code requirements applicable to those upland activities. The programs also involve different decision makers and appeal paths. The differences can warrant different permitting approaches.	Please see the responses provided for Comments FW/WEC16, RES10, P6609, WSPA01
BH01	Bill Haynes, Ashton	4/22/21	D	23.50.140	Regarding the Table for Dimensional Standards (page 147), the	We agree; our math was wrong. It has

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
	Engineering				<p>minimum length required to reach a moorage depth of 5' below ordinary high water.</p> <p>Ordinary High Water (OHW) elevation 314.5' has been well established on the Lake Whatcom - at least for the multiple projects I've been involved with.</p> <p>The proposed change results in a low water depth at the outer end of the dock (float) of 2'. Design low water has been established at an elevation of 311.5'.</p> <p>In a Jan. 29, 1999 letter from the WA Dept. of Ecology (DOE) to WCPDS and the WC Hearing Examiner, the DOE determined "...an in-water depth of 2.5 feet at 311.5 feet MSL is the minimum necessary draft to accommodate a standard powerboat on Lake Whatcom."</p> <p>The proposed update lowers the design depth from 2.5' to 2.0'. That depth is at the watered end of the dock only. Presumably, depths towards shore are shallower and at low water level a power boat will have less than 2' to moor in. In addition, the landward end of the float may go aground depending on the bottom contours if the outer end is at 2'. If the site is exposed to waves, the dock/boat may be tossed up and down on the lake bed.</p> <p>Assuming a 6'x20' floating dock aligned with its approach ramp, I would propose the overall minimum length required to reach an inshore depth of 5' at OHW (2' depth at 311.5'). That assumes depths offshore increase.</p>	been amended to be 5.5 feet now.
KC04	Kim Clarkin	4/22/21			I am concerned about the current document's lack of land use restrictions on areas that will be affected by sea level rise. I do not agree that waiting to strengthen regulations till more information is available is a good idea. In the meantime, many decisions will be made that may harm critical areas along the changing shoreline. Those decisions may also harm the people who invest in shoreline developments that storm surges could damage. This is the kind of foresight and protection citizens expect from their government—not a laissez-faire attitude such as led	Please see the responses provided for Comments FW/WEC01, FW/WEC02, FW/WEC12, WCPW07, WCPW08, WCPW09, RES03, RFW02, RFW03, RFW04, RFW06, RFW07, RFW11, RFW17, & PB06.

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					to the Oso disaster. Other commenters have given strong references for up-to-date scientific information the Planning Dept. can use to write pertinent and reasonable rules to distance new developments from the shoreline.	
KC05	Kim Clarkin	4/22/21			I do not see a reason for expanding the reasonable use exception to 4,000 ft2 in critical areas. That is a trophy home, not a reasonable exception. Critical areas are critical to wildlife, water and other things that we are trying to protect. Let's actually protect them.	Please see the responses provided for Comments BIAWC04, BIAWC09, GCD09, GCD14, MES09, MES11, MES31, NES01, RFW12, RFW13, & RFW18.
KC06	Kim Clarkin	4/22/21			<p>I strongly encourage you to use WDFW's most recent recommendations for riparian buffer widths for new developments. They are based on a thorough knowledge of rivers, valleys, and in-stream habitat development over the long term, and they should be incorporated in our long-term planning. No one is saying that existing developments have to be retired. New development should be completely different; recognizing our expanding understanding of the damage we wreak on ecosystems, we should aggressively seek to avoid that damage.</p> <p>I congratulate you and the Planning Department for making otherwise reasonable updates to a huge document and working toward making regulations more understandable. It has been a long slog for you, and I'm grateful for your attention to this extremely important roadmap to our future relationship with our environment. Please make it as strongly protective as you can.</p>	Please see the response to comment #FW/WEC09.
JM01	Janet Migaki	4/22/21			<p>The SMP, CAO, City and County Comprehensive Plans mention or refer to a quagmire of environmental agencies + regulations, as well as mention or refer to multiple intersecting jurisdictions, permits, ordinances, exemptions and waivers—all used for 'managing' waters of the State.</p> <p>Lake Whatcom, a significant water of the State, is not a healthy or protected source of water, yet it is used for Bellingham's drinking water. The Lake's well documented decline is troublesome since many of the lake's contaminants resist the treatment processes used by the City treatment plant and pass into public drinking water supplies.</p>	Lake Whatcom's water quality is managed through the Lake Whatcom Management Program, under the direction of the Lake Whatcom Policy Group. You can find what you're looking for at <a href="https://www.lakewhatcom.whatcomcounty.org/">https://www.lakewhatcom.whatcomcounty.org/</a> .

