

# Public Comment Summary: Island County Periodic Review

## Ecology Public Comment Period, March 1 – March 31, 2025

*Prepared by Stephanie Barney, WA Dept. of Ecology, April 17, 2025*

Comment Number	Comment Topic and Section Number (Citation)	Commenter	Comment	Local Government Response and Rationale
1	17.05A.060.I.4 -Shoreline Residential Historic Beach Community.	<p>Bryan Blair                      Sheri Cloud                      Christine Tremblay                      Roberta A. Rice                      Steve Knapp                      Jody Aamold                      Suzanne Hong</p>	<p>These commenters request a better understanding of the implications now facing them, as the update changes their Shoreline Environment Designation (SED) from Shoreline Residential to Shoreline Residential Historic Beach Community.</p> <p>Specific questions asked:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What are the primary benefits and drawbacks of owning property within a designated historic district? (Blair)</li> <li>2. Are there any tax incentives or financial benefits associated with historic designation? (Blair)</li> <li>3. How might this designation impact future building permits and renovations? (Blair)</li> <li>4. Do we have any input in this designation? (Blair)</li> <li>5. What was the genesis of the decision to change the designation of our properties to “Historic Properties”? (Cloud, Tremblay, Knapp)</li> <li>6. What will be the effect of this new designation on our</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Historic Beach Community (HBC) designation allows for combination of shorter buffers and setbacks along with the county’s highest impervious surface ratio (80%). There are no historic preservation implications for the HBC.</li> <li>2. There are no tax incentives, and the only financial benefit may be allowing for more buildable area on small lots.</li> <li>3. With smaller buffers and setbacks, along with greater impervious surface ratio, a greater building envelope is created.</li> <li>4. These lots are designated by the standards found in Island County’s Shoreline Master Program (SMP).</li> <li>5. During the 2020 SMP update, staff evaluated all shoreline communities to determine HBC status. Formerly, this happened on a parcel-by-parcel or permit-by-permit basis.</li> </ol>

			<p>properties? (Cloud, Tremblay, Knapp)</p> <p>7. What will be our new (in any) responsibilities as a result of this change? (Cloud, Tremblay, Knapp)</p> <p>8. How was the decision made to select some and not all the properties with addresses along the Boardwalk? (Cloud, Tremblay, Knapp)</p> <p>9. Please include any descriptive material that explains the significance of this new designation.</p> <p>10. Will the new Historic designation affect work currently being done to install a new septic system (approved by the County)? (Rice)</p> <p>11. How will the new Historic designation limit work, change needs, or ease ability to get upgrades to septic and such? (Aamold)</p> <p>12. What are the advantages/disadvantages of being designated "Historic" and what properties are included? (Hong)</p>	<p>6. Being redesignated from Shoreline Residential (SR) for HBC allows development closer to the Ordinary High Water Mark (OHWM) and increased impervious surface area.</p> <p>7. There are no requirements for historic preservation in the HBC. Any development that could be undertaken in the SR or Rural Conservancy (RC), the only two Shoreline Environmental Designations (SED) that were updated to HBC, is also possible in the HBC.</p> <p>8. Properties around the county's shoreline were reviewed based on the HBC criteria, staff proposed updates to Ecology, and then Ecology sent back a memo on the proposed HBC parcels accepting most that staff had proposed.</p> <p>9. HBC is not a new designation, Island County delineated all areas of the shoreline to ascertain which should be included in the existing HBC designation.</p> <p>10. The new SMP will not affect projects already under review unless the permit is cancelled and reapplied for after final adoption.</p> <p>11. HBC has smaller setbacks and buffers from the OHWM, as</p>
--	--	--	---	---

				<p>well as increased impervious surface limits. These re-designations will reduce the need for Variances as they more accurately reflect existing patterns of development.</p> <p>12. Historic in this context does not include the requirements of historic preservation, simply that the development existed prior to the enactment of the SMA at densities and setbacks that would not have been allowed afterwards.</p>
2	17.05A.060.I.4 - Shoreline Residential Historic Beach Community.	Pam and Bill Burnett	<p>This commenter has a lot in the Brighton Beach community, and request information why their lot was not included in the redesignation.</p> <p>Burnett requests information on how to get their property and others in Brighton Beach redesignated as Historic Beach Community (HBC). They request consideration for the HBC designation to include all older beach communities that existing before the first SMA be included, regardless of setback from the ordinary high water mark. They state specific concerns with impacts to upgrades, repairs, or replacement of septic systems.</p>	<p>Properties around the county's shoreline were reviewed based on the HBC criteria, staff proposed updates to Ecology, and then Ecology sent back a memo on the proposed HBC parcels accepting most that staff had proposed.</p> <p>Including all beach communities built before 1971 (the year the SMA was enacted) regardless of setback from OHWM would create a burden on Island County's shoreline habitat. If all residential lots were built at 80% impervious surface and 10-20 feet from OHWM, a net loss of ecological function would likely occur.</p> <p>Environmental Health septic regulations will remain the same,</p>

				septic repairs and replacements are processed as Shoreline Exemptions.
3	Shoreline Environment Designation Map	Paula Spina	This commenter is the owner of 5 contiguous parcels of land on the north shore of Crockett Lake in Central Whidbey Island, including the historic Crockett Farm (1056 Crockett Farm Rd, Coupeville). The commentor has interest in rearranging property lines to date the historic buildings on two properties to charity. A wetland study prepared for the boundary line adjustment finds the current/proposed SEDs affecting their property is inaccurate. The wetland delineation report finds the extent of a wetland on the subject properties is “drastically different and very much an overestimate of the shoreline wetlands on the property”. The commentor provides the wetland delineation report. They request a map correction to correctly show the wetland extent, consistent with their wetland report.	Island County is not updating any further shoreline environmental designations at this time, but could do so under a future SMP update. If the subject property is shown to be outside of shoreline jurisdiction, the project would not be subject to the SMP.
4	Chapter V: Shoreline General Policies, G. Sea Level Rise	John Lovie	This commenter asks, in consideration of current development patterns along the County’s shoreline and predicted effects of sea level rise on current and new development: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What do we want our shorelines to look like in 2050?</li> <li>2. How do we get there from here?</li> <li>3. Who will pay for it?</li> </ol>	Staff finds these questions to be excellent philosophical guidance for the County’s next SMP update. Ecology is currently conducting rulemaking for the SMA and further guidance is anticipated to assist jurisdictions in answering questions like these. Many of the flood related items referenced in the comment will be important for the next SMP update, as the state is

