



**STATE ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT (SEPA),
CHAPTER 43.21C RCW
DETERMINATION OF NON-SIGNIFICANCE (DNS)**

Proponent: Clallam County
Non-Project Action: Clallam County Shoreline Master Program (SMP) Update
Lead Agency: Clallam County Department of Community Development.

Description of Proposal: The proposal is to consider county adoption of the *Draft Clallam County Shoreline Master Program (SMP)—Planning Commission Recommendation (September 2017)* to update and replace: (1) the existing SMP adopted in 1976 (last amended 1992) and (2) procedures for the administration of the SMP set forth in Chapter 35.01, Shoreline Management, of the Clallam County Code (CCC) under Title 35 CCC, Shorelines. The proposal addresses compliance with the state Shoreline Management Act (SMA), RCW 90.58, and state SMP update guidelines (WAC 173-26). The SMP includes goals and policies, regulations for new development and uses, and administrative procedures for shoreline permitting processes. Under the SMA, the County and state Department of Ecology share joint authority and responsibility for the update and administration of the SMP. County adoption of an updated SMP will also require review and approval by Ecology to be effective.

Location of Proposal: The proposed SMP applies to: 1) all marine waters, reaches of rivers and streams where the mean annual flow is more than 20 cubic feet per second, and lakes and reservoirs 20 acres or greater in size that are within the jurisdiction of Clallam County; 2) areas within 200 feet from the ordinary high water mark or floodway of these water bodies; and 3) associated wetlands and river deltas. To consolidate regulations associated with these water bodies, the SMP would also apply to the full extent of the mapped 100-year floodplain and land necessary for buffers to protect critical areas (e.g., geologic hazard areas, other streams) that are overlapping or otherwise coincident with the shoreline jurisdiction pursuant to RCW 90.58.030 (2)(d). The City of Forks is considering the proposed SMP for rivers inside the city limits.

SEPA Threshold Determination: The lead agency has determined that this proposal will not result in probable significant adverse impacts to the environment and has issued a Determination of Non-Significance (DNS) under WAC 197-11-340(2). An environmental impact statement is not required under RCW 43.21.030 (2)(c). This decision was made after review of a completed environmental checklist; Appendix A to the checklist containing the *Final Clallam County Cumulative Impacts Analysis and No Net Loss Report (Revised June 2017)* and other supporting SMP update documents and information on file with the lead agency including, but not limited to the: *Shoreline Inventory and Characterization Report: For Portions of Clallam County Draining to the Strait of Juan de Fuca (March 2012)*; *WRIA 20 Inventory and Characterization Report (Revised May 2012 Draft)*; *Countywide Shoreline Restoration Plan (Revised February 2016)*; and *Final Consistency Review Report (July 2011)*.

SMP Documents: The proposed *Draft SMP—Planning Commission Recommendation* (September 2017); existing 1976 SMP (last amended 1992) and Chapter 35.01 CCC, Shoreline Management; supporting SMP Update documents; and other information are available for review at the Clallam County Department of Community Development (see below address) and on the County's SMP Update web page at: <http://www.clallam.net/LandUse/SMP.html>

Comment Period: Comments on this DNS must be submitted by **December 12, 2017**. A public hearing on the proposal before the Clallam County Board of Commissioners has been scheduled for December 12, 2017 at 10:30 a.m., or as soon thereafter as possible in the Commissioners' Meeting Room of the Clallam County Courthouse, 223 East 4th Street, Room 160, Port Angeles, Washington.

Contact Information: For more information, contact the Department of Community Development (see below address) or by calling 360-417-2420.

Responsible Official: Steve Gray, Deputy Director/Planning Manager (360-417-2520)

Address: Clallam County Department of Community Development
RE: SEPA COMMENTS
223 E. 4th Street, Suite 5
Port Angeles, WA 98362

Issuance Date: October 16, 2017 **Signature:** 
Steve Gray, Deputy Director/Planning Manager

Appeals: Unless the Responsible Official withdraws the threshold determination pursuant to WAC 197-11-340, the threshold determination shall be final at the end of the comment period. The final decision by the Clallam County Board of County Commissioners on the Clallam County Shoreline Master Program and this DNS may be appealed consistent with State law.

**CLALLAM COUNTY
SHORELINE MASTER PROGRAM (SMP) UPDATE
SEPA Environmental Checklist**

August 2017

Table of Contents

TABLE OF CONTENTS	I
A. BACKGROUND	1
B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS	5
1. <i>Earth</i>	<i>5</i>
2. <i>Air</i>	<i>7</i>
3. <i>Water</i>	<i>8</i>
4. <i>Plants</i>	<i>11</i>
5. <i>Animals</i>	<i>12</i>
6. <i>Energy and Natural Resources</i>	<i>14</i>
7. <i>Environmental Health</i>	<i>15</i>
8. <i>Land and Shoreline Use</i>	<i>15</i>
9. <i>Housing</i>	<i>19</i>
10. <i>Aesthetics</i>	<i>19</i>
11. <i>Light and Glare</i>	<i>20</i>
12. <i>Recreation</i>	<i>21</i>
13. <i>Historic and Cultural Preservation</i>	<i>22</i>
14. <i>Transportation</i>	<i>23</i>
15. <i>Public Services</i>	<i>25</i>
16. <i>Utilities</i>	<i>25</i>
C. SIGNATURE	26
D. SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS	27
APPENDIX A: CLALLAM COUNTY SMP UPDATE CUMULATIVE IMPACTS ASSESSMENT	32

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

A. BACKGROUND

1. Name of the proposed project:

Clallam County Shoreline Master Program (SMP) Update

2. Name of Applicant:

Clallam County

3. Address and telephone number of applicant and contact person:

Steve Gray, Planning Manager

Clallam County

223 E 4th St # 5

Port Angeles, WA 98362

(360) 417-2520

4. Date checklist prepared:

August 2017

5. Agency requesting checklist:

Clallam County

6. Proposed timing or schedule (including phasing, if applicable):

It is expected that the Clallam County Planning Commission will forward a recommended SMP to the Clallam County Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) in August/September of 2017. It is anticipated that the BOCC will schedule a public hearing on the Planning Commission recommendation in Fall 2017 and take action to adopt the SMP by ordinance or resolution, pending Ecology approval, in Fall or Winter 2017.

7. Plans for future additions, expansion, or further activity related to or connected with this proposal:

SMPs are required to be reviewed periodically by state law. Pursuant to the requirements in RCW 90.58.080, the next periodic review of the SMP for Clallam County is 2020. Periodic reviews are intended to be 'housekeeping' efforts and to address any changes to state law governing SMP's. However, updates may be adopted at any time, consistent with county and state amendment processes and procedures.

