

APPENDIX D
AGENCY COMMENT/RESPONSE
SUMMARY TABLE

**Agency Comment/Response Summary Table:
Draft Inventory, Analysis, and Characterization Report – March 2014 Draft
City of Pasco SMP Update**

No.	Comment Section	Commenter	Page	Comment	Response
1	Map Folio	Angela San Filippo Ecology 5/29/14	Maps 9a&b and 10a&b	It would be helpful to see the subreach breaks on the zoning and land use maps as well. This would help to better understand the decisions on preliminary environment designations.	Reach and subreaches added to Map Folio's land use and zoning map (Maps 9 and 10).
2	Map Folio	Angela San Filippo Ecology 5/29/14	Map 10a and 10b	It is very difficult to differentiate between the two zones: RS-20 and RS-12.	Revised hatching color of RS-20 to help visually differentiate.
3	Map Folio	Angela San Filippo Ecology 5/29/14	Map 4	It would be helpful if [Geologic Hazards] identified on a map.	Added Geologic Hazard Areas to the Map Folio (Map 4 – Surficial Geology).
4	Section 4.1 – Land Cover Types	Angela San Filippo Ecology 5/29/14	Pg. 14, Table 8	Total Acreage Column - Should this number and the Table 9 total (25,763 + 577 = 26,340) add up to the total acreage in Table 6 (28,061)?	No revision necessary – correct as is. Table 8 includes the shoreline numbers summarized in Table 9. New note added to Table 8: <i>1 = Includes shoreline jurisdiction.</i>
5	Section 4.2.1 – Existing Land Use	Angela San Filippo Ecology 5/29/14	Pg. 15	<i>The City is part of the Tri-Cities Metropolitan Area in southeast Washington and includes 25,247 acres in the current incorporated City limits and an additional 5,433 acres within its associated UGA.</i> Based on my reading of this these numbers should reflect the numbers in the preceding tables. Since they don't, where are they coming from? I see, they are coming from Table 10, but I still don't understand why the numbers from the other tables	<i>The summary of acreages provided in the Tables 6 through 12 are meant to illustrate the general distribution of ownership, land cover, and land use types within the City and its shoreline jurisdiction. The acre values are based on a variety of data sources and do not reflect the exact total acreage of land</i>

No.	Comment Section	Commenter	Page	Comment	Response
				aren't consistent with these.	<i>within the City or its shoreline jurisdiction. Data mismatch between the total acreages provided in Tables 6 through 12 are due to the data sources and the lack of zoning designations for UGA areas.</i>
				Total Acreage Column - Again, this number is different than the 577 acres of land in shoreline as presented in Table 9. I understand that there are uncertainties and it is difficult to obtain exact acreages but there should be some kind of explanation as to why different numbers are used to seemingly represent the same thing.	See Response to Comment 2.
6	Section 4.2.1 – Existing Land Use	Angela San Filippo Ecology 5/29/14	Pg. 16, Table 11	Total Acreage Column -Same comment with the numbers not being consistent throughout. This explains the difference between Tables 12 and 11 but not between Tables 12, 11, and 9.	See Response to Comment 2.
7	Section 4.2.1 – Existing Land Use	Angela San Filippo Ecology 5/29/14	Pg. 18, Table 12	Total Acreage Column -Same comment with the numbers not being consistent throughout. This explains the difference between Tables 12 and 11 but not between Tables 12, 11, and 9.	See Response to Comment 2.
8	Section 4.7 – Geologic Hazards	Angela San Filippo Ecology 5/29/14	Pg. 25, Table 13	It would be helpful if [Geologic Hazards] identified on a map.	Geologic Hazard areas added to Map Folio, Map 4.
9	Section 5.1.3.2 – Water Quality Conditions in Pasco	Angela San Filippo Ecology 5/29/14	Pg. 35	This [section text] already been covered in the surface water quality section.	Repeated text deleted. Section now references description in Section 4.6.2.
10	Section 5.1.4.2.2 - Aquatic Habitat	Angela San Filippo Ecology 5/29/14	Pg. 42	<i>The aquatic habitat. Many ESA-listed anadromous salmonid species are found within the two rivers, including bull trout, steelhead, sockeye, and spring and fall Chinook salmon.</i> This sentence doesn't make a lot of sense. Delete "This aquatic habitat.." from the previous page or complete that sentence and split this into	Correct language is included in the Microsoft Word version. We will confirm missing language is there when creating a PDF of the final document. <i>The aquatic habitat supports numerous resident and anadromous fish, aquatic invertebrates, and numerous migratory bird</i>