				diligently working on guidance around flood risk.
5	17.05A.110.A -Shoreline Stabilization.	Dennis R. Stettler, P.E.	This commenter requests revision of the shoreline stabilization standards of the SMP to address high bluff slopes because the code (current/proposed) does not contain provisions that allow for consideration of other types of risks other than predictions of erosion within 3 years. They find Island County's/Department of Ecology's interpretation of the shoreline stabilization standards ignores other factors contributing to instability of the shoreline, including waiting until the need is that immediate it would foreclose other opportunities. It is their professional opinion the code is inconsistent with Chapter 15 – Shoreline Stabilization of the Ecology Shoreline Management Handbook related to high bluffs and best available science.	Island County has written the SMP to align with state law and is not required to be consistent with the state guidebook published in 2009 and amended in 2017. Island County has not received Ecology's Initial Determination with Required and Recommended changes. No further County initiated changes are proposed at this time.
6	(1) 17.05A.070 - Definitions.  (2) 17.05A.060.I.4 - Shoreline Residential Historic Beach Communities.  (3)(4)(5) 17.05A.110.A – Shoreline Stabilization.	Brad Thompson	This commenter is the Chair of the South Whidbey Shoreline Group. They want to make it clearer and easier for property owners to protect their properties while not harming the shoreline environment. They request the ability now to protect their homes in advance of the impacts of the 18.6 year “lunar nodal cycle”. This commentor provides the following strike through/underline edits: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Opposes the removal of <i>decks, gazebos, fences</i> from the</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Opposition noted, however the version that was approved by the Board on August 13, 2024, and sent to Ecology unaltered can be found on our website. Normal appurtenance definition can be found, as approved, on page 28.</li> <li>2. Island County does not have any intention at this time of expanding the definition of HBC to include new properties that do not meet the current</li> </ol>

			<p>definition of “Normal Appurtenance”. Finds the version of the definition is not what the Commissioner’s approved.</p> <p><i>Normal appurtenance means a structure that is necessary for the use of enjoyment of a single-family residence, including a garage, deck, fence, gazebo, driveway, utilities, septic tank, drain fields, and grading less than 250 cubic yards and which does not involve placement of fill in any wetland or waterward of the ordinary high-water mark.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (2) Re-define Historic Beach Community (HBC) to include single-family homes built on low-lying shorelines and historically filled lands. The definition of is adapted from page 48 of Chapter 15 of the Ecology SMP Handbook.</li> </ul> <p><i>Shoreline Residential – Historic Beach Community means limited areas within the shoreline of Island County that have been <del>developed</del>platted in a dense pattern with small lots and greater impervious surface relative to other areas of the county. The existing marine waterfront lots are typically low-lying lots which have been</i></p>	<p>standards. Increased HBC determinations would likely require review for cumulative impact, as the development standards are more intensive (shorter setbacks/buffers, much greater impervious surface limits).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Island County’s SMP sets a clear limit that if a stabilization structure is expanding in any way, it is treated as new per 17.OA.110.A.3.f(ii).</li> <li>4. Standard requires review of conditions that may arise from limiting the shoreline function naturally. Such conditions should be addressed and avoided or mitigated if possible in order to achieve no net loss of ecological function.</li> <li>5. The should/shall conversation pertained only to 17.OA.090.N.12. It is also important to ensure that when building shoreline stabilization neighboring properties are not negatively impacted.</li> </ol>
--	--	--	--	---

			<p><i>developed on historically filled lands or are generally developed with residential structures constructed approximately thirty (30) feet or less from the ordinary high-water mark and the original structures were established prior to enactment of the Shoreline Management Act.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (3) ICC 17.05A.110.A.3.ii goes against WAC 173-26-231(3)(iii)(C).</li> </ul> <p><i>ICC 17.05A.110.3.a.ii The replacement performs the same stabilization function as the existing structure <del>and does not require additions to or increases in size; and</del></i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (4) Remove ICC 17.05A.110.A.2.i</li> </ul> <p><i>Applications for new shoreline stabilization shall address <del>intertidal and shoreline habitat loss which may arise due to permanent structures limiting the ability of the ordinary high water mark and shoreline to migrate landward in response to sea level rise.</del></i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (5) Rewrite ICC 17.05A.110.6.j to align with the Board of Island County Commissioners discussion and agreement on August 13, 2024 not to use the</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>work “shall” and replace it with “should” in the SMP update.</p> <p><i>ICC 17.05A.110.6.j When a new or replaced hard structural shoreline stabilization measure is proposed on a site where legally established hard structural shoreline measures do not exist on adjacent properties, the proposed stabilization measure <del>should</del> must demonstrate that impacts to adjacent properties <del>should</del> will not occur.</i></p>	
7	ICC 17.05A.100.K.11 – Residential.	Gordy and Eva Holmes	These commenters strongly support removal of the shoreline variance threshold for residential construction within the floodplain.	Noted.
8	General (17.05A)	Dennis R. Stettler, P.E.	This commenter finds the reorganization of code and inclusion of additional definitions or clarification of existing definitions very helpful.	Noted.
9	Shoreline Environment Designation Map	Kim and Jeff Comstock	These commenters support the SED Map correction for 5702 Mutiny Bay Road, Freeland from Rural Conservancy to Shoreline Residential.	Noted.
10	General (17.05A)	Scott Burell Steve Silverberg Dale Pinney Kim and Valerie Mill-Stephan	These commenters, members of the South Whidbey Shoreline Group, support all changes to the Island County SMP. They find Island County did a good job of balancing opposing views and creating a balanced document. Stress the importance of ensuring that future implementation and permitting pathways provide	Noted.