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					<p>Where in the SMP and accompanying documents does it mention or discuss the primary and ultimate regulatory agency held fully accountable for protecting the water quality of Lake Whatcom water?</p> <p>The Lake is violating several water quality parameters +contaminants, and the water has not been tested for a full toxicology analysis since late 1990s.</p> <p>Does the SMP address protecting the Lake's total water quality? I know the 50-year TMDL tries to address low DO levels, with not encouraging reports to date. What about so many more lake water quality issues- who is accountable and responsible for protecting and keeping the lake healthy enough to be a drinking water source?</p>	
MRC01	Marine Resources Committee	4/22/21			<p>Thank you for taking the time to review the Whatcom County Marine Resources Committee's (WCMRC) comments on marine land protection. One role of the WCMRC is to work with county leadership and other key constituencies to help protect marine and enhance nearshore habitat through local and state ordinances and regulatory plans. The WCMRC supports regulations and policies that further protect and enhance marine shoreline areas that are vital economically, culturally, recreationally, and environmentally.</p> <p>The Whatcom County Marine Resources Committee supports the inclusion of the proposed amendment to Chapter 8: Marine Resources Lands policy section, as developed by the WCMRC, to the Comprehensive Plan.</p>	Your comment will be provided to the P/C and Co/C for consideration.
BIAWC14	Rob Lee, BIAWC Executive Officer	4/22/21	F		<p>We want to say thank you for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• recommending the 4,000 sq. ft. RU area, we request excluding septic systems from this square footage if covered with native landscaping.</li> <li>• For creating the minor variance for buffer reduction of the 25% to 50%. We request that you lower the fee for minor variances.</li> <li>• We request that any buffer reductions under Reasonable Use are decided administratively through a minor variance,</li> </ul>	Your comment will be provided to the P/C and Co/C for consideration.

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					Critical areas included.	
BIAWC15	Rob Lee, BIAWC Executive Officer	4/22/21	F	16.16.270 & 16.16.273	<p>Reasonable Use and Variances: We will comment separately on the permit process, "impact area" size, and criteria issues.</p> <p>A. Permit Procedure:</p> <p>1) <i>Present Process</i>: PDS staff has proposed major changes to the procedures. The current 2017 CAO allows staff to grant reasonable use (RU) permits for one single family house under very strict criteria if CAO rules alone would deny "all reasonable and economically viable use" of the property. The next step is a variance requiring Hearing Examiner (HE) approval.</p> <p>We were surprised to learn recently that these RU permits have become a major part of local wetland scientist's workload. This is due mainly to high buffer standards and tight limits on adjustment options. These conflicts between strict environmental rules and permitted, customary land uses are obviously not unusual.</p> <p>2) <i>Staff Proposed Process</i>: As we understand it, the current draft Exh F/CAO proposal, dated 4/2/2021, offers a 3-level process:</p> <p>a) <i>Minor Variance</i>: if a person only needs a 25 to 50% CAO buffer reduction, they will apply for this approval. The draft does not say whether this value is total area, width, or both. Staff decides these permits; an application and notice to neighbors is required. We do appreciate this new minor variance idea allowing staff approval. The concept should be used for other CAO issues. No further CAO permits are needed. See Section 16.16.273, p 34.</p> <p>b) <i>A Major Variance</i> is required if the Minor Variance is denied. One would apply to PDS, and the H/E would decide after a hearing. This is an expensive and slow process; the fees are now \$2,750 each, plus critical area reports, probably consultants doing the applications, a consultant or attorney at the hearing, and possible legal costs if you or an opponent appeals the decision. Anyone testifying, or you, can appeal the decision to Supe-</p>	<p>Regarding the commenter's point A.2.b: A major variance wouldn't be required if the minor variance is denied; a major variance would be applied for if one wants to reduce a buffer more than 50%. They're not sequential: one just applies for the permit one needs.</p> <p>Similarly, regarding the commenter's point A.2.b: With staff's assistance, an applicant should know whether a major variance is attainable, given the required findings (§22.07.050). Thus, if one understood one's chances to be nil, one would just apply for an RUE; so again, they don't have to be sequential.</p> <p>The biggest difference is that through a variance, whether minor or major, one must still mitigate for impacts. Under an RUE the H/E can allow impacts without requiring mitigation. This would apply on a property that is so encumbered by critical areas that nothing could fit on the lot without causing impacts and there's no room to mitigate.</p>

