



Exhibit B

Shoreline Checklist & Statement of Exemption Form

for Ensuring Consistency with SMP Policies and Regulations and No Net Loss Policy

Checklist Purpose

The purpose of this checklist is to demonstrate consistency with the policies and regulations of Clallam County's Shoreline Master Program. The checklist helps identify and track the implications of a shoreline use/development on the ecological functions and processes in accordance with the SMP. The checklist applies to all use/development proposals within marine and freshwater shoreline jurisdiction.

Date _____ Permit # _____

Landowner Information

Name: _____
Address: _____
City: _____ State: _____ Zip Code: _____
Telephone: _____
E-Mail: _____

Applicant or Agent Information (if different than landowner)

Name: _____
Address: _____
City: _____ State: _____ Zip Code: _____
Telephone: _____
E-Mail: _____

Project Information

Project Name: _____
Project Location/Street Address: _____
State: _____ Zip Code: _____
Tax Parcel Number: _____
Type of Ownership: Federal _____, State _____, Local _____, Tribal _____, Private _____

Type of Shoreline:

Marine River Lake

Name of the adjacent waterbody: _____

Name of the shoreline reach (from Inventory and Characterization): _____

Shoreline Environment Designation: _____

What type of shoreline approval does the project require?

Shoreline exemption Substantial development permit
 Conditional use permit Variance

Project Description

Briefly summarize the purpose of the project:

Indicate the project category/primary use (provide use category consistent with those listed in SMP Table 2-1 and / or Table 2-2; several potentially common examples: 'Residential – Single family', 'Residential – Subdivision', 'Boating facilities – Public boat launch', 'Restoration – ecological restoration', or 'Utility – Stormwater facilities'): _____

Rapid Review – Single family and other developments exempt from an SSDP

1. Does the project exceed the thresholds of 'Minor New Development'? (Section 6.3, Regulation 2)
 Yes No
2. Is the existing shoreline buffer modified or unvegetated to an extent that it is inconsistent with the buffer condition requirements of SMP Section 6.3, Regulation 4? (less than 80% vegetated, and less than 150 woody stems per acre or 55 % areal cover of woody vegetation) Yes No
3. Does the project require shoreline buffer averaging? (Section 6.4, Regulation 1)
 Yes No
4. Does the project require shoreline safety buffer averaging? (Section 7.13, Regulation 4)
 Yes No
5. Will development include view clearance, shoreline access, or other modification within a standard habitat buffer or safety buffer? (Allowances under Sections 6.5 and 6.6)
 Yes No
6. Does the project include shoreline stabilization (of any kind)? (See Tables 2-1 and 2-2, Section 4.6)
 Yes No
7. Does the project include boating facilities (of any kind)? (See Tables 2-1 and 2-2, Section 4.2)
 Yes No
8. Will the project permanently impact any wetland or wetland buffers? (Sections 7.4, 7.5, and 7.6)
 Yes No
9. Marine Only - Does the project require a geotechnical report due to proposed development's proximity to on-site or adjacent landslide hazard areas, including feeder bluffs and exceptional feeder bluffs? (Sections 7.12, 7.13, and 7.14)
 Yes No
10. Freshwater Only – Will elements of the project occur within the regulatory floodplain (Sections 7.15 and 7.16)
 Yes No
11. Freshwater Only – Will elements of the project occur within a channel migration zone safety buffer such that the proposal requires documentation by an experienced geologist, engineering geologist, or professional engineer? (Section 7.14, Regulation 10)
 Yes No

If the answer is 'No' to all of the above questions, there is likely minimal potential for net loss of ecological function associated with the project. In such instances, additional review included in the '**Detailed Review**' section of this Checklist may be unnecessary – please skip to the '**Summary**' section.

If any of the Rapid Review questions were answered 'Yes', please complete all of the associated 'Detailed Review' sections that follow.

Detailed Review

Complete all sections that apply based on 'Rapid Review' questions and responses. For all responses, reference specific sections in technical reports completed for the project, as needed and relevant.

1. Answered 'Yes' that project exceeds the thresholds of 'Minor New Development' (Section 6.3, Regulation 2)

How much new impervious surface will be created?: _____ acres

How much new pollution generating impervious surface will be created?: _____ acres

How much forest canopy would be permanently impacted throughout shoreline jurisdiction?: _____ acres

Describe approach to minimize impacts to forest canopy throughout shoreline jurisdiction (Section 6.2, Regulation 8):

Describe approach to treat stormwater, and detail consistency with SMP Water Quality and Water Management regulations (Section 5.4.2):

2. Answered 'Yes' that existing shoreline buffer modified or unvegetated to an extent that it is inconsistent with the buffer condition requirements of SMP Section 6.3, Regulation 4 (less than 80% vegetated, and less than 150 woody stems per acre or 55 % areal cover of woody vegetation).