			realistic, timely, and effective options for homeowners who are actively trying to protect their properties in good faith.	
11	Vegetation Management	Lynn and Stan Swanson	These commenters request English Ivy be added to the Class C noxious weed list to facilitate education and eradication before it destroys the native ecosystem.	The SMP references the state list of noxious weeds, which does include English Ivy as a Class C noxious weed.
12	Robinson Beach Boat Ramp	Mary Thompson	This commenter asks if the update will have any impact on the planned construction of the Robinson Beach Boat Ramp in Freeland, WA.	The boat ramp will fall under the approved SMP whenever an application is deemed complete. A boat launch in the Rural Conservancy SED, such as the Robinson Beach Boat Ramp, is a Conditional Use in both the 2016 SMP and the locally approved SMP update.
13	17.05A.090.O -Public Access.	Barry Pomeroy	This commenter requests Ecology support and obligate Island County to comply with and follow the Washington State beach access laws and repurchase tide rights when shoreline properties are sold.	Nothing in the SMP restricts the right to navigation, commercial fishing rights, fishing, boating, swimming, water skiing, or other related recreational purposes. Repurchasing tidelands is a larger discussion that would require a significant investment of taxpayer monies.
14	Definitions Comprehensive Plan – Shoreline Element	Lynae Slinden	This commenter requests revision of the SMP to reflect the Public Trust Doctrine and responsibility manage development on the shoreline, striking a balance between private property rights and public access. They suggest the following strike through/underline edits:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Island County’s “Shorelines of state significance” definition mirrors RCW 90.58.030(2)(f)(ii)(D) for the Skagit Bay shoreline from the OHWM to extreme low tide and RCW 90.58.030(2)(f)(iii) for all other shorelines seaward of</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revise the definition of “Shorelines of statewide significance”</li> </ul> <p><i>Shorelines of statewide significance</i> means those areas of Puget Sound and the Strait of Juan de Fuca and adjacent saltwater north of the Canadian line and lying seaward from the line of extreme <del>high</del> low tide; and those additional areas specified in the Act (RCW 90.58.030(2)(f), which in Island County, includes the Skagit Bay shoreline from Brown Point to Yokeko Point.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revise Policy #9 of the SMP Goals and Policies, Chapter II, B. Recreation and Public Access Element.</li> </ul> <p>9. Require commercial, industrial, and <u>single family and multifamily residential waterfront development</u>, and residential subdivisions to provide a means for safe visual and pedestrian access to shorelines, where feasible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reinsert Policy #6 of the SMP Goals and Policies, Chapter V, Shoreline General Policies, C. Flood Hazard Reduction.</li> </ul> <p><u>6. When reviewing projects that could be affected by sea</u></p>	<p>extreme low tide. No change is proposed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generally, public access is not required at privately owned and developed single family residences. No change is proposed.</li> <li>• Chapter V of the Shoreline Element contains new section G with the Sea Level Rise policies:</li> </ul> <p><b>G. Sea Level Rise</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Continue to connect shoreline property owners and developers with current sources of information on sea level rise in Island County.</b></li> <li><b>2. Encourage shoreline property owners and developers to consult and utilize current sources of information on sea level rise and guidance in their development planning processes.</b></li> <li><b>3. Provide, as possible, educational opportunities on sea level rise planning and best management practices for shoreline property owners and developers.</b></li> <li><b>4. Monitor the impacts of sea level rise within densely developed coastal bluff communities and Shoreline Residential Historic Beach and Canal Communities to assess the adequacy of established shoreline regulations under such changing conditions.</b></li> </ol> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This policy has been retained.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	---	--

			<p><u>level rise adjust development standards such as building setbacks or elevation as necessary to minimize potential damage from flooding.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Retain Policy #16 of the SMP Goals and Policies, Chapter V, Shoreline General Policies, D. Public Access.</li> <li>• Retain G. Sea Level Rise, of Chapter V, Shoreline General Policies.</li> <li>• Create stormwater management districts on each island rather than one small district on South Whidbey.</li> <li>• Countywide management of flooding and landslide hazards to equally distribute costs and provide consistent management of water quality for anthropogenic and natural pollutant sources.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• G. Sea Level Rise is a newly added section.</li> <li>• Stormwater management district establishment is outside of the scope of the SMP.</li> <li>• Countywide (outside of 20' of the OHWM) management of flooding and landslide hazards is outside of the scope of the SMP. Flooding and landslide hazards within shoreline jurisdiction are addressed in the SMP.</li> </ul>
15	<p>(1)(6)(7) 17.05A</p> <p>(2) 17.05A.070 – Definitions.</p> <p>(3)(4)(5) 17.05A.090 – Shoreline use and development regulations.</p>	Jesse Brighten	<p>This commenter suggests elements that relate to tree management follow industry standard and best management practices, citing requirements for ISA professionals and risk thresholds to limit removals to 'high risk' and 'extreme risk'.</p> <p>(1) Suggests edit to the definition of "Hazard Tree":</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Island County's definition for "hazard tree" was developed with our Code Revisor to allow for retention of trees except when removal is required for safety purposes.</li> <li>2. Undefined terms in Island County Code are defaulted to standard dictionary definitions.</li> <li>3. Mitigation measures can come from a variety of applicant provided reports.</li> </ol>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Hazard Tree is a tree that has a ISA Tree Risk rating of Moderate or higher, and shall not be considered for removal unless classified as High Risk and mitigation efforts cannot reduce risk levels to Moderate or Low.”</li> </ul> <p>(2) Recommends included a definition to “Tree”:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Tree is defined as a perennial woody plant of a species of plant that typically grows as a single stem and in excess of 10’ in height”</li> </ul> <p>(3) Referring to 17.05A.090.B. Mitigation Measures, this commenter suggests adding a requirement for “any mitigation relating to trees shall be reviewed by a ISA Certified Arborist or other equally qualified professional.”</p> <p>(4) Referring to ICC 17.05A.090.F.6.a, this commenter suggests an edit to the protection standards for Washington Natural Heritage Program Areas, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Pruning of any tree should be conducted by an ISA Certified Arborist, and conform to ISA Best Management Practices. Use of climbing spikes shall not be permitted, tree (re) topping shall not be permitted, no more than 20% of live crowns</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. 17.05A.110.C.10 covers removal of hazard trees and requires a certified arborist.</li> <li>5. Pruning/thinning standards are found in 17.05A.110.C.8. Tree topping is banned per 17.05A.110.C.7.</li> <li>6. This is a larger policy consideration that could likely be discussed in a future SMP update.</li> <li>7. See item 6 above.</li> <li>8. That section was moved to 17.05A.110.C Shoreline vegetation maintenance.</li> </ol>
--	--	--	--	---

			<p>removed within 3-5 year pruning cycles, primary limb removal should be avoided, and pruning limited to secondary laterals. Pruning should avoid exposure of heart wood or ripe wood unless done to enhance ecological function.”</p> <p>(5) Referring to 17.05A.090.I.8, recommends specifying a limit of removal, or 20% of live foliage removed within 3-5 years and ban re-topping or topping.</p> <p>(6) “Native” should include “near native” species, advocating for expansion of acceptable species as viable options which are not technically native to the natural ecology of Whidbey Island (ex. Shore pine, vine maple).</p> <p>(7) Where applicable, require tree protection zones and critical root zones, ISA Best Management Practices for any tree greater than 12” DBH. Please refer to the comment for more details.</p> <p>(8) Do not remove section former section 17.05A.090.K – Shoreline vegetation conservation.</p>	
16	(1) 17.05A.070 – Definitions.	Tom Opdycke	(1) This commenter finds the revised definition of dredging will result in significant damage to beaches due to lack of permit review and recommends	1. The Board of Island County Commissioners decided to include the additional language in the <i>dredging</i> definition.