8. Environmental information that has been prepared, or will be prepared, directly related to this project:

The SMP was developed over several years during which time County staff, consultants, agencies, tribes and citizens collected, reviewed and synthesized a wide range of data and information on land use, land cover, physical and ecological

conditions, use patterns, etc. This information is described in several documents and in the background literature upon which those documents are based, including:

1. *Shoreline Inventory and Characterization Report: For Portions of Clallam County Draining to the Strait of Juan de Fuca (Final) (ESA, 2012)*
2. *WRIA 20 Inventory and Characterization Report (ICR) (Revised Draft) (UW Olympic Natural Resources Center [ONRC], 2012)*
3. *Final Clallam County Cumulative Impacts Analysis and No Net Loss Report (ESA, Last Revised June 2017) – Also Attached as Appendix A to this Environmental Checklist.*
4. *Countywide Shoreline Restoration Plan (Final Draft) (ESA, 2016)*
5. *Final Consistency Review for the Clallam County Shoreline Master Program Update (ESA, 2011)*
6. *Cumulative Impacts Analysis and No Net Loss Report (Final) (ESA, 2017)*
7. *Clallam County SMP Update: Integration Strategy for Critical Areas, Endangered Species Act Floodplain Policies, DNR Aquatic Lands Policies, and WRIA 20 (ESA, 2012)*
8. Feeder bluff and accretion shoreform mapping (Coastal Geological Services, 2011)
9. Riparian land cover dataset (Point No Point Treaty Council, 2010)
10. Shoreline Environment Designation Maps (available on the County's website)
11. Clallam County Draft Channel Migration Assessment Report and channel migration zone (CMZ) mapping for Morse Creek, Lyre River, East & West Twin Rivers, Deep Creek, Pysht River, Clallam River, Hoko River, Little Hoko River, Herman Creek, Sekiu River, and Sooes River (Cardno Entrix, GeoEngineers, and Ecology, 2011)
12. Clallam County Draft Channel Migration Assessment Report and channel migration zone (CMZ) mapping for Quillayute River, Bogachiel River, Calawah River, Elk Creek, Big River, Crooked Creek, Dickey River, and Sol Duc River (GeoEngineers, Ecology 2013)
13. Delineation of the Dungeness River Channel Migration Zone, River Mouth to Canyon Creek (Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe, 2008)

Several of the SMP update supporting documents listed above, including the shoreline inventory and characterization reports (ESA, 2012; ONRC, 2012), cumulative impact analysis/no net loss report (ESA, 2017), and the shoreline restoration plan (ESA, 2016) were developed in consultation with local experts and a variety of advisory groups and committees. These organizations include:

- Clallam Marine Resource Committee
- Clallam Ecosystem Recovery Work Group
- Coastal Marine Resources Committee
- North Pacific Coast Lead Entity
- North Olympic Peninsula Lead Entity
- Clallam SMP Advisory Committee

9. Applications that are pending for governmental approvals or other proposals directly affecting the property covered by the proposal:

No pending applications or approvals would be affected. Once adopted, the proposed SMP would apply to any new use or development located along the regulated shoreline within Clallam County. Permit applications for development in the shoreline area would be processed according to the SMP regulations and procedures in effect at the time the application was determined to be complete.

10. List of governmental approvals or permits that will be needed for the proposal:

The proposed SMP will need the following approvals:

- Review and threshold determination under the State Environmental Policy Act for Non-project actions;
- Adoption by the Clallam County Board of County Commissioners; and
- Approval by the Washington State Department of Ecology (RCW 90.58.090).

11. Brief, complete description of the proposal, including the proposed uses and the size of the project and site:

Clallam County initiated a comprehensive update of its SMP in 2011 to improve protection of the shoreline environments and ensure their continued use and enjoyment. The County adopted its first SMP in 1976 and had not undertaken a comprehensive review of the program in nearly 40 years. The update is also required by the Shoreline Management Act (SMA) of 1971 and the implementing rules known as the shoreline guidelines. The purpose of the SMP is to promote the health, safety, and general welfare of the community by providing reasonable regulations for use and development of Clallam County shorelines.

The Clallam County SMP is a comprehensive use plan for shoreline areas that includes goals and policies consistent with state law (RCW 90.58.020); maps, diagrams and charts or other descriptive material and text; use and development regulations; and administrative procedures for the shoreline permitting process. The SMP is based on the SMP guidelines (WAC 173-26), but tailored to the specific conditions and needs of Clallam County.

The SMA prioritizes water-dependent shoreline uses, which are those uses that are particularly dependent upon the water to support their use. The Act has two other main policy objectives:

- Promote public access for a substantial number of people; and
- Protect shoreline natural resources and functions.

The proposed SMP is a non-project action that affects activities and developments along the shorelines within County boundaries. The provisions of the proposed SMP would

apply to all shorelines of the state and shorelands as defined in RCW 90.58.030, with the exception of shorelines and shorelands located within the Olympic National Park or on tribal lands. As specified in the revised SMP, regulated shorelines and shorelands within County jurisdiction include:

- Reaches of rivers and streams where the mean annual flow is more than 20 cubic feet per second;
- Lakes 20 acres or larger in area;
- Marine waters of the Strait of Juan de Fuca, extending waterward from the ordinary high water mark (OHWM) to the state boundary with British Columbia;
- Marine waters of the Pacific Ocean, extending from the OHWM to the state boundary (the three nautical-mile limit); and
- Shorelands adjacent to the above water bodies that include:
 - Uplands areas extending landward for 200 feet in all directions as measured on a horizontal plane from the OHWM;
 - Floodways and the mapped 100-year floodplain areas associated with these waters;
 - All associated wetlands and river deltas; and
 - Contiguous critical areas and their buffers.

Currently, critical areas throughout the County are regulated by Clallam County Code (CCC) Chapter 27.12. The SMP also provides protection for critical areas, including critical saltwater and critical freshwater habitats (as defined by WAC 173-26-020 (29)), located within the jurisdictional limits of the SMA. In accordance with RCW 36.70A.480 (4) critical areas within shoreline jurisdiction must be protected such that there is no net loss of shoreline ecological functions. After SMP adoption, CCC Chapter 27.12 will apply to critical areas outside of shoreline jurisdiction; critical areas within shoreline jurisdiction (as well as associated critical area buffers) will be regulated by the SMP.

Each segment of the shoreline has an “environment designation” that reflects its existing ecological condition, land use pattern, zoning, the types of health and safety hazards that are present (e.g., flooding, landslides, etc.), geology, and other characteristics. The environment designations provide a framework for tailoring shoreline policies and regulations, in addition to the development standards and protections afforded in underlying zoning classifications, to different shoreline segments based on their characteristics. Shoreline environmental designation maps that display all shorelines under the jurisdiction of the SMP are included in Exhibit A of the proposed Clallam County SMP.

The SMP updates the County’s policies and regulations to be applied in each shoreline environment. Policies are aspirational statements that are meant to be general or broad in scope. Policies also give context to the regulations and aid in their interpretation.

Regulations stem from the policies and define the conditions under which shoreline development or use is allowed or not allowed. The policies and regulations in the SMP update address shoreline modifications (such as bulkheads and shoreline stabilization structures, land clearing and grading, etc.), specific shoreline uses (such as commercial, residential, and recreational development), and management and protection of critical areas (such as wetlands) located within the shoreline jurisdiction.

Finally, the proposed SMP updates the administrative provisions for reviewing development proposals in the shoreline and issuing shoreline substantial development permits, shoreline conditional use permits, shoreline variances, and statements of exemption.

12. Location of the proposal, including street address, if any, and section, township, and range; legal description; site plan; vicinity map; and topographical map, if reasonably available:

The proposed SMP is a County-wide, non-project action that affects activities and developments in the County's SMP jurisdiction. As noted in A.11 above, under the SMA, the shoreline jurisdiction includes all water areas of the state, the lands underlying them, and associated shoreland areas landward of the ordinary high water mark (OHWM) of waters that have been designated as "shorelines of statewide significance" or "shorelines of the state."

