

From: kkri@aol.com
Sent: Tuesday, January 28, 2020 11:18 AM
To: Phil Bourquin; Sarah Fox
Subject: Re: Mill Pond and SMP Shoreline

Categories: Planning Department

Good morning Phil and Sarah,

Thank you for updating the SMP with the mention of Mill Pond with the associated statement in the City's SMP. I peeked at the County's SMP and reviewed the Map where I see Mill pond marked on the Shorelines Map.

With SMP updates I am hoping that the associated wetlands maps will also update side by side to remove the wetlands not in the Shorelines of the State. I mention this because while attending the meetings with the consultants on the roundabout, on their drawing I saw Mill Pond's wetlands marked as such. I understand they needed to section of work area based on topography, however since SMP is being updated I wanted to bring to attention the wetlands as I believe wetlands and shorelines are two separate maps.

Thank you so much and have a great week.
manoj

-----Original Message-----

From: kkri <kkri@aol.com>
 To: PBourquin <PBourquin@cityofcamas.us>; SFox <SFox@cityofcamas.us>
 Sent: Fri, Nov 15, 2019 5:10 pm
 Subject: Re: Mill Pond and SMP Shoreline

Thank you Phil and Thank you Sarah

I appreciate you giving me some of your valuable time. Suggestion below is AWESOME, it clears a lot of doubts for me personally as well as it will help the new talent coming in to the City.

Thank you again and have a great weekend.

With my Kindest regards,
manoj

-----Original Message-----

From: Phil Bourquin <PBourquin@cityofcamas.us>
 To: kkri@aol.com <kkri@aol.com>; Sarah Fox <SFox@cityofcamas.us>
 Sent: Fri, Nov 15, 2019 4:36 pm
 Subject: RE: Mill Pond and SMP Shoreline

Manoj –

I spoke with Sarah earlier in the day. The City will update the Shoreline map identifying with words Mill Pond together over this body of water together with an asterisk * that will include a note something to the effect that the Mill Pond is not a body of water regulated under the Shoreline Management Plan. This map will be included in the update that is currently underway.

I believe, in doing so the concern of which we do not disagree will be mitigated.

Sincerely,



Phil Bourquin
 Community Development Director
 616 NE 4th Avenue
 Camas, WA 98607
www.cityofcamas.us | pbourquin@cityofcamas.us
 Phone: 360.817.1562

From: kkri@aol.com <kkri@aol.com>
Sent: Friday, November 15, 2019 4:27 PM
To: Sarah Fox <SFox@cityofcamas.us>
Cc: Phil Bourquin <PBourquin@cityofcamas.us>
Subject: Re: Mill Pond and SMP Shoreline

Hello Sarah,

Respectfully - Lets forget about Shoreline Management Plan - SMP for a few minutes, and pretend that we are a bunch of college kids and heard there is a 3 and a half acre water body in Camas called Mill Pond that became an issue for a property owner and the City of Camas 10 years ago and Court recognized this water body, so similar to them I am asking a simple question.

Where is Mill Pond and its shoreline? Which City document states the name MILL POND and shows where this "DISTINCT" water body is? Simple, short question.

Reason I am asking is

- 1) As a Tax payer and /or/a visitor/ and or a property owner in Camas - Where do I go to find Mill Pond and distinctly be able to see, feel, walk around this 3 and a half acre water body?
- 2) I stopped by the City office today and asked them if they can show me on a OFFICIAL CITY MAP where this water body is? They could not.
- 3) In the recent past I talked to a consultant hired by the City of Camas in the City Hall where I saw a map showing the water body that Court recognized as Mill Pond is marked "slough" Once again, like NARROW LAKE a map is floating in the City Hall because a highly paid consultant hired by the City of Camas does not know that "slough" is wrong and he has ALTERED a proper name, that was officially adopted almost 7 years ago and recognized as MILL POND.
- 4) I have asked you where can I see Mill Pond and I have yet not received anything in this email chain that tells me where in City's Documents or Maps, has the City recognized what the Court recognized with these words. (see attachment),

I am asking what do I need to do? Are you asking me to go back to Court who recognized this and ask them for more clarification? Even though City has gone through a plan modification each year since the decision, I dont see any map pointing to Mill Pond.