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					<p>rior Court, also costly and slow. See Section 16.16.273, p 34.</p> <p>c). A Reasonable Use Exception is the last resort, virtually identical to the Major Variance process and possible outcomes. It would also be decided by the HE, with high similar costs, and potential litigation. See 16.16.270. A and B.</p> <p>One may apply for an RUE only if their Major Variance app is denied. If you do not get adequate relief with a major variance, you must repeat the process to apply for and hope to be granted an RUE by the HE, paying like fees and costs again. You or an opponent may appeal this decision too to Superior Court from someone, at either stage.</p> <p>3) BIAWC/GAC Proposal: a simpler, less costly, and more practical alternative for all sides:</p> <p>a) Minor Variance (informal staff decision): expand the options to allow buffer adjustments above 50%. This would be determined mainly on a valid scientific analysis of site and vicinity functions and values of the affected wetland(s) and/or habitat(s), acceptable to qualified staff. Also, adjustments should be possible in both total buffer area and width. Can be appealed via RU process.</p> <p>b) Major Variance (formal HE decision): eliminate it, as redundant with the RU option, adding unneeded costs, complexity and time demands on both public and private parties.</p> <p>c) RUE: Use the draft as written; consider simplifying criteria per comments, information, and proposal below, per Item C.</p>	
BIAWC16	Rob Lee, BIAWC Executive Officer	4/22/21	F	16.16.270(C)(12)	<p>B. "Impact Area" size limit: For reasons stated in our April 12 2021 letter, we support the 4,000 sq. ft. value for the "impact area" to be allowed as the upper limit for buildings and other impervious surfaces, except for a minimal standard driveway. We suggest "impact area" be defined for certainty, and exclude landscaped areas using native plants and water features, and septic mounds or areas. The term "footprint" has a different meaning in the construction and real estate worlds.</p>	<p>Please see the responses provided for Comments BIAWC04, BIAWC09, GCD09, GCD14, MES09, MES11, MES31, NES01, RFW12, RFW13, &amp; RFW18.</p> <p>And the commenter is correct about the impact area having no scientific basis; rather, it is a legal basis. The courts have</p>

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					<p>Also, there is no scientific basis for any fixed value, 2,500 or 4,000. Also, some landowners who already have a "pre-CAO" house or other building on their parcel would be severely penalized by the 2,500 value.</p>	<p>consistently interpreted a reasonable use (in SFR zones) to be an averaged sized house in that jurisdiction. In Whatcom County, PDS records indicate that an averaged sized house is 1,820 sf, meaning the footprint would be around 900-1,000 sf (2-story). We would expect that someone wanting a larger home or more appurtenant improvements wouldn't choose a lot that is so encumbered by critical areas that they couldn't fit it on the property.</p>
BIAWC17	Rob Lee, BIAWC Executive Officer	4/22/21	F		<p>C. RU Criteria: In our April 12 2021 statement, we raised several substantive questions on the "reasonableness" of some of the many RU criteria (12! see p 2-3). And we attached the full text of guidance on Reasonable Use from the state Department of Commerce again. We did omit the small p1 diagram because it was not clear how it related to the text on it or overall context.</p> <p>In general, this guidance advises "careful use" of terms such as "alternative or possible uses, etc."; and care with "economic use" etc.; see p 2-3.</p> <p>In the Synopsis of Public Comments updated April 14, 2021, staff commented at length on this guidance (pp 110-113). We have no disagreement with most comments. But in D, p 111, if you as the government are going to say: "the criteria ... need to consistent with case law...", then you have an obligation to impacted citizens to cite at least the more recent and relevant cases and point out the claimed support.</p> <p>Somewhere in the Synopsis, staff also referred to Department of Ecology guidance on this topic. I searched their site and found: "Wetland Guidance for CAO Updates"; 65p, 2016 (attached). The subject is cited on 4 pages: 8, 13 and 31-32. This excerpt is the only substantive guidance in the document, p 8:</p> <p>"Exceptions are typically addressed in a CAO in the context of</p>	<p>Your comments will be provided to the P/C and Co/C.</p>