Describe current buffer condition (forested, shrub dominated, cleared; dominant invasive species; existing structures); include percent vegetated, and density of woody stems and/or aerial coverage of woody vegetation: _____

Describe any existing structures or modifications within the buffer (if any): _____

Are existing structures or modifications to be utilized as part of the proposed use / development?
 Yes No

Describe approach to restore and/or enhance the buffer such that it meets minimum buffer condition requirements of the SMP: _____

3. Answered 'Yes' that development will occur within standard habitat buffer or safety buffer areas (Rapid Review Questions 3, 4, and 5).

Development will occur within a Habitat buffer? Safety buffer? [Check all that apply]

Describe current buffer condition (forested, shrub dominated, cleared; dominant invasive species; existing structures); include percent vegetated, and density of woody stems and/or aerial coverage of woody vegetation – reference back to Detailed Review Part 2, if already completed:

Describe any existing structures or modifications within the buffer (if any) – reference back to Detailed Review Part 2, if already completed: _____

If proposed, is buffer averaging consistent with SMP allowances? (Sections 6.5 and 6.6).

Yes

No

If 'Yes', document how averaging will occur as to not degrade existing buffer conditions (highlight conditions of reduced areas, proposed mitigation / restoration actions) – reference Habitat Management Plan completed for the project (for habitat buffer averaging): _____

If safety buffer reduction is proposed, has reduction been verified / approved by qualified professional consistent with SMP?

Yes

No

If 'No', see geotechnical report requirements in Section 7.14; a geotechnical evaluation and report must be completed and approved by the County before safety buffer averaging can be permitted. If 'Yes', also see 'Detailed Review' section #7.

Describe proposed project elements / alterations to occur within the buffer area: _____

Describe approach to minimize buffer impacts and provide buffer restoration / enhancement areas – reference Habitat Management Plan completed for the project when appropriate:

4. Answered 'Yes' that development will include shoreline stabilization. (Tables 2-1 and 2-2, Section 4.6; Rapid Review Question 6)

Development will require: structural shoreline stabilization (revetment / bulkhead / riprap)?

Bioengineered shoreline stabilization? [Check all that apply] *Note: Gabions are prohibited outright.*

The proposal is for: Replacement of existing stabilization (Section 4.6.3); New or expanded shoreline stabilization (Section 4.6.5)

Note: Land divisions must be designed as to assure that development or use of the established lots will not require structural shoreline armoring in the foreseeable future (Section 4.6.4, Regulation 1)

Note: New structural shoreline armoring is prohibited on shorelines mapped as feeder bluff (Section 4.6.5, Regulation 3)

Describe current shoreline conditions (Does existing armoring occur? Is existing erosion evident?): _____

How much new shoreline armoring is proposed?: _____

Will existing armoring be removed or replaced as part of the proposal? Yes

No

If 'Yes', how much (linear feet of removal / linear feet of replacement): _____

What development / use necessitates shoreline armoring?: _____

Has applicant applied for other permits for shoreline stabilization?: Yes

No

REPLACEMENT SHORELINE STABLIZATION STRUCTURES: Is the proposed structure consistent with criteria of Section 4.6.3? (Including, but not limited to: the existing structure no longer adequately serves its purpose and the replacement structure would perform the same stabilization function as existing structure, with no additions or increases in size; structure is not located waterward of the OHWM of the existing structure, unless as allowed for residences occupied prior to Jan 1, 1992; structure is designed, located, sized, and constructed to minimize effects on shoreline processes and fish and wildlife habitat)

Yes

No

NEW OR EXPANDED SHORELINE STABILIZATION STRUCTURES (Section 4.6.5)

Document how non-structural shoreline stabilization measures have been considered, including relocating structures away from the water, enhancing vegetation, managing drainage and runoff, and other measures (Section 4.6.2, Regulation 2): _____

Is the proposed shoreline stabilization consistent with the criteria for allowances for such structures under Section 4.6.5 Regulation 2? Yes No

Where structural shoreline stabilization is proposed, summarize how alternatives to structural shoreline stabilization were determined to be infeasible or insufficient; and how the stabilization design is the least environmentally damaging alternative? _____

Detail how unavoidable adverse impacts are to be mitigated (consistent with the SMP prescribed mitigation sequence) such that there is no net loss of shoreline ecological functions or processes (in completing this response, detail the specific type of shoreline stabilization proposed and consistency with the applicable regulations of Section 4.6.2 thru 4.6.8; reference studies or other application materials prepared for the proposed shoreline stabilization): _____

5. Answered 'Yes' that development will include boating facilities (Tables 2-1 and 2-2, Section 4.2; Rabid Review Question 7)

Development includes (check the boating facility that applies)

Accessory to Residential Development: Dock, pier, float, and/or lift; Mooring buoy;
 Other _____ (specify)

Non-residential boating facility: Dock, pier, float, and/or lift; Mooring buoy; Public boat launch;
 Marina; Float plane moorage; Other _____ (specify)