Please advise.

Thank you for your help,

manoj

-----Original Message-----

From: Sarah Fox <SFox@cityofcamas.us>
 To: kkri@aol.com <kkri@aol.com>
 Cc: Phil Bourquin <PBourquin@cityofcamas.us>
 Sent: Fri, Nov 15, 2019 9:30 am
 Subject: RE: Mill Pond and SMP Shoreline

Manoj,

The map is attached and is Appendix A. The map was adopted in 2012 and is consistent with the court decision. I am truly not understanding why you feel that it has changed recently?

2.1 Applicability

1. This Program shall apply to all of the shorelands and waters within the City of Camas that fall under the jurisdiction of RCW 90.58. Such shorelands shall include those lands extending **two hundred (200) feet** in all directions as measured on a horizontal plane from the ordinary high water mark (OHWM), floodways and contiguous floodplain areas landward two hundred feet from such floodways, associated wetlands, critical areas with associated buffer areas, river deltas associated with the streams, and lakes and tidal waters that are subject to the provisions of this program, as may be amended; the same to be designated as to location by Ecology, as defined by RCW 90.58.

Within the City of Camas the following waters are considered "shorelines" and are subject to the provisions of this Program: Lacamas Creek, Fallen Leaf Lake, Lacamas Lake, and Round Lake. The Columbia and Washougal Rivers are further identified as shorelines of statewide significance. A copy of the *Camas Shoreline Designations Map* and its UGA is shown in Appendix A.

The City is pre-designating shorelines within its adopted UGA. Until annexation occurs, all development in these areas will continue to be regulated by the Clark County Shoreline Master Program. The City's SMP will apply concurrent with annexation and no additional procedures are required by Ecology at the time of annexation (WAC 173-26-150) unless a re-designation is occurring as specified per Table 4-1 of this Program.

From: kkri@aol.com [<mailto:kkri@aol.com>]
Sent: Friday, November 15, 2019 2:50 AM
To: Sarah Fox <SFox@cityofcamas.us>
Cc: Phil Bourquin <PBourquin@cityofcamas.us>
Subject: Re: Mill Pond and SMP Shoreline

Sarah,

It has been two days. It is important for me to see where City has made the distinction between Mill Pond and Round lake. I do not see any Map that shows this distinctly either on a Map or in words. Can you help me with a link or email me a copy of the official map, or point me to the Muni Code where Courts decision is listed as ordered ?

Please advise.
 Thank you
 manoj

-----Original Message-----

From: kkri <kkri@aol.com>
 To: SFox <SFox@cityofcamas.us>
 Cc: PBourquin <PBourquin@cityofcamas.us>
 Sent: Wed, Nov 13, 2019 10:57 am
 Subject: Re: Mill Pond and SMP Shoreline

Sarah,

Thankyou for the reply.

If SMP map for 2020 will not show the official name of the water body and if SMP map will not change during this update process, then is there a different Map with the City Of Camas that I can download which shows the current official name of the water body as was adopted 7 years ago by the State of WA and shows on USGS maps at the Federal level.

I guess what is a reasonable number of years a Tax payer in Camas should wait to see the "official" name of Mill Pond on City's current map ?

What do I need to do so my request is officially accepted where City's maps show the water body with its official name ? In City's maps both water bodies Round Lake and Mill Pond get published **together** however the official name of "Mill Pond" is missing but Round Lake does get printed and creates a false image. .

Thank you
 manoj

-----Original Message-----

From: Sarah Fox <SFox@cityofcamas.us>
 To: kkri@aol.com <kkri@aol.com>
 Cc: Phil Bourquin <PBourquin@cityofcamas.us>
 Sent: Wed, Nov 13, 2019 9:44 am
 Subject: RE: Mill Pond and SMP Shoreline

Manoj,

Yes, we have begun the process of reviewing our shoreline plan for consistency with state requirements. At this early stage, there are a few mandatory amendments to the regulations, but none to our map. At this time, I am unaware of any state mandated changes that would affect the shoreline regulations to your property.