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					<p>reasonable use of property. For more information about this regulatory tool, see Section VII of the Critical Areas Assistance Handbook published by the Washington State Department of Commerce: <a href="http://www.commerce.wa.gov/Documents/GMSCritical-Areas-Assist-Handbook.pdf">http://www.commerce.wa.gov/Documents/GMSCritical-Areas-Assist-Handbook.pdf</a></p> <p>We think this is an important legal issue for many county landowners. We suggest you ask the PDS/Commissions' legal counsel to review these criteria and related resources and produce a memo with a recommended set of criteria for the record before you complete your recommendations on this important issue to the County Council. The adopted CAO definitions of Reasonable Use and RU Exception should be reviewed too; attached.</p>	
BIAWC18	Rob Lee, BIAWC Executive Officer	4/22/21	F		<p>2. Buffers for wetlands and Habitat (HCAs)</p> <p>Our April 12 testimony makes several comments on this important issue. In general, the buffers make more land unusable for all kinds of essential land uses than preserving the actual wetland.</p> <p>At this point, we have carefully reviewed the 3 most recent statements by Miller Environmental Services on the many changes proposed by staff re wetland and habitat buffer and related issues. We have discussed many with him and find that we agree in general with all the comments. A few other wetland scientists have also submitted valuable comments, e.g., NW Ecological Services and NW Wetlands Consulting.</p> <p>We respectfully recommend that Planning Commission members and staff review these comments carefully, and seriously consider acceptance. Almost all are opposed to new, more restrictive language, and do not propose new text or values.</p> <p>Many of staff's proposed changes, and opposed by Miller, would tip whatever balance the CAO now has toward preservation of more non-wetland areas, i.e., buffers. Other items objected to will make the process of obtaining some flexibility in the rules</p>	Your comments will be provided to the P/C and Co/C.



Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					<p>more difficult, or impossible in some cases.</p> <p>We submitted two of the three Miller letters with our April 12 letter: the February 19, 2021 letter (8 pages; 14 comments, and the Jon Maberry Prepared Motions, one page, 12 issues, dated February 25 2021.</p> <p>We are attaching the firm's most recent April 12, 2021 letter to this statement, 8 issues and 6 p.</p> <p>We are taking this approach because no active members of our GAC or of the BIAWC have the scientific credentials or experience to do the kind of objective analysis of the draft changes that Miller and the other scientists have done.</p> <p>From reading all the Miller comments, we conclude that if the CAO draft is adopted as written today, the Whatcom CAO will be one of the restrictive in the state, if not the most!</p>	
BIAWC19	Rob Lee, BIAWC Executive Officer	4/22/21	F		We do ask that the Planning Commission hold the record open for written comments for at least 2 weeks. We will review the testimony after the hearing and may want to send additional comments.	The P/C considered this request at their 4/22 hearing and denied it.
MES51	Ed Miller, Miller Environmental Services	4/22/21	F	16.16.900	<p><b>P/C Public Hearing Testimony:</b> The WAC definition of "watercourse," which is where the ditches would fall, talks about the presence of a high water mark and the presence of fish; it specifically excludes irrigation ditches, canals, stormwater treatment, conveyance systems, or other entirely artificial watercourses. So it seems to me that ditches, unless they carry fish or convey a prior stream, are not waters of the state. So it seems to me that ditches are not waters of the state unless they carry fish or convey a prior stream. And from a practical standpoint, regulating ditches in Whatcom: If all the ditches become a critical area with a buffer, we'd have to do critical areas report for everyone with the ditch, with a buffer. I'm not sure how that would work. If you filled a ditch, what the mitigation would be for that, would you have to create another ditch? I'm not sure how that would work. If Public Works was to create a new ditch for a new road they'd be creating a new critical area, putting a new buffer on someone's property. Additionally, most all of the ditch-</p>	These comments were considered by the P/C in their deliberations and final recommendation on the definition and regulation of ditches.