B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS

1. Earth

a. General description of the site:

Clallam County is located in the north Olympic Peninsula and extends from approximately Cape Flattery to south of La Push, east to the Little Quilcene River and back north to Discovery Bay. The Olympic Mountains are a dominant feature in Clallam County, rising to elevations of over 7,000 feet at their highest point. Multiple large river systems, such as the Bogachiel River, Hoh River and Sol Duc River, originate within the Olympic National Park and flow to the west to drain to the Pacific Ocean. Several other large rivers including the Pysht, Lyre, Elwha and Dungeness, and many smaller streams also originate in the Olympic Mountains and flow north to the Strait of Juan de Fuca. Outside of the National Park, the terrain is less mountainous, except along the Strait, where steep bluffs line the majority of the shoreline.

Evergreen forests are the dominate land cover within the County, which has experienced a significant amount of logging activity, primarily in the western County. Population is concentrated in the northeastern portion of the County, around Port Angeles and Sequim, with Forks and the unincorporated communities of Clallam Bay and Sekiu representing the largest population

center in the western county. Western Clallam County also includes the Tribal communities of La Push and Neah Bay.

Additional details are found in the two shoreline Inventory and Characterization reports (ESA, 2012; ONRC, 2012).

b. What is the steepest slope on the site (approximate percent slope)?

The landscape is hilly in the west but rises dramatically to the east in the Olympic Mountains. The broad, hilly landscape between the Olympic Mountains and the Pacific Ocean has not been glaciated and the northern and western County shorelines are composed of marine bluffs that reach to over 200 feet in height.

c. What general types of soils are found on the site (for example clay, sand, gravel, peat, muck)? Specify the classification of agricultural soils and note any prime farmland.

Soils in Clallam County vary from well-drained to poorly-drained. Based on County soil maps, major areas with slow drainage occur around the Sequim/Dungeness Peninsula, near Joyce, and in the western portion of the County (outside of the study area of this report). Well-drained soils occur predominantly in the eastern end of the County, mostly along streams and rivers.

d. Are there any surface indications or a history of unstable soils in the immediate vicinity? If so, describe.

Geologically hazardous areas, including landslide hazard areas and channel migration zones, are known to occur throughout the County. These areas, along with Shoreline Slope Stability ratings provided by Ecology, are described and mapped in the two shoreline Inventory and Characterization reports (ESA, 2012; ONRC, 2012).

e. Describe the purpose, type, and approximate quantities of any filling or grading proposed. Indicate the source of the fill.

The SMP is a non-project action that does not involve filling or grading, but would regulate grading and filling in shoreline areas. Under Section 5.2 of the proposed SMP, clearing and grading activities within shoreline jurisdiction would be permitted only as part of an approved shoreline use/development and would be subject to the requirements of the primary use/development. Fill waterward of the ordinary high water mark is only allowed under specific circumstances, including approved water-dependent developments (e.g., marinas, public infrastructure), restoration activities, or stabilization projects. The SMP generally requires grading to be minimized and to blend in with the surrounding environment whether through use of natural stabilization

techniques (planting native vegetation or mulch) or with the aesthetic qualities of the shoreline.

f. Could erosion occur as a result of clearing, construction, or use?

The SMP would not cause erosion, but it contains regulations to control erosion. For example, all proposals that place fill within the shoreline jurisdiction must submit a temporary erosion and sediment control plan (Section 5.2 of the SMP update). Shoreline stabilization projects (Section 4.6) require submittal of a geotechnical report with non-structural measures as the preferred stabilization technique. Forest practices (Section 3.4) and mining operations (Section 3.5) must conduct erosion studies and implement erosion control measures to prevent and minimize erosion and sedimentation.

g. About what percent of the site will be covered with impervious surfaces after project construction (for example buildings or asphalt)?

No new impervious area is proposed. The SMP contains development standards for lot coverage and allowed impervious surface coverage (Section 5.2), and existing zoning regulations would control the amount of new impervious area allowed for each permitted shoreline use. The proposed SMP also encourages use of low impact development techniques to reduce stormwater runoff (Sections 3.3, 3.6, 3.8, 3.11).

h. Describe the proposed measures to reduce or control erosion, or other impacts to the earth, if any.

The proposed SMP includes provisions to limit clearing, retain existing native shoreline buffer vegetation, manage stormwater, and provide erosion and sediment control (see Sections 4b, 4d, 3c1, and 1f of the SEPA checklist, respectively). These provisions are implemented on a project-by-project basis.

2. Air

a. What types of emissions to the air would result from the proposal (e.g. dust, automobile, odors, industrial, wood smoke) during construction and when the project is completed? If any, generally describe and give approximate quantities, if known.

None.

b. Are there any off-site sources of emissions or odors that may affect your proposal? If so, generally describe.

No.

c. Describe proposed measures to reduce or control emissions or other impacts to air, if any.

None specifically.

3. Water**a. Surface:**

- 1. Is there any surface water body on or in the immediate vicinity of the site (including year-round and seasonal streams, saltwater, lakes, ponds, and wetlands)? If yes, describe type and provide names. If appropriate, state what stream or river it flows into.**

Clallam County contains a substantial number of surface waters that are under the jurisdiction of the SMP, including approximately 130 miles of marine shoreline along the Strait of Juan de Fuca, 350 miles of stream shoreline, and 1,500 acres of lake waters and associated shoreline.

Wetlands that are associated with these waterbodies are also under the jurisdiction of the SMP.

Shorelines and waterbodies (including Lake Crescent, Lake Ozette, and the Pacific Coast shoreline landward of the ordinary high water mark) within Olympic National Park, the Quileute Indian Reservation, and the Makah Reservation are not subject to the SMP.

The streams, wetlands, lakes, and marine shorelines within County shoreline jurisdiction are mapped and described in the two shoreline Inventory and Characterization reports (ESA, 2012; ONRC, 2012) and on the Shoreline Environment Designation maps.

- 2. Will the project require any work over, in, or adjacent to (within 200 feet) the described waters? If yes, please describe and attach available plans.**

Not applicable. As a non-project action, adoption of the proposed SMP would not require any in- or over-water work. New development in the shoreline jurisdiction would be subject to the provisions of the proposed SMP, which includes specific prohibitions and standards for in- and over-water structures.

- 3. Estimate the amount of fill and dredge material that could be placed in or removed from surface water or wetlands and indicate the area of the site that would be affected. Indicate the source of fill materials.**

No filling or dredging is proposed. Under the proposed SMP, dredging within shoreline jurisdiction is permitted in all environment designations, except the Natural designation where it is prohibited, through a conditional use permit only when the activity is consistent with the proposed SMP and when there are no feasible alternatives to dredging. Typically, dredging is allowed in support of marinas, water-dependent industries and developments, restoration, maintenance of

lawfully established uses, navigation channels, public access, and flood management (Section 4.3 of the SMP update).

4. Will the proposal require surface water withdrawals or diversion? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities, if known.

No surface water withdrawals are proposed.

5. Does the proposal lie within a 100-year flood plain? If so, note location on the site plan.

Clallam County floodplains are depicted on the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) flood insurance rate maps (FIRM), and described in detail in two shoreline Inventory and Characterization reports (ESA, 2012; ONRC, 2012). In general, mapped floodplain areas are located within the low-lying coastal areas and the lower reaches of river systems. The 100-year floodplain is generally synonymous with the shoreline jurisdiction.

6. Does the proposal involve discharges of waste materials to surface waters? If so, describe the type of waste and anticipated volume of discharge.

No discharges of waste materials to surface waters are proposed. The SMP prohibits the direct discharge of pollutants to surface waters. Animal, sewage, and aquaculture waste must comply with applicable governmental waste disposal standards (e.g., Clean Water Act).