	<p>(2) 17.05A.110.D – Grading and filling.</p> <p>(3) 17.05A.090 – General Shoreline Development Standards.</p> <p>(3) 17.05A.095 – Shoreline Reports.</p> <p>(3) 17.05A.100.K – Residential.</p> <p>(3) 17.05A.110.A - Shoreline Stabilization.</p> <p>(3) 17.05A.130 – Shoreline Master Program procedures.</p>		<p>the following revision: <b>Dredging means the removal of earth, sand, gravel, silt, or debris from the bottom of a stream, river, lake, bay, or other water body for the purpose of deepening a navigational channel, or to obtain use of the bottom materials for fill.</b> <i>Dredging includes any harvesting of natural resources by any mechanical or hydraulic means which involves substrate displacement or disturbance.</i> <del><i>Dredging does not include removal of obstructions or sediment as part of regular maintenance and repair of infrastructure.</i></del></p> <p>This commenter provided two examples of “maintenance and repair” projects conducted by Island County Public Works as case studies for how the revised definition of dredging could result in significant impacts to the beach.</p> <p>(2) This commenter finds the revisions to grading and filling requires, specifically 17.05A.110.D.2, 3, and 4.a, are overly restrictive and fail to account for the needs of historically filled properties – those developed with fill prior to the SMA, including those filled before December 4, 1969. They find the prohibition of fill in flood hazard areas (D.2), limits on grading and filling (D.3), and “no net loss” requirement (D.4.a) goes against legal protections for historic fills under the Savings Clause (RCW 90.58.270), violates the SMA’s</p>	<p>Regular maintenance and repair of infrastructure should be evaluated at the time of project installation, if a larger scope dredging occurs, it would be subject to all regulations in the SMP.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Island County supports the changes to 17.05A.110.D.2 &amp; 3, 17.05A.110.D.4.a was not revised. D.2 is supported by both Island County Policy and RCW 90.58.270. D.2 also allows for fill in the flood zone when there is no feasible alternative. There are no public trust challenges to these low-lying communities, nor are there regulatory burdens aimed at their removal.</li> <li>3. No county initiated changes proposed at this time. Ecology will make a final determination on whether or not the SMP meets state law.</li> <li>4. There are a number of property protection strategies in the SMP. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bulkhead height is already tied to FEMA 1 foot above extreme high water for processing as a Shoreline Exemption, or no higher than necessary to resist tide, wave, and floodwater action during a 100-year storm event. One could potentially apply for an SDP</li> </ul> </li> </ol>
--	---	--	--	---

			<p>balanced approach and legislative intent, and must recognize the special need for historically filled lands. They find the SMP prohibits “maintenance fill” (definition found in comment), necessary to prevent historically filled properties for inundation. They find the SMPs failure to allow for adaptation to effects from sea level rise (SLR) violates RCW 90.58.270, 90.58.020, WAC 173-27-080, and ICC 17.05A.140.</p> <p>(3) This commenter suggests the following edits to revise 17.05A.110.D:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include definitions for “Historically Filled Property” and “Maintenance Fill”*</li> <li>• Exempt Maintenance Fill*</li> <li>• Broaden Grading and Fill Rules*</li> <li>• Adjust the “No Net Loss” Baseline*</li> </ul> <p>*Edited for brevity. Please refer to the commenter’s letter for the full extent of their comments.</p> <p>(4) This commenter asks for demonstration how the SMP enables protection of shoreline properties, particularly those historically filled properties. The commenter seeks a fair opportunity to protect their home. They identified the following revisions to align the SMP with state law, including the Savings Clause and Chelan Basin:</p>	<p>or possibly S-VAR for a higher wall.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A replacement bulkhead can be expanded, it is then reviewed under the new or expanded stabilization code.</li> <li>• The requirement for placement at OHWM when the OHWM has reestablished itself behind a derelict stabilization structure comes from state law.</li> <li>• No county initiated changes proposed at this time. Ecology will make a final determination on whether or not the SMP meets state law.</li> <li>• The minimum necessary is appropriate to the need. It literally is the minimum necessary to meet the need while causing the least environmental harm.</li> </ul> <p>Island County has not received Ecology’s Initial Determination with Required and Recommended changes. No further County initiated changes are proposed at this time.</p>
--	--	--	---	--