Does existing overwater structure exist on the site?: _____

Has applicant applied for other permits for proposed boating facility?: Yes No

If yes, summarize mitigation required for state and/or federal permits: _____

Will existing overwater structures be removed or replaced as part of the proposal? Yes No

If 'Yes', how much (linear feet of removal / linear feet of replacement): _____

Is overwater structure in the proposed location atypical to conditions / development on neighboring and/or nearby properties?: Yes No If 'Yes', document how proposed overwater structure is necessary where it has not been needed and/or does not occur along neighboring shoreline areas: _____

Document consistency with requirements for proposed boating facility (Sections 4.2.2 [Marinas]; 4.2.3 [Boat launches] 4.2.4 [Piers, Docks, and Floats, Non-residential]; 4.2.5 [Piers, Docks, Floats, and Lifts, Accessory to Residential Development and Private Recreational Use]; 4.2.6 [Mooring buoys]); attach materials and reference here: _____

Summarize approach to minimize shoreline impacts / restore temporary impacts associated with construction and ongoing use of proposed boating facility(s): _____

6. Answered 'Yes' that development will require wetland impacts. (Sections 7.4, 7.5, and 7.6; Rapid Review Question 8)

Development will require: Permanent wetland impacts; Permanent buffer impacts; Temporary wetland and/or wetland buffer impacts

Describe wetland(s) that will be impacted (category): _____

Has applicant applied for other permits for wetland alteration?: Yes No

If yes, summarize mitigation required thru other permits: _____

Describe how 'all reasonable measures have been taken to avoid adverse effects on wetland functions and values', as required by SMP: _____

Summarize impacts and compensatory mitigation approach consistent with Sections 8.3 and 8.5; cite and reference Wetland Mitigation Plan: _____

7. Marine Only - Answered 'Yes' that development requires a geotechnical report due to proposed development's proximity to on-site or adjacent landslide hazard areas, including (but not limited to) feeder bluffs and exceptional feeder bluffs? (Sections 7.12, 7.13, and 7.14; Rapid Review Question 9)

Development will occur within: Feeder bluff or exceptional feeder bluff; other landslide hazard area; Shoreline safety buffer for exceptional feeder bluff; Shoreline safety buffer for feeder bluff Shoreline safety buffer for other marine-shoreline associated landslide hazard area Critical area buffer [Check all that apply]

Describe current safety and/or critical area buffer condition (forested, shrub dominated, cleared; dominant invasive species; existing structures); include percent vegetated, and density of woody stems and/or aerial coverage of woody vegetation – reference back to Detailed Review Part 2, if already completed: _____

Describe proposed alterations within landslide hazard areas (if applicable) (detail consistency with allowances within 7.14): _____

Describe proposed alterations within landslide hazard area buffer (detail consistency with allowances within 7.13): _____

Provide name of geotechnical report and qualified professional: _____

Describe how proposal location, design, construction, and ongoing use and maintenance avoids impacts to the marine shoreline landslide hazard area(s) to the greatest extent feasible. Impact avoidance measures could include: reducing the number, size or scale of buildings, driveways and other features; altering the configuration or layout of the proposed development; using environmentally favorable construction materials; implementing special drainage or runoff management practices; foregoing construction of accessory structures; preserving native vegetation; and other reasonable measures: _____

Would the proposed use impact natural sediment and erosion processes integral to the health and sustainability of marine nearshore ecosystems?: _____

8. Freshwater Only - Answered 'Yes' that development will occur within the regulatory floodplain. (Sections 7.15 and 7.16; Rapid Review Question 10)

Verify that no land disturbing activities would occur within the floodway (unless permitted by the SMP).(Section 7.16, Regulation 6): _____

9. Freshwater Only - Answered 'Yes' that elements of the project will occur within a channel migration zone safety buffer such that the proposal requires documentation by an experienced geologist, engineering geologist, or professional engineer to allow development within the standard safety buffer (Section 7.14, Regulation 10)

Describe current CMZ condition (signs of recent and/or active channel migration, forested, shrub dominated, cleared; dominant invasive species; existing structures):

Provide name of report and qualified professional: _____

Describe proposed project elements / alterations to occur within the CMZ standard safety buffer area:

Verify that safety buffer averaging is consistent with limitations included under Section 7.13, Regulation 4 (never reduced to less than 35 feet; reduced portion of the buffer cannot exceed forty percent (40%) of the buffer length): Yes No

Summary / Conclusion

Provide any additional information needed to verify that the project is not expected to result in a net loss of shoreline ecological functions: _____

Applicant: Based on available information, the project is not expected to result in a net loss of shoreline ecological functions. Yes No

Signature: _____ Date: _____

County Reviewer: Based on available information, the project is not expected to result in a net loss of shoreline ecological functions. Yes No

Signature: _____ Date: _____