Dredge waste material, as discussed in Section 4.3 of the SMP, is permitted only when alternatives are infeasible and when the dredging/dredge disposal is necessary to support an existing legal use, an approved water-dependent use, an essential public facility, or an approved restoration project. Dredge disposal may be permitted in all environmental designations, except the Natural designation where it is prohibited, through a conditional use permit, only when the activity is consistent with the SMP. Applicants must provide a submittal to discharge dredge waste material.

b. Ground

1. Will ground water be withdrawn, or will water be discharged to ground water? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.

No groundwater withdrawals or discharges are proposed.

- 2. Describe waste material that will be discharged into the ground from septic tanks or other sources, if any. Describe the general size of the system, the number of such systems, the number of houses to be served (if applicable), or the number of animals or humans the system(s) is expected to serve.**

No material will be discharged into the ground. All new development or re-developing properties within the shoreline jurisdiction will be required to connect to sanitary sewer lines, where available. Where sewer lines are not available, on-site sewage systems must be located and designed to meet all applicable water quality, utility, and health standards. On-site sewage systems must comply with the shoreline and critical area buffer requirements of this Program, and must be a minimum of 100 feet landward of the ordinary high water mark and any waterbody (Section 5.4 of the SMP update). On shorelines which, according to the state's water quality assessment, exceed allowances for nitrogen contamination, the County must require new septic systems to provide denitrification (Section 5.4). The discharge of animal waste must comply with applicable governmental waste disposal standards (e.g., Clean Water Act) (Section 3.1).

c. Water Runoff (including storm water)

- 1. Describe the source of runoff (including storm water) and method of collection and disposal, if any (including quantities if known). Where will this water flow? Will this water flow into other waters? If so, describe.**

New impervious surfaces within the shoreline area could generate additional stormwater runoff. New development and redevelopment would be required to manage stormwater. Stormwater management facilities, limited to detention/ retention/ treatment ponds, media filtration facilities, and lagoons or infiltration basins, are permitted within shoreline when there is no other feasible location for the stormwater facility and the facility is located, constructed, and maintained in a manner that minimizes adverse effects impacts to shoreline ecological functions (Section 3.12 of the SMP update). In addition, stormwater facilities must meet applicable stormwater management standards and the discharge water meets state water quality standards including total maximum daily load (TMDL) standards. The SMP encourages the use of low impact development (LID) techniques and other best management practices (BMPs) to minimize adverse impacts on water quality and habitat (Sections 3.3, 3.6, 3.7, 3.8, 3.11, 3.12).

2. Could waste materials enter ground or surface waters? If so, generally describe.

Under the proposed SMP, all shoreline uses and developments must use effective temporary erosion and sediment control (TESC) methods during project construction. To protect water quality, shoreline uses and developments must comply with Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 development standards (Section 5.4 of the SMP update). All building materials that come in contact with surface waters must be composed of non-toxic materials that will not adversely affect water quality or aquatic plants or animals. Solid and liquid wastes and untreated effluents are not allowed to enter any groundwater or surface water or to be discharged onto land. Finally, illicit non-stormwater discharges to the stormwater system are prohibited.

3. Does the proposal alter or otherwise affect drainage patterns in the vicinity of the site? If so, describe.

Affects to drainage patterns would be addressed on a project-level basis through the County's surface water design requirements.

d. Describe proposed measures to reduce or control surface, ground, and runoff water impacts, if any.

The proposed SMP encourages management of stormwater throughout the County consistent with Clallam County Draft Comprehensive Stormwater Management Plan in addition to storm and surface water regulations. Low impact development techniques are encouraged where possible.

4. Plants

a. Types of vegetation found on-site:

A wide variety of plant species and plant communities are found within County Shoreline jurisdiction, as documented in the two shoreline Inventory and Characterization reports (ESA, 2012; ONRC, 2012).

b. What kind and amount of vegetation will be removed or altered?

The proposed SMP requires new development to protect native shoreline vegetation (Section 5.1). New clearing, thinning, and limbing of existing vegetation within the shoreline and critical areas buffers is subject to numerous policies and regulations to minimize environmental impacts (Sections 5.1 and 6.5).

Limited clearing, grading, thinning, and/or pruning in a shoreline buffer is allowed for views, hazard tree removal, invasive species management, and private pathways (Section 6.5). Clearing does not require compensatory mitigation provided that the amount and extent of buffer modification is the

minimum necessary to accommodate the allowed use, the modification is located within pre-existing disturbed areas, areas with low habitat value or within the 'active use' area and all other requirements of the Program are met. This requirement is meant to ensure that impacts are avoided and minimized to the extent possible.

Generally, approval of selective vegetation clearing requires preparation of a vegetation management plan (Section 6.5).

c. List threatened or endangered species or critical habitat known to be on or near the site.

No known.

d. Describe proposed landscaping, use of native plants, or other measures to preserve or enhance vegetation on-site.

The proposed SMP encourages the protection and restoration of native vegetation and control of non-native invasive plant species (Section 6.3 of the SMP update). Vegetation within the shoreline buffer must meet specific cover and/or density standards: as an average density of at least one hundred fifty (150) trees and/or shrubs per acre or fifty-five percent (55%) areal cover of trees and/or shrubs, whichever is greater. The vegetated areas must comprise at least eighty percent (80%) of the buffer area.

If the buffer vegetation does not meet the cover and/or density thresholds, the applicant is required to enhance and improve the buffer by planting trees and/or shrubs to achieve the required plant density and cover. The number, spacing and species to be planted must be adequate to create a functioning buffer similar to what would be found on a relatively undisturbed site. The vegetation must be nurtured and maintained to preserve the cover and density characteristics and ensure continuation of a healthy and functioning buffer over time.

e. List all noxious weeds and invasive species known to be on or near the site.

Clallam County contains a wide variety of noxious weeds and invasive species common to the Pacific Northwest, such as reed canarygrass, Himalayan blackberry, and Scotch broom.

5. Animals

a. Underline any birds and animals which have been observed on or near the site or are known to be on or near the site:

The two shoreline Inventory and Characterization reports (ESA, 2012; ONRC, 2012) describe animals which are known to be present along Clallam County shorelines, including:

- Threatened and endangered species and critical habitats (species listed under the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) as threatened or endangered and their federally designated critical habitats);
- Nearshore habitats and species (species and habitats primarily associated with saltwater environments);
- Freshwater habitats and species (species and habitats primarily associated with freshwater environments); and
- Terrestrial habitats and species (other species and habitats associated with upland areas).

b. List any threatened or endangered species or critical habitat near the site.

Puget Sound Chinook salmon, Puget Sound steelhead, Hood Canal summer-run chum salmon, and Lake Sockeye salmon and designated critical habitat for those species.

In addition, the County's marine waters contain a multitude of threatened or endangered species, including the following marine mammals regulated by NOAA Fisheries:

- Southern Resident killer whales,
- Blue whales,
- Fin whales,
- Humpback whales,
- Northern Pacific Right whales,
- Sei whales,
- Sperm whales,
- Bocaccio,
- Yelloweye rockfish, and
- North American green sturgeon.

Threatened and endangered species regulated by USFWS include:

- Short-tailed albatross,
- Yellow-billed Cuckoo,
- Northern spotted owl,
- Marbled murrelet,
- Streaked Horned lark,
- Bull trout,

- Golden paintbrush,
- Taylor's Checkerspot, and
- Leatherback sea turtle*.