The city's current shoreline maps are consistent with the court decisions, and there aren't any proposals to change the map.

I will be working to keep the city's webpage current as the project progresses ("Shoreline Master Program" tab). I will include draft documents and notices about upcoming meetings. I will also add you to the list of those interested in receiving project updates.
<http://www.ci.camasa.wa.us/planning/planningenvironmentalshorelinemaster>

Best,
Sarah

From: kkri@aol.com [<mailto:kkri@aol.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, November 13, 2019 8:07 AM
To: Sarah Fox <SFox@cityofcamas.us>; Phil Bourquin <PBourquin@cityofcamas.us>
Subject: Fwd: Mill Pond and SMP Shoreline

Good morning Sarah,
Congratulations on your win in Vancouver.

I believe the City is going through the Shoreline Plan update and I wanted to start early and ask for your help on a couple of items.

1) Will the Shorelines around Mill Pond cause any issues for my property that I should be aware of so they can be taken into consideration in relation to the City's SMP update. If I need to do anything for my property rights or the proposed development plan I would like to know. Do you see any issues that will be new problems ?

2) I would like ensure that City's maps now show the separation of Mill Pond from Round Lake as was approved by the Shorelines Court along with WA DNR officially naming the water body Mill Pond as stated in RCW Chapter 237-990 as well as USGS maps show the name of the water body as Mill Pond.

Please advise if the City would need anything else from me to ensure the City's different maps and Maps included in SMP show the water body with its official name Mill Pond.

As always thank you for your help,
manoj

NOTICE OF PUBLIC DISCLOSURE: This e-mail account is public domain. Any correspondence from or to this e-mail account may be a public record. Accordingly, this e-mail, in whole or in part may be subject to disclosure pursuant to RCW 42.56, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.

Sarah Fox

From: kkri@aol.com
Sent: Friday, November 15, 2019 5:10 PM
To: Phil Bourquin; Sarah Fox
Subject: Re: Mill Pond and SMP Shoreline

Thank you Phil and Thank you Sarah

I appreciate you giving me some of your valuable time.
 Suggestion below is AWESOME, it clears a lot of doubts for me personally as well as it will help the new talent coming in to the City.

Thank you again and have a great weekend.

With my Kindest regards,
 manoj

-----Original Message-----

From: Phil Bourquin <PBourquin@cityofcamas.us>
 To: kkri@aol.com <kkri@aol.com>; Sarah Fox <SFox@cityofcamas.us>
 Sent: Fri, Nov 15, 2019 4:36 pm
 Subject: RE: Mill Pond and SMP Shoreline

Manoj –

I spoke with Sarah earlier in the day. The City will update the Shoreline map identifying with words Mill Pond together over this body of water together with an asterisk * that will include a note something to the effect that the Mill Pond is not a body of water regulated under the Shoreline Management Plan. This map will be included in the update that is currently underway.

I believe, in doing so the concern of which we do not disagree will be mitigated.

Sincerely,



Phil Bourquin
Community Development Director
 616 NE 4th Avenue
 Camas, WA 98607
www.cityofcamas.us | pbourquin@cityofcamas.us
 Phone: 360.817.1562

From: kkri@aol.com <kkri@aol.com>
Sent: Friday, November 15, 2019 4:27 PM
To: Sarah Fox <SFox@cityofcamas.us>
Cc: Phil Bourquin <PBourquin@cityofcamas.us>
Subject: Re: Mill Pond and SMP Shoreline

Hello Sarah,

Respectfully - Lets forget about Shoreline Management Plan - SMP for a few minutes, and pretend that we are a bunch of college kids and heard there is a 3 and a half acre water body in Camas called Mill Pond that became an issue for a property owner and the City of Camas 10 years ago and Court recognized this water body, so similar to them I am asking a simple question.

