WAC 173-26-110 (4) Submittal Requirement

Summary of Amendments to the Adopted City of Pacific SMP
Scope and Intent of the Amendments

On September 12, 2011, the Pacific City Council adopted Resolution No. 1089, a resolution of intent to adopt the City’s proposed Shoreline Master Program (SMP).

The amendments are comprehensive in nature. The proposed SMP establishes the Comprehensive Plan’s shoreline goals and policies, the Pacific Shoreline Jurisdiction; the Shoreline Characteristics and Inventory; research and development of a Cumulative Impacts Analysis; development of Pacific’s Shoreline Environmental Designation Maps; and creation of a Restoration Plan, using the preceding, development of and revisions to Pacific Municipal Code (PMC) Titles 21- Shorelines and Title 23 - Critical Areas regulations.

Below is a summary of the City of Pacific’s effort, documents and amendments:

A. Establishing Shoreline Jurisdiction
The Pacific SMP Amendment process resulted in the re-establishment of the City of Pacific Shoreline Jurisdiction, through the creation of a Technical Memorandum in November 2009.

B. Pacific Inventory and Characterization Report
Early steps in the City of Pacific’s comprehensive SMP update process included the inventory and characterization of shoreline conditions. This study provided a basis for updating the City’s goals, policies, and regulations for shoreline management. The document was tentatively approved by Ecology in November 2010.

As an illustrative example, this report includes:

- REGULATORY OVERVIEW
- SHORELINE JURISDICTION AND DEFINITIONS
- RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PLANS
- METHODS
- DETERMINING SHORELINE PLANNING AREA BOUNDARIES
- APPROACH TO CHARACTERIZING ECOSYSTEM-WIDE PROCESSES AND SHORELINE FUNCTIONS
- APPROACH TO INVENTORY AND CHARACTERIZATION OF REGULATED SHORELINES
- ECOSYSTEM-WIDE CHARACTERIZATION AND PROCESSES
- PACIFIC SHORELINE INVENTORY AND ANALYSIS
  - Natural processes and functions
    - Hydrological and Biological Resources
    - Tributaries and Associated Wetlands
    - Fish and Wildlife Presence
    - Floodplain and Channel Migration
    - Built Environment
    - Existing and Planned Land Use
    - Impervious Areas
    - Public Access
    - Infrastructure
    - Historic and Cultural Resources
- ECOLOGICIC MANAGEMENT AND PROTECTION TOOLS
- FUNCTIONAL ANALYSIS AND OPPORTUNITY AREAS
  - WRRA Plans
C. Develop Shoreline considerations into the Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan
The Pacific SMP Amendment process has resulted in the introduction of Goals and associated Policies into the Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan.

Examples include:

- Provide for Management of Shorelines in Accordance with the Shoreline Management Act RCW 90.48.
- Provide that the policies, regulations, and administration of the Shoreline Master Program ensure that new uses, development, and redevelopment within the shoreline jurisdiction do not cause a net loss of shoreline ecological functions.

D. Updates to the Pacific Municipal Code (Shoreline Administration and Regulations)
The Pacific SMP Amendment process, when formally adopted, will result in the repeal of the existing SMP regulations (1974 version) within the PMC, and replacement with new standards that are compliant with RCW 90. The Draft SMP was tentatively approved by Ecology in August 2011.

As an illustrative example, these include:

- Definitions and Regulations in PMC Chapter 21 (Administration and Shoreline Management Regulations)
- Shoreline Environment Designations Map
- Definitions and procedures in PMC Title 16 - Land Use and Environmental Procedures
- Reference and Adoption of the Shoreline Restoration Element of the Shoreline Master Plan.

E. Pacific Municipal Code Chapter 23 - Critical Areas
When formally adopted, the Pacific SMP Amendment process will result in changes to the City of Pacific’s Critical Area Regulations. This is accomplished by repealing specific, non-conforming sections of PMC 23, replacing them with new standards that are compliant with RCW 90.58, and supplementing this Chapter with new standards that align with those proposed for adoption within PMC 21 – Shorelines. The Draft SMP language was tentatively approved by Ecology in August 2011.

As an illustrative example, these include:

- 23.10.030 Definitions – Wetlands
- 23.20.050 (G) SMA jurisdiction mitigation measures standards

F. Restoration Plan
The City of Pacific Shoreline Master Program Update developed and submitted to Ecology in April 2011 contains a Restoration Plan. The Plan provides specific goals, polices and restoration strategies (by reach) for activities conducted with Shoreline jurisdiction that produce impacts, thus assuring no net loss of shoreline ecological functions.