*sea turtles are regulated by both USFWS and NOAA Fisheries.

c. Is the site part of a migratory route? If so, explain.

The Strait of Juan de Fuca is a critical migratory corridor for salmon and other species, including Chinook salmon and Hood Canal summer chum, two federally threatened species. Clallam County is located within the Pacific Flyway, which is a flight corridor for migrating waterfowl and other birds.

d. Proposed measures to preserve or enhance wildlife, if any.

The proposed SMP regulations protect existing riparian and wetland vegetation through shoreline and critical area buffer standards; vegetation conservation provisions; limits on filling, clearing and grading; and mitigation sequencing.

In addition, as part of the SMP update effort; the County evaluated the "cumulative impacts" of reasonably foreseeable future development to verify that proposed policies and regulations for shoreline management are adequate to ensure "no net loss of shoreline ecological functions." The report analyzed expected cumulative impacts that can occur over time as the Draft SMP is implemented. The report describes how the County will achieve no net loss through the adoption and implementation of the SMP.

e. List any invasive animal species known to be on or near the site.

A variety of invasive animal species common to the Pacific Northwest are found throughout Clallam County, such as brook trout, American bullfrog, eastern gray squirrel, and a variety of non-native song birds, such as European starling.

6. Energy and Natural Resources

a. What kinds of energy (electric, natural gas, oil, wood, solar) will be used to meet the completed project's energy needs? Describe whether it will be used for heating, manufacturing, etc.

Not applicable.

b. Would the project affect the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties? If so, explain.

No. The proposed SMP maintains a maximum building height limitation of 40 feet above average grade level for properties in the shoreline jurisdiction.

- c. **What kinds of energy conservation features are included in the plans of this proposal? List other proposed measures to reduce or control energy impacts, if any.**

Not applicable.

7. Environmental Health

- a. **Are there any environmental health hazards, including exposure to toxic chemicals, risk of fire and explosion, spills, or hazardous waste that could occur as a result of this proposal? If so, describe.**

No.

1. **Describe special emergency services that might be required.**

Not applicable.

2. **Describe proposed measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards.**

Not applicable.

b. Noise

1. **What types of noise exist in the area which may affect your project (for example: traffic, equipment operation, other)?**

Not applicable.

2. **What types and levels of noise would be created by or associated with the project on a short-term or long-term basis (for example: traffic, construction, operation, other)?**

Not applicable.

3. **Describe proposed measures to reduce or control noise impacts, if any.**

Not applicable.

8. Land and Shoreline Use

- a. **What is the current use of the site and adjacent properties?**

Residential use is the most prevalent form of development in the eastern portion of the County. In addition, the Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe Reservation is located along Sequim Bay and the Tribe has several commercial and administrative facilities on or near the marine shoreline. Agricultural uses are concentrated in the inland portions of the County, with only a small percent of the shorelines in agricultural production. Although this portion of the County has seen the largest population growth in recent years, there are still large portions of the shorelines that are undeveloped.

There are several publicly-owned shoreland areas in this in the eastern County, include the Sequim Bay State Park, Miller Peninsula State Park and the Dungeness National Recreation Area.

In the central portion of the County, residential development along the shoreline occurs primarily in eastern portions of this area, particularly at the mouth of Morse Creek, Freshwater Bay, and the marine bluff areas near the Elwha River and between Morse Creek and the City of Port Angeles. West of Freshwater Bay shoreline land use is predominately public and private commercial timber management. Lake Sutherland is heavily developed with single family residential homes.

Land use in the northwestern portion of the County is predominately commercial forest. With the exception of the Clallam Bay/Seki UGA, most of the marine shoreline is undeveloped. Additional pockets of moderate to high density residential development are located at Bullman Beach and the Hoko River estuary. Water-dependent commercial facilities include several private resorts. Highway 112 is located within the SMP jurisdiction in several locations.

The Clallam Bay shoreline is the most heavily developed area in the northwest part of the County and several water-dependent commercial facilities are located along the shoreline. There are two marina breakwaters and several docks supporting these facilities.

In the western and southwestern portions of the County, commercial timber production is the dominant land use. The reaches of the major river systems contain limited commercial and residential development, while the middle and downstream reaches tend to be close to infrastructure and contain few residential developments.

Residential development is relatively dense along the south end of Lake Pleasant and lower Lake Creek. A mill is located on a southern lake reach, while the north reaches are primarily commercial forestlands with limited residential development. Lake Pleasant and an associated County park are popular recreational destinations. In contrast, Lake Ozette shoreline is not developed and is surrounded by privately owned forestlands.

b. Has the site been used for agriculture? If so, describe.

Agriculture comprises a modest percentage of the land use on the marine shore, but there is relatively little agricultural use occurring along freshwater shorelines in Clallam County. Agricultural uses within the County are primarily concentrated in the Dungeness River Valley.

c. Describe any structures on the site.

Single family residential development represents the primary building type within shoreline jurisdiction. Piers, ramps, floats, bulkheads, and similar structures are often associated with shoreline residential developments.

d. Will any structures be demolished? If so, what?

Adoption of the proposed SMP would not result in the demolition of any specific structures.

e. What is the current zoning classification of the site?

Zoning varies throughout the County's shoreline areas. Within the marine shoreline jurisdiction, the eastern County is primarily zoned as Rural Low and Agricultural Residential, the central County is primarily composed of Commercial Forest zoning, while the western County is also dominated by Commercial Forest zoning.

In the freshwater shoreline jurisdiction, the eastern County is primarily zoned as Rural Low along in lower reaches and Commercial Forest in the upper reaches. Commercial Forest is the dominant zoning designation in freshwater shoreline jurisdiction in the central and western portions of the County.

f. What is the current comprehensive plan designation of the site?

Comprehensive plan designations of the shoreline areas vary throughout the County. Countywide, the majority of shoreline areas are located within designated Commercial Forest lands. The lower shoreline reaches in the eastern part of the County are generally associated with rural lands. These rural lands are characterized by mix of low density residential development and forestry, and agricultural uses also occur along shoreline areas in western Clallam County. Designated limited areas of more intensive rural development (LAMIRDs), which are characterized by more intensive residential development (1 dwelling unit per acre or greater), are found scattered throughout the County.

Marine and/or freshwater shoreline areas designated for urban growth are associated with the Sequim, Port Angeles, Forks, and Clallam Bay-Seki Urban Growth Areas (UGAs). Most of the shorelines within these UGAs subject to the proposed SMP are characterized and designated for residential development and infill. The unincorporated Clallam Bay-Seki UGA marine waterfront is characterized and designated for a mix of residential, commercial, and recreational development.

g. If applicable, what is the current shoreline master program designation of the site?

The current shoreline designations for the County shoreline areas are shown on Clallam County Shorelines of the State Environmental Designations, map

updated February 8, 2010. Most of the County's shoreline areas (over 75%) are designated Conservancy or Rural.