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flexible Bulkhead Heights: Adjust 17.05A.110.A.5.f.iii to allow heights based on NOAA projections, with geotechnical oversight.</li> <li>• Reasonable Upgrades: Amend 17.05A.110.A.3.a.ii to permit enlarging replacements when justified.</li> <li>• Maintain current positions: Revise 17.05A.110.A.3.c to allow stabilization at original locations unless ecological harm is severe.</li> <li>• Permit fill for protection: Modify 17.05A.110.A.1.f and 17.05A.110.D.2 to allow fill for elevation on historically filled properties.</li> <li>• Simplify permitting: Replace “minimum necessary” with “appropriate to the need” in 17.05A.095.D/E, and eliminate bonding in 17.05A.090.B.3.</li> </ul> <p>The letter submitted by this commenter goes into detail to support the revisions above. Please refer to the commenter’s letter for the full extent of their comments.</p> <p>Exhibit A is an analysis of state law designed to balance ecology and property rights.</p> <p>Exhibit B is a comparison of state and county regulations, featuring proposed</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>changes to address areas where the SMP is more restrictive. Sections mentioned in Exhibit B include: 17.05A.095, 17.05A.100.K.15, 17.05A.110.A, and 17.05A.130.</p> <p>Exhibit C highlights where the SMP denies owners viable protection from sea level rise, also featuring proposed changes. Sections mentioned in Exhibit C include: 17.05A.090.A.5, 17.05A.090.B.3, 17.05A.090.N, 17.05A.095.D, 17.05A.095.E, 17.05A.110.A.1.f, 17.05A.110.A.2.e, 17.05A.110.A.3.a.ii, 17.05A.110.A.3.c, 17.05A.110.A.3.c.v, 17.05A.110.A.3.f., 17.05A.110.A.5.f.iii, and 17.05A.110.D.2.</p>	
17	<p>(1) 17.05A.090 – General shoreline development standards</p> <p>(2) 17.05A.120 – Shorelines of Statewide Significance</p>	Hugo Flores, DNR	<p>(1) This commenter suggests adding language to identify the location of state-owned aquatic lands (SOALS) and consultation with DNR during the pre-application phase of projects. The suggest the following language: <u>Consult with the Washington State Department of Natural Resources/Aquatic Resources Division for the existence and/or location of state-owned aquatic lands at the project onset.</u></p> <p>(2) This commenter requests Island County consider DNRs Kelp and Eelgrass Health and Conservation Plan, a prioritization and monitoring plan for kelp and eelgrass conservation under RCW 79.135.440. The goal of the plan is</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Island County has not received Ecology’s Initial Determination with Required and Recommended changes. The Board of County Commissioners will review and decide on any recommended changes. No further County initiated changes are proposed at this time.</li> <li>2. Kelp and eelgrass beds are considered both Critical Saltwater Habitats and Fish and Wildlife Conservation Areas is Island County’s SMP.</li> </ol>

			to conserve 10,000 acres of native kelp forest and eelgrass meadows by 2040.	
18	<p>(1) Chapter V: Shoreline General Policies, G. Sea Level Rise</p> <p>(1) 17.05A.110.A – Shoreline stabilization.</p> <p>(2) 17.05A.100.A – Agriculture</p> <p>(3) 17.05A.090.G – Shoreline Species and Habitats of Local Importance</p>	Steve Erickson, Whidbey Environmental Action Network	<p>(1) This commenter finds the sea level rise policies and regulations inadequate. Requests addition of the following to address concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Require monitoring for illegally built or enlarged shore defense structures.</li> <li>• Do not permit expansions of existing shoreline residences or normal appurtenances that cannot demonstrate continued operation during the life of the structure without new shoreline stabilization. Prohibit shoreline armoring when the structure will not be protected for the remainder of its design life.</li> <li>• Monitor coastal sewage and septic systems.</li> <li>• Address on-going and future shoreline pollution from abandonment of structures and appurtenances as they become undesirable/uninhabitable.</li> <li>• Clarify shoreline stabilization does not address tidal action; differences between “erosion”, “flooding”, and normal tidal action associated with sea level rise.</li> <li>• Adopt a policy that the costs for removal of uninhabited or abandoned structures is the</li> </ul>	<p>1. Island County awaits Ecology’s rulemaking on SMA regarding sea level rise to incorporate changes into SMP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Island County code enforcement is complaint based and does not include an active monitoring program, as it is not economically feasible at this time.</li> <li>• 17.05A.090.J.1.e requires a geotechnical/geocoastal report indicating that the proposed expansion (when in a buffer or setback) will not require shoreline stabilization for the life of the single-family residence, typically 100 years.</li> <li>• Septic system are monitored by the Island County Environmental Health department. All septic systems in the shoreline require periodic testing.</li> <li>• Island County awaits Ecology’s rulemaking on SMA regarding sea level rise, as this will be a region-wide issue</li> <li>• See bullet above, as of now, no bond or insurance program is planned.</li> </ul>

			<p>burden of the property owner, not the public.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assure financial guarantees to remove structures and armoring that ceases of function as intended.</li> </ul> <p>(2) This commenter requests the SMP prohibit wetland filling for agriculture. Suggested language: <u>Placement of fill of any kind in wetlands by existing or new agriculture operations is prohibited.</u></p> <p>(3) This commenter finds the designation of new species and habitats of local importances impossible. They refer to the nomination requirements of 17.05A.090.G.2.a.iii as a “poison pill”.</p>	<p>2. Island County requires new agricultural uses to conform to the SMP and would prohibit fill in wetlands. Existing and ongoing agricultural practices are allowed and required to follow best management practices. Placement of fill in a wetland would have to be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>3. 17.05A.090.G.2.a.iii should read: “Where restoration <del>of</del> habitat is proposed, include a specific plan for restoration, including a conceptual design and a means of financing the restoration.” If restoration of habitat was not proposed with the nomination of a species or habit of local importance, no specific plan or funding would be required.</p>
19	<p>(1) 17.05A.130 – Shoreline Master Program Procedures.</p> <p>(2) Comprehensive Plan – Shoreline Element</p> <p>(3) 17.05A.060 – Shoreline environment designation and maps.</p> <p>(4)(5)(8)(9)(11) 17.05A.070 -Definitions.</p>	Larry Kwarsick, Sound Planning Services	<p>(1) This commenter finds 17.05A.130.C.15.f does not comply with WAC 173-26-140.</p> <p>(2) This commenter finds the Shoreline Element of the Island County Comprehensive Plan/SMP do not address the “protection and restoration of buildings” found in WAC 173-26-176(3)(e). The commenter’s WAC reference seems incorrect, so we assume this is the correct reference based on the language provided in the comment. The commenter recommends the SMP include a specific</p>	<p>1. This section does not supersede, and does not conflict with WAC 17326-140, it simply states that this is one of the shoreline administrator’s roles.</p> <p>2. Island County does plan on additional changes around historical preservation, but not at this time. 17.05A.140 – Nonconforming development addresses continued use of, and redevelopment/expansion of existing uses. The Ebey’s Design Guidelines and Chapter</p>