Where is Mill Pond and its shoreline? Which City document states the name MILL POND and shows where this "DISTINCT" water body is ? Simple , short question.

Reason I am asking is

- 1) As a Tax payer and /or/a visitor/ and or a property owner in Camas - Where do I go to find Mill Pond and distinctly be able to see, feel, walk around this 3 and a half acre water body?
- 2) I stopped by the City office today and asked them if they can show me on a OFFICIAL CITY MAP where this water body is ? They could not.
- 3) In the recent past I talked to a consultant hired by the City of Camas in the City Hall where I saw a map showing the water body that Court recognized as Mill Pond is marked "slough" Once again, like NARROW LAKE a map is floating in the City Hall because a highly paid consultant hired by the City of Camas does not know that "slough" is wrong and he has ALTERED a proper name, that was officially adopted almost 7 years ago.and recognized as MILL POND.
- 4) I have asked you where can I see Mill Pond and I have yet not received anything in this email chain that tells me where in City's Documents or Maps, has the City recognized what the Court recognized with these words. (see attachment),

I am asking what do I need to do ? Are you asking me to go back to Court who recognized this and ask them for more clarification ? Even though City has gone through a plan modification each year since the decision, I dont see any map pointing to Mill Pond.

Please advise.

Thank you for your help,

manoj

-----Original Message-----

From: Sarah Fox <SFox@cityofcamas.us>
 To: kkri@aol.com <kkri@aol.com>
 Cc: Phil Bourquin <PBourquin@cityofcamas.us>
 Sent: Fri, Nov 15, 2019 9:30 am
 Subject: RE: Mill Pond and SMP Shoreline

Manoj,

The map is attached and is Appendix A. The map was adopted in 2012 and is consistent with the court decision. I am truly not understanding why you feel that it has changed recently?

2.1 Applicability

1. This Program shall apply to all of the shorelands and waters within the City of Camas that fall under the jurisdiction of RCW 90.58. Such shorelands shall include those lands extending **two hundred (200) feet** in all directions as measured on a horizontal plane from the ordinary high water mark (OHWM), floodways and contiguous floodplain areas landward two hundred feet from such floodways, associated wetlands, critical areas with associated buffer areas, river deltas associated with the streams, and lakes and tidal waters that are subject to the provisions of this program, as may be amended; the same to be designated as to location by Ecology, as defined by RCW 90.58.

Within the City of Camas the following waters are considered "shorelines" and are subject to the provisions of this Program: Lacamas Creek, Fallen Leaf Lake, Lacamas Lake, and Round Lake. The Columbia and Washougal Rivers are further identified as shorelines of statewide significance. A copy of the *Camas Shoreline Designations Map* and its UGA is shown in Appendix A.

The City is pre-designating shorelines within its adopted UGA. Until annexation occurs, all development in these areas will continue to be regulated by the Clark County Shoreline Master Program. The City's SMP will apply concurrent with annexation and no additional procedures are required by Ecology at the time of annexation (WAC 173-26-150) unless a re-designation is occurring as specified per Table 4-1 of this Program.

From: kkri@aol.com [mailto:kkri@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, November 15, 2019 2:50 AM
To: Sarah Fox <SFox@cityofcamas.us>
Cc: Phil Bourquin <PBourquin@cityofcamas.us>
Subject: Re: Mill Pond and SMP Shoreline

Sarah,

It has been two days. It is important for me to see where City has made the distinction between Mill Pond and Round lake. I do not see any Map that shows this distinctly either on a Map or in words. Can you help me with a link or email me a copy of the official map, or point me to the Muni Code where Courts decision is listed as ordered ?

Please advise.
 Thank you
 manoj

-----Original Message-----

From: kkri <kkri@aol.com>
 To: SFox <SFox@cityofcamas.us>
 Cc: PBourquin <PBourquin@cityofcamas.us>
 Sent: Wed, Nov 13, 2019 10:57 am
 Subject: Re: Mill Pond and SMP Shoreline

Sarah,
 Thankyou for the reply.