No.	Comment Section	Commenter	Page	Comment	Response
11	Section 5.3.4.2, Preliminary ED Considerations	Angela San Filippo Ecology 5/29/14	Pg. 56, Table 17	What about subreaches 5a, 5d, 6a, and 8a? two different sentences.	Many ESA-listed... Table 17 has been revised to include missing subreaches.
12	Section 5.3.4.2, Preliminary ED Considerations	Angela San Filippo Ecology 5/29/14	Pg. 56, Table 17	<p>Chiawana, Wade, Riverview, Schlagel, and Saccajawa parks (SR 3a, 5c, and 6b and Reach 7)</p> <p>The parks themselves are considered high intensity? This seems counter intuitive, it would help if the map folio showed the subreaches in relation to the parks, existing zoning, and land use. Also the description of subreach 3a in the Reach Characterization appendix indicates this subreach is almost entirely encompasses Chiawana Park.</p>	<p>Subreaches added to Map Folio – Map for Ownership and Public Access, Land Use, and Zoning.</p> <p>Section 5.3.4.2 states: The listing of these areas under the high intensity and other categories should not imply that this is what these areas will be designated in the SMP update process. Developing and applying environment designations in the City will occur with more detailed analysis of the information in this report, input from the City Planning Commission, Ecology, and from the public during the shoreline visioning process and other public forums.</p>
13	Section 5.3.4.2, Preliminary ED Considerations	Angela San Filippo Ecology 5/29/14	Pg. 56, Table 17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider a special designation area for leveed areas along the Columbia River, where limited ecological function and future development potential exists, and the areas are dedicated for public recreation as part of the regional trail system Consider a recreation-based designation for the several park areas 	Noted

No.	Comment Section	Commenter	Page	Comment	Response
				Both great ideas and I highly encourage tailoring the environment designations to fit the City of Pasco's needs and future goals.	
14	Public Access	Stephanie Utter, BOR, 5/30/2014	N/A	The public land on which the CBP infrastructure is situated are not meant for public access due to the hazards and the possibility that there could be people and equipment present maintaining the facilities.	Noted
15	Public Access	Stephanie Utter, BOR, 5/30/2014	N/A	Reclamation has facilities (Pasco Pump Laterals PPL) in Reach 1 that terminate before the Columbia River, and an interest in the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers (USACE) facility that runs parallel to the Columbia River in Reaches 3 and 4. The PPL is a series of constructed facilities used to distribute irrigation water to farmers for agricultural purposes, and the USACE facility collects surplus drainage from agricultural lands in and around the Pasco area. Reclamation has management agreements with several agencies that operate and maintain land in and around shorelines throughout the CBP and Franklin County. Any upgrades to existing features on managed land, water, or facilities would be at the discretion of Reclamation and within Federal laws and regulations. At this time, Reclamation has no concerns with what has been proposed. However, we will continue to monitor the plan for concerns as it progresses through the process.	Noted
16	Shoreline Jurisdiction –	Michael Ritter, WDFW,	N/A	The IAC identifies that 1.2 miles of the Esquatzel Coulee are within the City's jurisdiction, but due to	No revision necessary. Copy of August 2014 Memo provided to Michael Ritter, WDFW.

Appendix D
Agency Comment/Response Summary Table

No.	Comment Section	Commenter	Page	Comment	Response
	Esquatzel Coulee	6/19/2014		<p>justification provided in the Franklin County IAC and application of current SMP criteria, it should be removed as a shoreline of statewide significance for the current City of Pasco SMP update. It would be useful if this 1.2 mile section of the Esquatzel Coulee were shown on a map to better understand its relationship to development to either support the IAC that is should be deleted from the current SMP update or continued to be included as important shoreline habitat within the City of Pasco.</p>	

1918
1919
1920

1921
1922
1923

1924
1925
1926

1927
1928
1929

1930
1931
1932

1933
1934
1935

1936
1937
1938

1939
1940
1941

1942
1943
1944
1945
1946
1947
1948
1949
1950
1951
1952
1953
1954
1955
1956
1957
1958
1959
1960
1961
1962
1963
1964
1965
1966
1967
1968
1969
1970
1971
1972
1973
1974
1975
1976
1977
1978
1979
1980
1981
1982
1983
1984
1985
1986
1987
1988
1989
1990
1991
1992
1993
1994
1995
1996
1997
1998
1999
2000
2001
2002
2003
2004
2005
2006
2007
2008
2009
2010
2011
2012
2013
2014
2015
2016
2017
2018
2019
2020
2021
2022
2023
2024
2025
2026
2027
2028
2029
2030
2031
2032
2033
2034
2035
2036
2037
2038
2039
2040
2041
2042
2043
2044
2045
2046
2047
2048
2049
2050