	<p>(5) 17.05A.090.E – Geologically Hazardous Areas</p> <p>(6) 17.05A.090.I – Shoreline buffers, shoreline setbacks, and impervious surface limits.</p> <p>(7) 17.05A.090.N – Flood hazard reduction.</p> <p>(8) 17.05A.100.K – Residential.</p> <p>(10) 17.05A.090.J – Developments affecting shoreline setbacks and buffers.</p>		<p>section of alternative standards that prioritize the restoration, preservation, and protection of historical structures and cultural resources. They suggest the creation of a new SED, possibly named historic conservation SED, for the Captain Whidbey Inn. Examples of communities with such SED include Port Townsend and Coupeville.</p> <p>(3) This commenter presents a few instances where the zoning/land use designation is inconsistent with the SED and vice versa, inconsistent with WAC 173-26-191. Please see the comment for more detailed information.</p> <p>(4) This commenter suggests removing the work “platted” from the definition of “Historic beach community”. Also state it’s not clear that such lots have a “greater impervious surface relative to other areas of the country”. They find the greater impervious surface is related to the lot size.</p> <p>(5) This commenter suggests inclusion of a definition for “steep slope” and clarify that the steep slope buffer and setback applies to all classes of geologically hazardous areas.</p> <p>(6) Further, the commenter states the reference of “erosion hazard areas designed in the Department of (5) Ecology Coastal Zone Atlas dated April 1979” in the definition of “Geologically Hazardous Areas” is a feature not</p>	<p>17.04A – Ebey's Landing National Historical Reserve Design Review and Community Design Standards speaks to protection and restoration of buildings along Penn Cove.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Island County is not updating any further shoreline environmental designations at this time, but could do so under a future SMP update.</li> <li>4. HBC designation is meant for those areas with historic development patterns that would no longer be allowed. There is some relief for those not in HBC designated areas from section 17.05A.140 – Nonconforming development.</li> <li>5. Island County has not received Ecology’s Initial Determination with Required and Recommended changes. No further County initiated changes are proposed at this time.</li> <li>6. Island County is working to align codes across departments to eliminate inconsistencies. Definition updates in the SMP will wait until after approval unless provided by Ecology as recommended or required changes. Recommended changes will be reviewed and decided upon by the Board of County Commissioners.</li> </ol>
--	---	--	--	--

			<p>identified in the current Coastal Zone Atlas. They also point out an inconsistency between the definition for geologically hazardous area in the ICC 17.05A vs. ICC 11.02.</p> <p>(7) They find the key word “within” found in 17.05A.090.E.1 is undefined.</p> <p>(8) This commenter requests the language of ICC 11.02.140, which uses “may require” be included in ICC 17.05A.</p> <p>(9) This commenter states Public Works requires engineered grading, and drainage plans for single family projects without a finding of necessity, referencing ICC 11.03.130. The commenter asks why are steep slope buffers and setbacks different in the environment designation?</p> <p>(10) This commenter finds footnote #5 of Table 3 of ICC 17.05A.090.I regarding common line use on SRHBC properties eliminates the established buffer and setback. They state tying the setback to the common line could impact the preferred placement of drainfields away from the OHWM.</p> <p>(11) This commenter asks how to determine the least impactful area, as required by ICC 17.05A.090.N.12?</p> <p>(12) This commenter finds there’s multiple definitions of geologically</p>	<p>7. Should likely include buffers in 17.05A.090.E.1 language.</p> <p>8. See item 6 above.</p> <p>9. See item 6 above. The buffers and setbacks were created in the 2016 SMP update, and have remained unchanged. The steep slope buffers are established to allow for the natural erosion of bluffs while minimizing threats to structures. Steep slope buffers are greater in the Natural designation and along feeder bluffs for this reason.</p> <p>10. With the increase in HBC lot designation, it is important to protect the neighborhoods that have recently been designated by not allowing development waterward of existing residences. While placement of drainfields is a separate issue, there is a variance process for septic systems if a parcel is constrained.</p> <p>11. The least impactful area will be decided by reports generated by the applicant, typically a Biological Site Assessment.</p> <p>12. See item 6 above.</p> <p>13. Steep slope buffers cannot be reduced by using common line or setback averaging.</p> <p>14. Island County uses a 100-year standard for the life of a home as called out in the SMP. The Board decided to include the</p>
--	--	--	--	---

			<p>hazardous areas due to references in the SMP. They refer to the reference in 17.05A.100.K.12.</p> <p>They state ICC 17.02B defines geologic hazard areas as critical areas.</p> <p>17.05A.100.K.13 directs the determination of all critical area buffers as established in 17.02B. They find 17.02B does not establish geologic hazard buffers and refers to ICC 11.02 and 11.03, which they find also does not establish buffers.</p> <p>(13) This commenter asks how does the common line interact with steep slope setbacks?</p> <p>(14) Referring to 17.05A.100.K.15, this commenter asks how can someone determine what will happen over a 100-year period when building a residence along the shoreline of marine waters? They also do not see how someone can avoid the mandatory provisions of ICC 14.02A.050 or FEMA standards. They suggest replacing “shall” with “should” and including “to the extent feasible, referring to WAC 173-26-231.3.a.iii.A. Further, this commenter finds the SMP does not contain a section that includes a preference for permit issuance based upon age of an SFR, consistent with RCW 90.58.100.6 – standards governing the protection of SFRs and appurtenant structures against damage or loss due to shoreline erosion.</p>	<p>word shall rather than should in this context.</p> <p>15. See item 6 above.</p> <p>16. J.1 does apply to all setbacks in the shoreline. Island County uses a 100-year standard for the life of a home as called out in the SMP. Development along the remaining shoreline parcels in Island County will likely continue to be challenging with these factors.</p> <p>17. Staff agrees that the 250 yards mentioned as a residential appurtenance is not including grading related to building a single family residence.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

			<p>(15) This commenter finds the definition of “Geologically hazardous areas” includes soil liquefaction areas, which is not included in the definition of “geologically hazardous areas” in ICC 11.02 or ICC 17.02B.</p> <p>(16) This commenter asks if (e) of 17.05A.090.J.1 includes waterfront buffers and setbacks and steep slope buffers and setbacks? Mentions again, looking 100 years into the future when anticipating development is challenging when faced with climate change, sea level rise, king tides, and the County’s sinking islands.</p> <p>(17) This commenter finds the definition of residential appurtenance is flawed or misleading. They state the 250 cubic yard restriction pertains to grading that is not associated with the substantial development exemption for the construction of an SFR.</p> <p>The letter submitted by this commenter goes into detail. Please refer to the commenters’ letter for the full extent of their comments.</p>	
21	<p>(1) 17.05A.040(C)(4) – Shoreline Master Program</p> <p>(2) 17.05A.050.D – Applicability</p>	<a href="mailto:islandcountysmp@protonmail.com">islandcountysmp@protonmail.com</a>	<p>(1) This commenter asks why the exemptions established in 17.02B limited in the SMP to transportation, utilities, and existing structures? They question why specific exemptions of 17.02B are not exempt within shoreline jurisdiction when they are exempt outside of shoreline jurisdiction. See</p>	<p>1. These activities are exempt from the requirements of Chapter 17.02B and may still require shoreline permitting. The selected items were those that pose less risk of impact to critical areas or involve critical</p>