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					es in Whatcom County that have these buffers are located in County right-of-way, so it just seems from a practical standpoint it's not even doable. Aside from the fact that they don't appear to be waters of the state by state definition.	
TSF09	Diani Taylor, Taylor Shellfish Farms	4/22/21			<b>P/C Public Hearing Testimony:</b> I am a 5 <sup>th</sup> generation shellfish farmer with my family business, Taylor Shellfish Farms. We have been farming shellfish here in the state since 1890 and grow a variety of oysters, mussels, clams and geoduck today. Our company is vertically integrated where we farm-to-table, so we include everything from hatcheries and nurseries to farms, processing facilities, and retail and restaurants. I wanted to introduce myself after we submitted comments on the most recent draft of the SMP document. We really appreciate regulations, especially in the Shoreline Master program, that are so important to protect our environmental resources, including water quality and shoreline and our shoreline ecosystem, which is important and critical for our farms. Our comments are intended to just ensure that the regulations around aquaculture are based on the most current scientific and technical information and align with the state guidelines.	Comment noted. These comments were considered by the P/C in their deliberations and final recommendation. Please see staff responses to TSF's written comments addressing their issues.
RES25	Karlee Deatherage, RE Sources	4/22/21			<p><b>P/C Public Hearing Testimony:</b> The current version of the SMP is an improvement for protecting our shorelines. However, there are 3 areas to further strengthen. We submitted a letter on April 12 asking the P/C to make changes with respect to reasonable use, sea level rise, and include the use of Department of Fish and Wildlife new riparian buffer guidance in the critical areas ordinance.</p> <p>The science is clear when it comes to sea level rise. We have been and continue to witness the impacts of rising seas. With storm surges impacting property, we will see the loss of critical shoreline habitats for salmon and forage fish through a phenomenon called coastal squeeze if we don't act now to prevent the construction of buildings or infrastructure in harm's way.</p> <p>Suggested code for amending 23.30 under general regulations that the new section was included in our letter, please restore the staff proposed language for 16.16.270 (Reasonable Use</p>	These comments were considered by the P/C in their deliberations and final recommendation. Please see staff responses to these previously raised issues.