SED designations will be revised as part of this proposed SMP update and include:

- Aquatic: All shoreline waters waterward of the ordinary high water mark.
- Natural: Lands that are largely free of development and modification (Approximately 8% of the County's regulated shoreland areas are designated as Natural under the proposed SMP).
- Resource Conservancy: Forested lands that are zoned and managed primarily for timber production (Approximately 65% of the County's regulated shoreland areas are designated as Resource Conservancy under the proposed SMP).
- Shoreline Residential-Conservancy: Lands that are characterized by low density residential development, where ecological functions are not substantially degraded (Approximately 23% of the County's regulated shoreland areas are designated as Shoreline Residential-Conservancy under the proposed SMP).
- Shoreline Residential-Intensive: Land that are characterized by moderate- to high-density residential development, where ecological functions have been substantially degraded (Approximately 3% of the County's regulated shoreland areas are designated as Shoreline Residential-Intensive under the proposed SMP).
- Marine Waterfront: Lands that are intensively developed with marine water-oriented commercial, recreational, and/or transportation uses (Less than 1% of the County's regulated shoreland areas are designated as Marine Waterfront under the proposed SMP. This designation is limited to heavily-developed marine shoreline areas within the Clallam Bay-Sekiu UGA).

h. Has any part of the site been classified as an "environmentally sensitive" area? If so, specify.

Critical areas regulated by Clallam County through the proposed SMP and present in the shoreline include wetlands, aquatic habitat conservation areas, terrestrial habitat conservation areas, geologically hazardous areas, frequently flooded areas, critical aquifer recharge areas.

Critical areas protections are intended to assure no net loss of shoreline ecological functions necessary to sustain shoreline natural resources. Critical area buffers are required to protect critical areas and priority species as well as

protect water quality. For example, protection and restoration of wetland and stream buffers is important for improvement of water quality and maintenance of cool water for salmon recovery. Protection of existing native vegetation and enhancement of degraded riparian areas is a key component in protecting water quality and improving in-stream habitat for listed salmon.

i. Approximately how many people would reside or work in the completed project?

Not applicable.

j. Approximately how many people would the completed project displace?

None.

k. Describe proposed measures to avoid or reduce displacement impacts, if any.

Not applicable.

l. Describe proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with existing and projected land uses and plans, if any.

The purpose, management policies, designation criteria, and boundary description of all the environment designations are described in Chapter 2 of the proposed SMP. The proposed environment designations are consistent with achieving no net loss of ecological functions as well as both the existing land use pattern and Comprehensive Plan future land use designations.

9. Housing

a. Approximately how many units would be provided, if any? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.

None. The proposed SMP would not change the underlying Comprehensive Plan land use or zoning designations.

b. Approximately how many units, if any, would be eliminated? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.

None. The proposed SMP would not change the underlying Comprehensive Plan land use or zoning designations.

c. Describe proposed measures to reduce or control housing impacts, if any.

Not applicable.

10. Aesthetics

a. What is the tallest height of any of the proposed structure(s), not including antennas? What is the principal exterior building material(s) proposed?

No specific structures are proposed. The proposed SMP update maintains a maximum building height limitation of 40 feet for commercial and industrial

structures and 35 feet for residential structures (above grade level) on properties within shoreline jurisdiction.

b. What views in the immediate vicinity would be altered or obstructed?

Not applicable.

c. Describe proposed measures to reduce aesthetic impacts, if any.

The SMP update requires shoreline uses and activities to be designed and operated to avoid blocking, reducing, or adversely interfering with the public's visual access to the water and shorelines.

In some instances, project proponents (e.g., aquaculture [Section 3.2 of the SMP update], mining spoil disposal [Section 3.5], and boating facilities [Section 4.2]) may be required to conduct a visual analysis describing effects on aesthetic qualities of the shoreline. Building setbacks may also be required for shoreline developments with preservation or establishment of a well vegetated and mostly undisturbed area between the waterbody and the development.

11. Light and Glare

a. What type of light and glare will the proposal produce? What time of day would it mainly occur?

Not applicable.

b. Could light or glare from the finished project be a safety hazard or interfere with views?

Not applicable. The height limitation for structures in the shoreline is intended, in part, to preserve views.

c. What existing off-site sources of light or glare may affect your proposal?

Not applicable.

d. Describe the proposed measures to reduce or control light and glare impacts, if any.

Development must be designed to separate and screen the shoreline area, critical areas, and natural areas from light and glare impacts (Sections 3.5, 7.5, and 7.8 of the SMP update). The site design must consider the varying degrees of impacts of different land uses. Site screening should take advantage of natural topography or existing vegetation, wherever possible. Where natural screening is not available, berms, landscaping, and structural screens should be implemented. Landscaping must be consistent with Chapter 33.53 Clallam County Code.

12. Recreation**a. What designated and informal recreational opportunities are in the immediate vicinity?**

In eastern Clallam County, public access to the shorelines for recreation and enjoyment is available in many areas. Dungeness Spit and Dungeness Bay, the shoreline between Sequim Bay and Discovery Bay, and numerous parks and open spaces throughout the East Planning Region provide access to the water. County parks include the Dungeness Recreation Area, Panorama Vista, Marlyn Nelson, Dungeness Landing, Three Waters and Cline Spit. Other public lands also abut shorelines.

Public access to shorelines in the central portion of the County is available at Salt Creek and Striped Peak recreation areas near Tongue Point, Freshwater Bay and areas along the Elwha River. There is also a public boat launch at Lake Sutherland (maintained by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife). Steep erodible banks preclude public access to public lands in several areas. Private campgrounds are operated at Whiskey Creek, Crescent Beach and the Lyre River.

Public access to the shoreline in the northwest portion of the County is generally limited to informal access along State Highway 112, Pillar Point County Park, and the Clallam Bay/Sekiu area. Private access is available from resort areas. Although there are substantial public forest lands along the marine shorelines, most of the area is not accessible by land. Washington State Parks has recently acquired land in the Hoko River estuary and additional public access is possible in the future.

The western and southwest portions of the County contain large expanses of private land holdings, but also offer numerous public access points across a variety of publicly-owned lands. Multiple boat ramps are located on nearly each of the major river systems within this portion of the County. In addition, the Forest Service maintains Klahanie Campground on the Calawah River, Olympic National Forest operates Klahowya Campground on the Sol Duc River, and the Department of Natural Resources operates a campground just south of Lake Pleasant. Clallam County also maintains a public park, dock, and boat ramp at south end of Lake Pleasant. At the north end of Lake Ozette, the Lost Resort provides a store, restaurant and cabins.

b. Would the proposed project displace any existing recreational uses? If so, describe.

No, this is a non-project action.

- c. **Describe proposed measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation, including recreational opportunities to be provided by the project or applicant.**

A goal of the SMA is to provide and enhance public access and recreational opportunities in the shorelines of the state. Public, water-oriented recreational development is a preferred shoreline use. The Clallam County SMP states that shoreline development must not block or interfere with normal public use of or public access to publicly owned shorelines and waterbodies.

13. **Historic and Cultural Preservation**

- a. **Are there any buildings, structures, or sites, located on or near the site that are over 45 years old listed in or eligible for listing in national, state, or local preservation registers? If so, specifically describe.**

The proposal involves a County-wide, non-project action. There are many historic-era and precontact-era cultural resources recorded along County shorelines. Additional such resources are likely present, but have not yet been identified. There is considerable evidence that indigenous Native Americans heavily and regularly utilized shorelines for resource gathering, habitation, internment, and religious purposes. In addition, there are many recorded resources along the shoreline that area associated with non-Native uses during the historic-era.

- b. **Are there any landmarks, features, or other evidence of Indian or historic use or occupation? This may include human burials or old cemeteries. Are there any material evidence, artifacts, or areas of cultural importance on or near the site? Please list any professional studies conducted at the site to identify such resources.**

The shorelines of Clallam County are within the traditional territories of numerous Native American groups whose descendants are now members of six Federally recognized Native American Tribes: Hoh Indian Tribe, Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe (previously Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe of Washington), Lower Elwha Tribal Community, Makah Indian Tribe of the Makah Indian Reservation, Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe, and the Quileute Tribe of the Quileute Reservation.