	<p>(3) 17.05A.060 – Shoreline environment designation and maps.</p> <p>(4) 17.05A.070 – Definitions</p> <p>(5) 17.05A.080 – Shoreline use classification</p> <p>(6)(7)(8)(9)(10)(11)(12)(13) 17.05A.090 – Shoreline use and development regulations</p> <p>(15) 17.05A.095 – Shoreline Reports</p> <p>(16)(17)(18) 17.05A.100 – Shoreline specific use regulations</p> <p>(19) 17.05A.110.A – Shoreline Stabilization.</p> <p>(20) 17.05A.110.D – Grading and filling.</p>		<p>the comment for the specific 17.02B exemptions listed.</p> <p>(2) Requests including a statement indicating the SMP is not intended to conflict or supersede the comp plan’s goals or policies.</p> <p>(3) This commenter finds the County should require application of the SMP’s SED criteria when there is a mapping error, not Ecology’s SMP handbook, referring to 17.05A.060.D.</p> <p>(4) This commenter finds inconsistent application of the Rural conservancy SED, referring to 17.05A.060.G. They state any lots with more than low density residential should be designated Shoreline Residential SED, pursuant to the designation criteria.</p> <p>(5) This commenter finds the County should not use the boundaries of ‘platted’ communities as a basis for the Shoreline Residential SED, referring to 17.05A.060.I. They also find the Historic Beach SED criteria should include language from the definition section because it contains more criteria than the actual designation criteria.</p> <p>(6) This commenter suggests edits for the following definitions: Beach enhancement; Boat launch; Flood control works; Gabions; Geotechnical analysis; Hazard tree; Jetty; Non structural stabilization; Normal</p>	<p>areas that have already been altered.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. The Shoreline Element of the Comprehensive Plan informs the SMP code. As such it is meant to reflect the goals and policies found in other elements of the Comprehensive Plan.</li> <li>3. Island County has not received Ecology’s Initial Determination with Required and Recommended changes. No further County initiated changes are proposed at this time.</li> <li>4. A county-wide investigation of shoreline environmental designations was not undertaken with this SMP update. Changes were limited to coastal lagoons and Historic Beach Communities.</li> <li>5. Cleaning up definitions will not be undertaken at this time. Island County has not received Ecology’s Initial Determination with Required and Recommended changes. No further County initiated changes are proposed at this time.</li> <li>6. See item 5 above.</li> <li>7. This clause allows for a project to be processed as a Shoreline Exemption if the applicant can identify a specific provision in the SMP that exempts their</li> </ol>
--	--	--	---	---

			<p>appurtenance; Normal protective bulkhead; Normal maintenance and repair; Pervious pavement; Primary structure; Replacement; Setback &amp; Shoreline Buffer; Shoreline jurisdiction; Shoreline stabilization; and, Tightlines. Please see the comment letter for the specific edits.</p> <p>(7) Referring to the use tables in 17.05A.080, this commenter points out a contradiction in the description of “conditional uses and developments” (I think).</p> <p>(8) This commenter asks why are private piers, docks, and floats a P1 (in the Shoreline Residential SED)? Finds they should be a P13.</p> <p>(9) This commenter asks why is a community master permit required to allow private piers and docks in the canal community designation? They do not believe a master permit should be required.</p> <p>(10) Referring to 17.05A.090.D.8, this commenter prefers the SMP defer and remain consistent with the County’s critical areas ordinance.</p> <p>(11) Referring to 17.05A.090.E.5, this commenter prefers this language to other language found in the SMP that refers to a 100-year analysis of risk.</p>	<p>project from a Conditional Use Permit.</p> <p>8. This is likely a typo that can be corrected.</p> <p>9. A community master plan allows a canal community with an approved canal community master plan to permit a dock/pier/float as a Shoreline Exemption instead of a Conditional Use permit.</p> <p>10. This was a consolidation of multiple sections and placed with the other critical area protections in the SMP.</p> <p>11. Island County has adopted 100 years as the life of a structure.</p> <p>12. That is a procedural issue, this section requires documentation demonstrating compliance.</p> <p>13. This code section was moved from 17.05A.090.D.13 and was not modified.</p> <p>14. Island County incorporated this section in the 2016 update in which critical areas codes were partially integrated into the SMP. No county-initiated changes are proposed at this time.</p> <p>15. This would be processed as an accessory structure, in general the exemption from a building permit does not exempt a development from land use permitting. Education about permitting is another option.</p>
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>(12) Referring to 17.05A.090.F.5.c, this commenter suggests the county establish as a condition of permit approval, compliance with applicable federal laws/regulations.</p> <p>(13) Referring to 17.05A.090.G, this commenter asks why not refer to the nomination criteria in ICC 17.02B?</p> <p>(14) This commenter suggests SMP stream buffers and stream buffer modification standards align with ICC 17.02B, referring to 17.05A.090.H.2 and H.2.b. The advocate for the same protections and same review process.</p> <p>(15) This commenter suggests inclusion of an allowance for small recreational structures (&gt;200sqft), i.e. deck, shed, with conditions of allowance, referring to 17.05A.090.H.2.d. They suggest this happens frequently, unpermitted, under the assumption of consistency with the &gt;200sqft exemption in the building code.</p> <p>(16) Referring to 17.05A.090.I.4 and Table 3, this commenter wants allowance for small recreational structures within the steep slope buffer. They believe the common line footnote of Table 5 will result in unintended consequences and more shoreline variances. They also state a concern for citing septic systems due to implementation of the footnote.</p>	<p>16. Such development could take place under current code. Geotechnical Reports and Biological Site Assessments are expensive and time consuming.</p> <p>17. 17.05A.090.J.1 are requirements for building within the shoreline buffer or setback. This is an extra allowance that calls for additional requirements. J.1.e and J.1.f are requirements only when structures are proposed within the shoreline buffer or setback. J.2 is requirements for building within the shoreline setback, no County initiated changes are proposed at this time. J4 controls development on non-conforming lots. 2,200 square feet refers to the size of the lot landward of the shoreline buffer and outside of the side and front yard setbacks, and then the driveway must be under 1,100 square feet. After that determination, the maximum footprint of all structures and impervious surfaces shall be no larger than 2,200 square feet. At no point in J.4 is there a maximum standard for reasonable use of 2,200 square feet development within shoreline. The common line buffer reduction allows a reduction of 50% of the buffer</p>
--	--	--	--	---