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					<p>Exceptions) and improvements over the current code to require the Hearing Examiner approval for reasonable use exceptions. However, 4,000 square feet of impact area is excessive, especially when some lots could be 6,000 square feet.</p> <p>Lastly, WDSW release guidance on riparian buffers in July and also in December 2020. We hope the P/C will incorporate best available science from WDW that calls for a one hundred foot buffers known as the "200-year site potential tree height" from the edge of the 100-year floodplain or channel migration zone. This could be applied as a new section to 16.16.420 (General Standards) for frequently flooded areas or a new entry in the table for 16.16.740 (Habitat Conservation Area Buffers).</p>	
PG01	Andrew Gamble, PetroGas	4/22/21			<p><b>P/C Public Hearing Testimony:</b> We do have a few concerns, questions, and clarifications about the update.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• First of all, we've noticed that there are some overlapping regulations, and we just want to point out that where there's already existing regulation in place and that the SMP need not be layered on and may not actually be necessary.</li> <li>• Another thing that we're looking at is that there's a potential for a maximum height requirement. We don't think that should apply to the Cherry Point UGA.</li> <li>• And then there's maintenance dredging. We think that should probably be a permitted and conditional use, and I think I read somewhere that it was to be prohibited and conditional. That should just be for the maintenance dredging. And then dredge material disposal management actually is already in place, so it doesn't need to be managed again.</li> <li>• And then some clarification on no net loss. We were looking for a bit of an explanation on the baseline condition. Is that the same as it was outlined in, I think it was a 2007 staff report, on a previous update?</li> <li>• And as for mitigation, is that still achieved through voluntary and incentives, or is that going to be permit required mitigation? Could that be applied to legacy or historical problems and not part of a new project proposal?</li> </ul>	<p>These comments were considered by the P/C in their deliberations and final recommendation. But briefly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff doesn't believe there are overlapping regulations.</li> <li>• There does need to be height limitations so as to protect the shoreline, especially in terms of protecting views.</li> <li>• Maintenance dredging is proposed to be a Permitted Use.</li> <li>• The baseline condition was set by the 2007 SMP Update and it's corresponding background documents.</li> <li>• Some mitigation may be required for impacts from project proposals, but the County does not require applicants to "fix" existing issues, though applicants are always welcome to do so through voluntary mitigation.</li> <li>• No, Shoreline CUPs already existed in the County's SMP.</li> <li>• Currently only SLR policies are being considered, which would not create</li> </ul>

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• And does this SMP Update establish a shoreline conditional use permit?</li> <li>• Then finally, we were looking for some clarification on the sea level rise policies. I heard Mr. Hansen talk about that as well. It's kind of scattered throughout. And we were looking to see if this is going to create new responsibilities for permit applicants.</li> </ul>	<p>new responsibilities for permit applicants. However, we expect that in the not too distant future there may be regulations requiring applicants to address it in their permit analyses.</p>
P6613	Tim Johnson, Phillips 66	4/22/21			<p><b>P/C Public Hearing Testimony:</b> I would refer you to the Phillips 66, April 12<sup>th</sup> written comments as well as some supplemental comments that were submitted today via email. But I would like to highlight a few comments tonight, specifically in Exhibit C, Chapter 8.</p> <p>Regarding Policy 8T -1 we would request some clarification of the methods by which the County will coordinate with landowners to protect marine resource lands</p> <p>In policy 8 U-2 we request some clarification of the types of non-regulatory programs and options and incentives that owners of marine resource lands can employ to meet or exceed the County environmental goals.</p> <p>In Exhibit D, Title 23, the general provisions indicate that shoreline development must be consistent with Shoreline Management Act of 1971, the County Shoreline Regulations, and other County land use regulations. Chapter 23 then references certain requirements for existing legal fossil fuel refinery operations, existing legal transshipment facilities, expansions of those facilities, and new or expansions of renewable fuel refineries or transshipment facilities. And is related definitions also provided on page 241 on expansions of existing fuel, fossil fuel, and renewable fuel facilities that says they are required to obtain conditional shoreline permits. As the planning department is aware, industry, labor, and environmental organization stakeholders have been working together to develop recommendations and changes to the County Council's October 2019 proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments. There's been considerable progress made by the stakeholders, and those have been present-</p>	<p>These comments were considered by the P/C in their deliberations and final recommendation. Please see the staff responses to Phillips 66's written comments on these same issues.</p>

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					<p>ed to the County Council for their consideration, and we request that this SMP draft be delayed until the final work from the stakeholder effort is accepted or rejected and the final definitions and framework for conditional use permit is finalized. And then finally, I would just like to note that we would request an additional opportunity to review and provide input and further revisions made by the staff before the shoreline amendments are finalized.</p>	
WH02	Wendy Harris	4/22/21			<p><b>P/C Public Hearing Testimony:</b> I support the comments that have been submitted by the environmental community; they are well founded.</p> <p>But I want to express my outrage that the P/C majority is using their position to reduce environmental protections for their own interests, ignoring what is best for the public and the planet. This is being done at a time when scientists have issued three distress letters about how we are not doing enough fast enough at the risk of biosphere collapse and extinction of most forms of life, including our own. There are many members of the public who share my views. If you are here for yourself, you're here for the wrong reason.</p> <p>I'm also appalled at the lack of science I failed to hear being discussed. I heard agenda based changes being proposed and I heard nothing regarding the science that supports this. This must have resulted in staff using science as if they were drafting a legal brief to support their argument. Why wasn't the science presented front and center to the topic being discussed? This is troubling. I understand that this round of the SMP update does not require a new review of the foundational elements necessary to determine no net loss. However, DOE indicated that there was an exception for a substantial change in Shoreline function. I believe that applies here and is very relevant since the County still lacks baseline standards, means of quantification, and monitoring protocols. In other words, we have no means of determining no net loss, which leads to the following statement in all but the largest SEPA reviews, which is in regards to species of wildlife present: "none known to the best of</p>	<p>These comments were considered by the P/C in their deliberations and final recommendation.</p>