If SMP map for 2020 will not show the official name of the water body and if SMP map will not change during this update process, then is there a different Map with the City Of Camas that I can download which shows the current official name of the water body as was adopted 7 years ago by the State of WA and shows on USGS maps at the Federal level.

I guess what is a reasonable number of years a Tax payer in Camas should wait to see the "official" name of Mill Pond on City's current map ?

What do I need to do so my request is officially accepted where City's maps show the water body with its official name ? In City's maps both water bodies Round Lake and Mill Pond get published **together** however the official name of "Mill Pond" is missing but Round Lake does get printed and creates a false image. .

Thank you
 manoj

-----Original Message-----

From: Sarah Fox <SFox@cityofcamas.us>
 To: kkri@aol.com <kkri@aol.com>
 Cc: Phil Bourquin <PBourquin@cityofcamas.us>
 Sent: Wed, Nov 13, 2019 9:44 am
 Subject: RE: Mill Pond and SMP Shoreline

Manoj,
 Yes, we have begun the process of reviewing our shoreline plan for consistency with state requirements. At this early stage, there are a few mandatory amendments to the regulations, but none to our map. At this time, I am unaware of any state mandated changes that would affect the shoreline regulations to your property.

The city's current shoreline maps are consistent with the court decisions, and there aren't any proposals to change the map.

I will be working to keep the city's webpage current as the project progresses ("Shoreline Master Program" tab). I will include draft documents and notices about upcoming meetings. I will also add you to the list of those interested in receiving project updates.
<http://www.ci.camas.wa.us/planning/planningenvironmentalshoreslinemaster>

Best,
 Sarah

From: kkri@aol.com [mailto:kkri@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 13, 2019 8:07 AM
To: Sarah Fox <SFox@cityofcamas.us>; Phil Bourquin <PBourquin@cityofcamas.us>
Subject: Fwd: Mill Pond and SMP Shoreline

Good morning Sarah,
 Congratulations on your win in Vancouver.

I believe the City is going through the Shoreline Plan update and I wanted to start early and ask for your help on a couple of items.

1) Will the Shorelines around Mill Pond cause any issues for my property that I should be aware of so they can be taken into consideration in relation to the City's SMP update. If I need to do anything for my property rights or the proposed development plan I would like to know. Do you see any issues that will be new problems ?

2) I would like ensure that City's maps now show the separation of Mill Pond from Round Lake as was approved by the Shorelines Court along with WA DNR officially naming the water body Mill Pond as stated in RCW Chapter 237-990 as well as USGS maps show the name of the water body as Mill Pond.

Please advise if the City would need anything else from me to ensure the City's different maps and Maps included in SMP show the water body with its official name Mill Pond.

As always thank you for your help,
manoj

NOTICE OF PUBLIC DISCLOSURE: This e-mail account is public domain. Any correspondence from or to this e-mail account may be a public record. Accordingly, this e-mail, in whole or in part may be subject to disclosure pursuant to RCW 42.56, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.

Prepared By	Jurisdiction	Date
Sarah Fox, Senior Planner	City of Camas	January 2020
<i>Kim Van Zwalenburg review *where no comment is provided, I concur with your proposed Action.</i>	<i>Department of Ecology</i>	<i>1/23/2020</i>

Row	Summary of change	Review	Action
2019			
a.	OFM adjusted the cost threshold for building freshwater docks	Page 12 (#8). Our city only has freshwater, so type of water body is not stated. Threshold amount must be updated.	Proposed with amendments <i>KVZ: Note the changes identified in the draft SMP to ensure the exemption is consistent with that in the law and our rule.</i>
b.	The Legislature removed the requirement for a shoreline permit for disposal of dredged materials at Dredged Material Management Program sites (<i>applies to 9 jurisdictions</i>)	This does not apply to our jurisdiction.	N/A
c.	The Legislature added restoring native kelp, eelgrass beds and native oysters as fish habitat enhancement projects.	Page 13 <u>Fish habitat enhancement projects</u> . Does not list project types, rather states that the project must conform to RCW 77.55.181 and be approved by WDFW. Page 6-29 <u>Shoreline Enhancement</u> . Does not specify projects.	No action needed
2017			
a.	OFM adjusted the cost threshold for substantial development to \$7,047.	Page 10 (#1). Threshold must be updated per statute.	Proposed with amendments <i>KVZ: Note change needed in definitions section.</i>
b.	Ecology permit rules clarified the definition of “development” does not include dismantling or removing structures.	Page 92, Definitions for “Development” does not include clarification. Staff concurs that it would be helpful.	Proposed to <u>add</u> to the definition at page 7-4 (#41) <u>“Development does not include dismantling or removing structures”</u>
c.	Ecology adopted rules clarifying exceptions to local review under the SMA .	These laws are not referenced in our SMP.	No action needed <i>KVZ: The specifics under WAC sections 173-27-044 and 045</i>