There are over 400 recorded archaeological sites in Clallam County. Archaeological evidence from some of the County's oldest shoreline archaeological sites demonstrates that people have lived along the shores of today's Clallam County for thousands of years. Early known coastal archaeological sites in Clallam County include, but are not limited to:

- Ozette
- *cix'ícen* (Tse-whit-zen)
- Tongue Point

- Hoko River sites
- Sand Point
- Sooes

Early non-Native explorers arrived in the 1770s and non-Native settlement began in the 1850s; early industries were focused on logging. Clallam County was formed in 1854.

- c. Describe the methods used to assess the potential impacts to cultural and historic resources on or near the project site. Examples include consultation with tribes and the department of archeology and historic preservation, archaeological surveys, historic maps, GIS data, etc.**

For this non-project action, potential impacts were assessed based on published overviews of Clallam County history (Oldham, 2005; Wessen, 1990) and review of the Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation's Washington State Information System for Architectural & Archaeological Records Data (WISAARD).

- d. Proposed measures to avoid, minimize, or compensate for loss, changes to, and disturbance to resources. Please include plans for the above and any permits that may be required.**

The proposed SMP would require that all shoreline use and development proposals be reviewed to determine if they have the potential to impact historic, cultural, and/or archaeological sites/resources (Section 5.5 of the SMP update). The Administrator must consult with the Washington State Department of Archeological and Historic Preservation and if there is evidence that the proposed project is located within five hundred (500) feet of such a site/resource or if the site has not been surveyed or evaluated for presence/absence of cultural resources, the Administrator must notify and inform potential affected Tribes and the Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation and require preparation of Cultural Resource Site Assessments and Cultural Resource Management Plans.

14. Transportation

- a. Identify public streets and highways serving the site, and describe proposed access to the existing street system. Show on-site plans, if any.**

The proposal involves a County-wide, non-project action that does not directly affect public streets or highways. Public streets and highways within Clallam County are shown in the two shoreline Inventory and Characterization reports (ESA, 2012; ONRC, 2012).

- b. Is the site currently served by public transit? If not, what is the approximate distance to the nearest transit stop?**

Yes. Clallam Transit provides transit on major roadways, including US Route 101 and State Routes 110, 112, and 113 that are located within the shoreline jurisdiction.

- c. How many parking spaces would the completed project have? How many would the project eliminate?**

Not applicable.

- d. Will the proposal require any new roads or streets, or improvements to existing roads or streets, not including driveways? If so, generally describe.**

Not applicable.

- e. Will the project use (or occur in the immediate vicinity of) water, rail, or air transportation? If so, generally describe.**

No.

- f. How many vehicular trips per day would be generated by the completed project? If known, indicate when peak volumes would occur.**

Not applicable.

- g. Describe proposed measures to reduce or control transportation impacts, if any.**

Transportation development may be permitted in certain environment designations through a substantial development permit or conditional use permit.

Roads and other transportation facilities, according to Section 3.11 of the SMP) may cross critical areas, their buffers, and shoreline areas, but applicants must show that:

- There is no other feasible alternative route with less impact;
- The crossing minimizes interruption of natural processes;
- Culverts, if needed, must be designed according to applicable state and federal fish passage guidance; and
- Crossings must be limited to the minimum width necessary.

Overall, development must be designed to provide the shortest, most direct route across water; not block flood capacity; avoid, minimize, and compensate for impacts to shoreline function; not affect water quality; and be designed to limit the need for routing surface waters into and through culverts.

15. Public Services

- a. **Would the project result in an increased need for public services (for example: fire protection, police protection, health care, schools, other)? If so, generally explain.**

No.

- b. **Describe proposed measures to reduce or control direct impacts on public services.**

Not applicable.

16. Utilities

- a. **Underline utilities currently available at the site:**

Electricity, natural gas, water, refuse service, telephone, sanitary sewer, septic system, other

- b. **Describe the utilities that are proposed for the project, the utility providing the service, and the general construction activities on the site or in the immediate vicinity which might be needed.**

No new utilities are proposed. Utility structures and facilities, such as hydroelectric dams, natural gas pipelines, and public water systems are regulated under the SMP. Generally, new utilities may be permitted in certain environment designations through a conditional use permit and must be allowed under the Clallam County Zoning Code, Title 33 CCC. The SMP requires that project design and construction techniques minimize impacts while non water-dependent utilities should be located outside of the shoreline buffer (Section 3.12 of the SMP update). Utilities must not cause a net loss of shoreline ecological functions or processes or adversely impact other shoreline resources and values. Mitigation will be required for any unavoidable impacts to the shoreline environment.

Chapter 1 C. SIGNATURE

The above answers are true and complete to the best of my knowledge. I understand that the lead agency is relying on them to make its decision.

Signature:



Name (print):

Steve Gray

Title:

Planning Manager

Date Submitted:

8/10/17

SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NON-PROJECT ACTIONS

Because these questions are very general, it may be helpful to read them in conjunction with the list of the elements of the environment.

When answering these questions, be aware of the extent the proposal, or the types of activities likely to result from the proposal, would affect the item at a greater intensity or at a faster rate than if the proposal were not implemented. Respond briefly and in general terms.

1. How would the proposal be likely to increase discharge to water; emissions to air; production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or production of noise?

The proposal would not directly increase discharges to water; emissions to air; production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or production of noise. All development and redevelopment in the shoreline jurisdiction would be subject to applicable local, state, and federal regulatory requirements, including building code, fire code, and surface water design standards, in addition to the provisions of the proposed SMP update. As part of the SMP update, a cumulative impacts assessment (CIA) was completed to analyze the potential adverse impacts that could result from uses and developments permitted through the SMP. The CIA concluded that over time reasonably foreseeable development in the shoreline would not result in a net loss of ecological functions such as water quality. The CIA is included as Appendix A.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increase are:

The proposed SMP update includes policies and regulations for the protection of the shoreline environment and addressing impacts of specific uses and shoreline modifications. Generally, the proposed SMP creates a system of shoreline environment designations that establish more uniform management of the County's shoreline. The updated development standards and regulation of shoreline modifications provide more protection for shoreline ecological processes. The updated standards and regulations are more restrictive of activities that would result in adverse impacts to the shoreline environment. The shoreline restoration plan provides the County with opportunities to improve or restore ecological functions that have been impaired as a result of past development activities.

2. How would the proposal be likely to affect plants, animals, fish, or marine life?

The proposed SMP update has been developed, in part, to meet the goal of "no net loss" of shoreline ecological functions. That is, as development occurs in accordance with the SMP, impacts to shoreline ecological functions will be avoided, minimized, or mitigated. Additionally, the shoreline restoration plan addresses the goal of improving shoreline ecological functions that have been degraded over time from past development activities. Through goals, policies, development standards, use regulations, and mitigation requirements, the proposed SMP update provides protection and enhancement of fish and wildlife habitat, natural vegetation, and management of critical areas (streams, wetlands, etc.). These elements are discussed above in Section B of this checklist, as well as below.

Proposed measures to protect or conserve plants, animals, fish, or marine life are:

All new uses and developments must comply with the applicable policies and regulations for protection of critical areas including critical saltwater and critical freshwater habitats. Critical areas, including critical saltwater and critical freshwater habitats, within shoreline jurisdiction must be regulated according to this Program and not Chapter 27.12 of Clallam County Code.