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					<p>my knowledge." And by that everybody escapes having to care about or mitigate for wildlife impacts or whatever other kind of impacts are around. Other changes in events approved or pending are going to reshape the shoreline in the County jurisdiction in a manner that will make it unrecognizable from its current condition. We've lost one of the most important shoreline keystone species since the last SMP. The sea star numbers established how the loss of even a small number of stars had a significant impact on our healthy shoreline function. There is the Birch Bay berm. There's the Cherry Point update that's allowing expansion of use and of size, and that's going to bring in more tankers which have led to the killer hornets that are here in Blaine, and they're believed to arrive via Cherry Point tanker. And so these are vectors for aquatic invasive disease. Taken as a whole, this is enormous change and it's a loss in shorelines of statewide significance that does not follow the prioritized shoreline use preference so that we estimate one sentence. I asked that the DOE require the County at least provide a concrete example of how the no net loss would work.</p>	
BIAWC20	Roger Almskaar, BIAWC	4/22/21			<p><b>P/C Public Hearing Testimony:</b> We submitted our 2<sup>nd</sup> round of testimony by email. It was late today. Did you see our letter come in a 4-page letter and some attachments? OK, good, thank you. So that's in the record. So I'll move along here.</p> <p>Let's see, I want to say thank you to Cliff Strong for his good work on the staff report, and the synopsis just made our work a lot easier in figuring out what's going on with this extremely complicated project.</p> <p>Most of the impacts on building that we're concerned about are coming from critical area rules, not shoreline rules. We just don't get into the shoreline areas very much anymore.</p> <p>I want to give you something about my background, though I think most of you don't know this. I'm a land use consultant right now, but I got into planning in 1971, being hired by Whatcom County to do the first SMP, which goes back a long time. Our final product adopted in 1976 was about 170 pages. Lots of</p>	<p>These comments were considered by the P/C in their deliberations and final recommendation. Please see the staff responses to the BIAWC's written comments on the proposed reasonable use process.</p>

Comment #	Commenter	Date	Exhibit	Section	Comment (Abbreviated; please see original correspondence for exact language, supporting arguments, and/or supporting material citations.)	Staff Response
					<p>definitions that I had to write. At that time the state guidelines from Ecology were a booklet of about 25 pages. I don't know if Cliff has ever seen that one. Let me move on here.</p> <p>I think the most important thing for me to say tonight is we're very concerned about the reasonable use process. And I've been surprised in the last few months to learn that that process has become a major part of the workload of many of the local wetland scientists. That was not true a few years ago, and I've been doing short plats for a long time and just hadn't heard that. So my most important thing to say tonight is that we are really concerned about the staff's new proposal to have three layers of permit processing to get a reasonable use exception. The first layer would be the staff of (mini?) variance, second would be a variance through the H/E, and the third would be a reasonable use through the H/E. So you'd be going there twice, paying the same amount of money, twice fees and everything. And so our proposal is to eliminate the middle level, the variance that would go to the H/E. And if you're not satisfied with what you are able to negotiate with a staff, with your wetland scientist, work out a deal based on science, not arbitrary numbers, it's politics. But then you can go to the H/E. So we're agreeing to support that. It's still going to be expensive for people, but at least it's not double the cost as it is. But please look at that in detail as quite a bit in our paper on that.</p>	

Total # of comments: 277