			<p>(17) This commenter has identified 15 edits of 17.05A.090.J. They find predictions extending 100-years unreasonable (J.1.e) and covenant unreasonable (J.1.f). They advocate for flexibility in the requirements for developments in the shoreline setback (J.2). Referring to J.4.b, this commenter asks if the 1,100 sqft allowance is in addition to the 2,200 sqft for the buildable area and does it only include areas in shoreline jurisdiction? They want the County to clarify the 2,200 sqft maximum applies only to non-conforming development and is not the maximum allowed for reasonable use for all development in the shoreline (J.4.c). Referring to J.4.h, advocate for the standard being the common line. They request a revision allowing the shoreline administrator to define the “waterward corners of the façade” (J.6) and suggest edits to the subsections (a) and (b). Finds Figures 6 and 7 are incorrect. Referring to J.6.c, asks why the 24 ft maximum, where did the number come from?</p> <p>(18) Referring to 17.05A.090.L.4, “standard shoreline buffer enhancement plan adopted by Island County”, this commenter asks if the county is capable of adopting a single plan for buffers of various shoreline environments?</p>	<p>width. J.6 concerns Shoreline Setback reductions. The Shoreline Administrator/Planning Director makes the final decision on which corner is the nearest waterward corner of the façade. The 50% of the shoreline buffer width is a hard limit, it is extremely unlikely a Variance would be approved at a greater than 50% buffer reduction. No changes are proposed to J.6 at this time. The reduction to a 24-foot setback is for Canal Communities, where there is a 0-foot buffer. This is a 40% reduction in the setback, and also controlled by the common line limitation so that a structure would not be closer than the neighboring structures.</p> <p>18. Presumably, such a plan would have to address different types of buffers to enhance.</p> <p>19. Code enforcement is complaint based in Island County. Buffer enhancement would have been a condition approval on a permit for this section to apply.</p> <p>20. The amount of development under this standard will be low, keeping the County from needing to perform a new cumulative impact analysis. 1:1</p>
--	--	--	---	---

		<p>(19) This commenter finds 17.05A.090.M.1.a.iii extreme, asking why not take enforcement action?</p> <p>(20) This commenter asks about the bio-assessment waiver in A.3.c. They ask how the County will determine environmental impacts and no net loss? How does this align with the buffer enhancement requirements?</p> <p>(21) Referring to 17.05A.100.E.3, the commenter suggests a description for how to measure the 1-mile and requirement of a geocoastal analysis and bio-assessment for all new private boat launches extending waterward of the OHW.</p> <p>(22) Referring to 17.05A.100.K, this commenter asks how docks, piers, boat launches and different from residential structures (K.11). They point to an inconsistency in the buffer for lots within the Natural SED in K.23 vs. Table 3 of 17.05A.090.I.4. Referring to K.24, they find 17.05A.100.C already has standards for beach access structures. They find the SMP should contain a provision in K.25.e to address existing decks when the house is lifted to get above flood elevation. They point to an inconsistency requiring enhancement for decks placed in the setback when the decks are considered pervious, and the mitigation requirements only apply to new impervious surfaces in the buffer and setback.</p>	<p>mitigation on site will still be required even without the BSA.</p> <p>21. Island County measures the 1 mile as a direct distance between points on a map. Private boat launches would require a BSA, however a Geocoastal Report is more for shoreline armoring.</p> <p>22. Docks, piers, and boat launches are categorized under Boating and Related Facilities. K.23 refers to a vegetative buffer, not a building setback/buffer. K.24 standards are for residential beach access structures. While it would be helpful to call out deck requirements when raising a structure out of the floodplain, no County initiated changes are proposed at this time. Decks are not typically counted as impervious surface, and current regulations do require mitigation.</p> <p>23. While that may be a helpful addition, no County initiated changes are proposed at this time.</p> <p>24. No County initiated changes are proposed at this time.</p> <p>25. 17.05A.110.D.1.g allows for fill below the OHWM as part of mitigation actions, shoreline restoration, or habitat enhancement projects. There would be no feasible</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>(23) This commenter finds 17.05A.100.N.7 should include a section dedicated to standards for construction of residential stormwater outfalls.</p> <p>(24) This commenter opposes changes to the requirements for shoreline armoring in canal communities (A.2.c)</p> <p>(25) This commenter wants clarification that placement of beach nourishment as mitigation or shoreline enhancement does not qualify as fill (D.2).</p> <p>The letter submitted by this commenter goes into detail. Please refer to the commenters' letter for the full extent of their comments.</p>	<p>alternative to placement in the flood hazard area, as that is where the beach nourishment would have to occur.</p>
22	<p>(1) 17.05A.070 – Definitions</p> <p>(2) 17.05A.110.A – Shoreline stabilization.</p>	Jim Black	<p>(1) This commenter suggests edits to the following definitions: Dredging; Shoreline stabilization, Soft shore stabilization. Please see the comment letter for the specific edits.</p> <p>(2) Referring to A.4., this commenter finds there needs to be criteria for when soft shore stabilization can be permitted. They also state there is no criteria for the repair of existing soft shore stabilization.</p> <p>The letter submitted by this commenter goes into detail. Please refer to the commenters' letter for the full extent of their comments.</p>	<p>1. The Board of Island County Commissioners decided to include the additional language in the <i>dredging</i> definition. Regular maintenance and repair of infrastructure should be evaluated at the time of project proposal, if a larger scope dredging occurs, it would be subject to all regulations in the SMP.</p> <p>Definition for <i>soft shore stabilization</i> redirects to <i>non-structural shoreline stabilization</i>.</p>

				<p>2. 17.05A.110.A.1 and Table 5 address permitting requirements for new or replacement soft-shore stabilization. Note 3 on Table 5 refers to the definition of <i>repair</i>, which redirects to <i>normal maintenance and repair</i>.</p>
--	--	--	--	---