The SMP also provides for additional protections of native vegetation and limitations on shoreline developments. The SMP requires that all uses and development (even exempt activities) achieve no net loss of ecological functions. As part of the SMP update a cumulative impacts assessment (CIA) was completed to analyze the potential adverse impacts that could result from uses and developments permitted through the proposed SMP. The CIA concluded that over time, reasonably foreseeable development in the shoreline would not result a net loss of ecological functions such as fish and wildlife habitat. The CIA is included as Appendix A.

3. How would the proposal be likely to deplete energy or natural resources?

The proposed SMP update is not expected to result in any probable significant adverse environmental impacts relating to the depletion of energy or natural resources.

Proposed measures to protect or conserve energy and natural resources are:

No specific measures are proposed.

4. How would the proposal be likely to use or affect environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated (or eligible or under study) for governmental protection; such as parks, wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, threatened or endangered species habitat, historic or cultural sites, wetlands, floodplains, or prime farmlands?

Generally, the proposed SMP update establishes policies and regulations for the protection and conservation of critical areas and public access recreational sites. The proposed SMP creates system of shoreline environment designations that establishes more uniform management of the County's shoreline. The updated development standards and regulation of shoreline modifications provides more protection for shoreline processes. The updated standards and regulations are more restrictive of activities that would result in adverse impacts to the shoreline environment. The restoration planning effort outlined in the proposed SMP provides opportunities to improve or restore ecological functions that have been impaired as a result of past development activities. In addition, the proposed SMP is meant to complement several County, state, and federal efforts to protect shoreline functions and values.

Proposed measures to protect such resources or to avoid or reduce impacts are:

Numerous provisions of the proposed SMP were developed consistent with the state shoreline guidelines (WAC 173-26) to provide a level of protection of shoreline that assure no net loss of ecological functions. These include protections of critical areas and native shoreline vegetation. They also include limitations on damage resulting from shoreline development and shoreline modifications.

As part of the SMP update a cumulative impacts assessment (CIA) was completed to analyze the potential adverse impacts that could result from uses and developments permitted through the SMP. The CIA concluded that over time reasonably foreseeable development in the shoreline would not result a net loss of ecological functions. The CIA is included as Appendix A.

5. How would the proposal be likely to affect land and shoreline use, including whether it would allow or encourage land or shoreline uses incompatible with existing plans?

The proposed SMP creates preferences for water-oriented uses and public access in the shorelines. At the same time, it allows uses that are allowed by the underlying zoning provided they are developed consistent with the SMP's development standards.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce shoreline and land use impacts:

The proposed SMP update creates a system of shoreline environment designations that are tailored to protecting existing ecological functions within the shoreline environment while allowing appropriate uses consistent with County's existing Zoning Code, Comprehensive Plan, and Park and Recreation Master Plan.

The purpose, management policies, designation criteria and boundary description of all the environment designations are located in Chapter 2 of the proposed SMP. The proposed environment designations are consistent with both the existing land use pattern and Comprehensive Plan future land use designations.

Consistent with the state's shoreline guidelines (WAC 173-26), the proposed SMP includes provisions that require that all new shoreline uses or development mitigate their adverse impacts to achieve no net loss of shoreline ecological functions. Mitigation sequencing consistent with WAC 173-26-201(2)(e) is required.

6. How would the proposal be likely to increase demands on transportation or public services and utilities?

The proposed SMP update does not establish new patterns of land use or increased density of existing land use patterns. Therefore, approval of the proposed SMP is not expected to result in significant changes to or increased demand for public services or infrastructure.

Proposed measures to reduce or respond to such demand(s) are:

Since increased demands are not anticipated, no specific measures are proposed.

7. Identify, if possible, whether the proposal may conflict with local, state, or federal laws or requirements of the protection of the environment.

The County's SMP is meant to be consistent with and work in conjunction with several local, state and federal programs to protect the functions and values of shoreline resources and protect the health and safety of Clallam County residents. These programs include, but are not limited to, the following:

Local Regulations and Plans

- Comprehensive Plan and Zoning (Clallam County Code (CCC) Title 31 and 33):
 - The County's comprehensive plan identifies long-range planning goals and policies that address issues of a county-wide nature. The plan also fulfills the County's responsibilities to manage growth as mandated by the Growth Management Act (GMA).

The current Comprehensive Plan adopted in 1995 (last amended 2016) provides guidance for development within the unincorporated areas, as well as those lands held by the state. Although the County works cooperatively with the Tribes to achieve common goals, the Comprehensive Plan does not cover tribal trust lands.

CCC Title 33 establishes zoning districts in the County. These districts, which generally follow land use designations established in the Comprehensive Plan, include 6 resource and public zones, 13 rural zones, 7 urban zones, 13 commercial zones, and 2 industrial zones.
- Critical Areas Regulations (CCC 27.12):
 - The County's existing critical areas ordinance, in CCC Chapter 27.12, currently applies to critical areas located within unincorporated lands not within City, National Park / Forest lands, or tribal trust lands. Adopted in 1992, and last amended in 2016, the code provides protection standards for critical areas through the use of buffers, land use restrictions, mitigation sequencing, and building standards. After SMP adoption, CCC Chapter 27.12 will continue to apply outside of shoreline jurisdiction. Critical areas within shoreline jurisdiction, including associated critical area buffers, will be regulated by the SMP.
- Water Resources Inventory Area (WRIA) Plans
 - Watershed planning occurs under enabling legislation passed in 1998 (Watershed Management Act, RCW 90.82). It is closely tied to planning for other water and watershed resources, including local land use planning and other federal, state, regional, and local laws, regulations, and planning initiatives. The watershed planning process provides a framework for locally based resource management. The primary goals of local watershed planning are to assess the status of water resources within each WRIA and determine how to address competing demands for water.

State and Federal Regulations

A number of state and federal agencies may have jurisdiction over land or natural elements in the County's shoreline jurisdiction. Local development proposals most commonly trigger requirements for state or federal permits when they impact wetlands or streams; potentially affect fish and wildlife listed under the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA); result in over one acre of clearing and grading; or affect the floodplain or floodway. As with local requirements, state and federal

regulations may apply throughout the County, but regulated resources are common within the shoreline jurisdiction. The state and federal regulations affecting shoreline-related resources include, but are not limited to:

- Endangered Species Act:
 - The federal ESA addresses the protection and recovery of federally listed species. The ESA is jointly administered by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Fisheries (formerly referred to as the National Marine Fisheries Service), and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS).
- Clean Water Act (CWA):
 - The federal CWA requires states to set standards for the protection of water quality for various parameters, and it regulates excavation and dredging in waters of the U.S., including wetlands. Certain activities affecting wetlands in the County's shoreline jurisdiction or work in the adjacent rivers may require a permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and/or Washington State Department of Ecology under Section 404 and Section 401 of the CWA, respectively.
- Hydraulic Project Approval (HPA):
 - The Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) regulate activities that use, divert, obstruct, or change the natural flow of the beds or banks of waters of the state and may affect fish habitat. Projects in the shoreline jurisdiction requiring construction below the ordinary high water mark could require an HPA from WDFW. Projects creating new impervious surface that could substantially increase stormwater runoff to waters of the state may also require approval.

Appendix A:
Clallam County SMP Update
Cumulative Impacts Assessment