Row	Summary of change	Review	Action
			<p><i>identify process changes that may affect the city. I recommend you include a section briefly addressing these. It could be as simple as including a reference directly to the WAC sections in your Administration section which will give future planners a heads up. These exceptions apply whether you include them in the SMP or not because they are statutory. Note that exemption #12 is actually one of the listed exceptions. I recommend you delete it from the list.</i></p>
d.	<p>Ecology amended rules clarifying permit filing procedures consistent with a 2011 statute.</p>	<p>SMP is consistent with this language. Pages 92 (#40) “Date of Filing” and Appendix B at Section XIII - Permit Validity and Expiration.</p>	<p>No action needed. Addressed during comprehensive update. <i>KVZ: See some suggested revisions to that section (now XI in the Version 1 draft).</i></p>
e.	<p>Ecology amended forestry use regulations to clarify that forest practices that only involves timber cutting are not SMA “developments” and do not require SDPs.</p>	<p>SMP provides information on conversion to an allowed use. Forest Practice (Section 6.3.5).</p>	<p>N/A</p>
f.	<p>Ecology clarified the SMA does not apply to lands under exclusive federal jurisdiction</p>	<p>Does not apply to Camas</p>	<p>N/A</p>
g.	<p>Ecology clarified “default” provisions for nonconforming uses and development.</p>	<p>SMP is consistent. (Section 2.5) Nonconforming Development</p>	<p>No action needed. Addressed during comprehensive update.</p>
h.	<p>Ecology adopted rule amendments to clarify the scope and process for conducting periodic reviews.</p>	<p>SMP does not include this reference, therefore no change needs to be made.</p>	<p>No action needed</p>
i.	<p>Ecology adopted a new rule creating an optional SMP amendment process that allows for a shared local/state public comment period.</p>	<p>SMP and city code do not reference state process.</p>	<p>No action needed</p>

Row	Summary of change	Review	Action
j.	Submittal to Ecology of proposed SMP amendments. Rule: WAC 173-26-110, WAC 173-26-120, effective 9/7/2017.	The city can send revisions electronically instead of paper copies.	No action needed
2016			
a.	The Legislature created a new shoreline permit exemption for retrofitting existing structure to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act .	Exemptions at Section 2.3.2 do not include an ADA provision. Staff proposes to amend with exactly worded state provision.	Proposed to <u>add</u> the following (new #17): <u>“The external or internal retrofitting of an existing structure with the exclusive purpose of compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. Sec. 12101 et seq.) or to otherwise provide physical access to the structure by individuals with disabilities.”</u>
b.	Ecology updated wetlands critical areas guidance including implementation guidance for the 2014 wetlands rating system.	Ordinance No. 15-007 Camas adopted the mandated updates on July 27, 2015. Ecology provided final approval of the amendments on July 13, 2015.	No action needed as updates were adopted.
2015			
a.	The Legislature adopted a 90-day target for local review of Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) projects.	SMP does not include these WSDOT provisions of law.	May consider adding for clarity.
2014			
a.	The Legislature created a new definition and policy for floating on-water residences legally established before 7/1/2014.	Camas does not have any floating residences.	N/A <i>KVZ: See my comments on “floating home”. You might consider including the definition and adding a clear prohibition in your marina regulations.</i>
2012			
a.	The Legislature amended the SMA to clarify SMP appeal procedures .	Camas’ SMP does not outline the SMP appeal process and therefore no changes would need to be made to our SMP.	No action needed