G. Cumulative Impact Analysis
The Shoreline Management Act Guidelines (WAC 173-26-18683)(d) require analysis of cumulative impacts “to ensure no net loss of ecological functions and protection of other shoreline functions and/or uses.” The Pacific SMP update process examined and created a report that led to the development of our Master Program policies and regulations, addressing the cumulative impacts on shoreline ecological functions that would result from shoreline development and uses that are reasonably foreseeable. The document was tentatively approved by Ecology in July 2011.
As an illustrative example, this report includes:

- Methodology
  - Current Circumstances Affecting the Shorelines and Relevant Natural Processes
  - Reasonably Foreseeable Future Development
  - Use of the Shoreline Beneficial Effects of Any Established Regulatory Programs
  - Landscape Characterization Freshwater Shorelines
  - General Framework and Conceptual Model
  - Characterization Structure

- General analysis of Cumulative effects
  - Existing Conditions
  - Reasonably foreseeable future development
  - Future Population and Economic Growth
  - Comprehensive Plan Urban Growth Areas
  - Zoning Critical Areas Stormwater
  - Endangered Species Act
  - Enhancement Programs such as King County Floodplain Management and Puget Sound Partnership (PSP)

H. Public Participation, Outreach & Involvement
The City of Pacific Shoreline Master Program Update developed and submitted to Ecology a Public Participation Plan in November 2009, designed to inform and encourage participation by a diverse group of stakeholders such as:

- Other Governmental Agencies
- Quasi-governmental Groups
- Community Groups and Clubs
- Citizens and Property Owners, especially shoreline property owners
- Business Groups and Associations
- Environmental Organizations and Conservation Groups

Public outreach included notifying all stakeholders by mail and inviting them to participate, and informational notices posted in several locations throughout the community. Ongoing outreach included notifying stakeholders who expressed interest, by continuing to send them information, having individual meetings with stakeholders having extensive holdings or management responsibility, such as King County Flood Control Zone District (FCZD) representatives. Additionally, numerous public meetings were held to inform, solicit comment and ultimately adopt the SMP update.

The City of Pacific’s efforts towards achieving compliance with the intent of the Plan can best be summarized and illustrated as:

Outreach activities

- September 24, 2009 - Meeting with King County FCZD representatives
- November 2009 - Web site set up
- February 1, 2010 - SMP overview, invite Park Board to Public Information Meeting
- February 9, 2010 - Notice of Public Information Meeting to affected property owners
- February 23, 2010 - Planning Commission Presentation/Public Information Meeting
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 4, 2010</td>
<td>City Council Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 26, 2010</td>
<td>Planning Commission Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 31, 2011</td>
<td>Notice mailed to SMP “Stakeholders”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 8, 2011</td>
<td>Meeting with King County FCZD representatives to review Draft SMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 9, 2011</td>
<td>Draft SMP Open House “Stakeholders” presentation in Community Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 16, 2011</td>
<td>Draft SMP Open House “Stakeholders” presentation in Community Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 3, 2011</td>
<td>Notice to CTED of 60 day adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 22, 2011</td>
<td>Planning Commission study session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 24, 2011</td>
<td>Notice mailed to the regional Tribes, interested properties and adjacent jurisdictions for review comments concerning Draft SMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 24, 2011</td>
<td>Notice of Public Hearing posted at City Hall, Library and Post Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 25, 2011</td>
<td>Notice of Public Hearing published in Auburn Reporter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 25, 2011</td>
<td>SEPA Determination of Non-Significance published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 26, 2011</td>
<td>Draft SMP Public Hearing before the Planning Commission with recommendation made to the City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 15, 2011</td>
<td>Draft SMP City Council Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 6, 2011</td>
<td>Draft SMP City Council Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 12, 2011</td>
<td>City Council final adoption of Resolution No. 1089, Intent to Adopt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary Public Comment**

**Letter:**
Karen Walter, Fisheries Division, Muckleshoot Indian Tribe, dated April 22, 2011

**Summary Public testimony**

**February 23, 2010:**
Four of the seven attendees lived on the 3rd Place SE, adjacent to the White River. They knew King County FCZD was interested in acquiring their properties for a levee setback project, and were mostly concerned about losing their properties through some sort of government action. Another resident, living on 3rd Avenue SE, was concerned about constraints on the use of his land. The sixth lived on White River Drive in the area of the 2009 flood, and had come for information. The seventh was a resident naturalist, concerned about impacts to wildlife and habitat.

**April 26, 2011:**
One of the February 2010 attendees from 3rd Place SE was joined by his wife and two neighbors from the other side of the river, all voicing concerns about the potential effects of shoreline regulations on their properties.