Row	Summary of change	Review	Action
2011			
a.	Ecology adopted a rule requiring that wetlands be delineated in accordance with the approved federal wetland delineation manual .	Exact phrase is found at Appendix C, Section 16.53.030 <i>KV: 16.53.030 D.1</i>	No action needed. Addressed during comprehensive update.
b.	Ecology adopted rules for new commercial geoduck aquaculture .	Camas has no saltwater.	N/A
c.	The Legislature created a new definition and policy for floating homes permitted or legally established prior to January 1, 2011.	Camas has no floating homes.	N/A <i>KVZ: I did notice that you include a definition (#63) for "floating home". I recommend you revise it consistent with the statutory definition. You can then include a sentence in marinas prohibiting these. I also recommend you remove references to "houseboat". A houseboat, depending on how it is constructed, may fall under the floating on-water residence category. Basically, this issue is very tangled (and very political – there is currently a bill in the Legislature).</i>
d.	The Legislature authorizing a new option to classify existing structures as conforming .	In conformance with law. Section 2.7 Nonconforming Development	No action needed. Addressed during comprehensive update.
2010			
a.	The Legislature adopted Growth Management Act – Shoreline Management Act clarifications .	No reference to SMP amendments or the timing of Ecology’s final action is included in our SMP.	No action needed.
2009			
a.	The Legislature created new “relief” procedures for instances in which a shoreline restoration project within a UGA creates a shift in Ordinary High Water Mark.	No reference to law is given, however Staff recommends including for clarification.	May add for clarity to Section 3.9 Restoration (new #12), <u>“The City may grant relief from SMP development standards and use regulations resulting from shoreline restoration projects within urban growth areas</u>

Row	Summary of change	Review	Action
			<u>consistent with criteria and procedures in WAC 173-27-215."</u>
b.	Ecology adopted a rule for certifying wetland mitigation banks .	The city allows mitigation to occur at wetland bank in conformance with rules. App. C, page 158 (#5) Alternate Wetland Mitigation	No action needed. Addressed during comprehensive update.
c.	The Legislature added moratoria authority and procedures to the SMA.	No provisions for moratoria are stated within the SMP.	No action needed. Camas can rely on the statutory authority of the SMA.
2007			
a.	The Legislature clarified options for defining "floodway" as either the area that has been established in FEMA maps, or the floodway criteria set in the SMA.	Defined consistent with law. Page 95 (#66) Floodway	No action needed. Addressed during comprehensive update.
b.	Ecology amended rules to clarify that comprehensively updated SMPs shall include a list and map of streams and lakes that are in shoreline jurisdiction.	List of shorelines, streams and lakes is at Section 2.1. The shoreline map is at Appendix A (adopted with 2012 comprehensive update).	No action needed. Addressed during comprehensive update.
c.	Ecology's rule listing statutory exemptions from the requirement for an SDP was amended to include fish habitat enhancement projects that conform to the provisions of RCW 77.55.181.	Included as required by law. Refer to Section 2.4 (#16).	No action needed. Addressed during comprehensive update.

Additional amendments

The attached amendments reflect a proposal for modifying the processing of shoreline permits. The city's Shoreline Administrator will issue Shoreline Substantial Development Permits and Shoreline Exemptions. The city's Hearings Examiner will issue local recommended decisions on Shoreline Conditional Use Permits and Shoreline Variances. Other proposed amendments reflect changes in order to better manage local shoreline conditions, and reduce the number of variance applications.

KVZ: I recommend you add specific lines for the proposed changes by adding additional table rows. You can then track your proposed changes over time and identify how they are consistent with the SMA and SMP Guidelines and our other implementing rules. Showing how changes are consistent with the SMA and the Guidelines is required when submitting to Ecology for approval. The statutory and rule changes listed above automatically show this requirement. However, when you propose other revisions (such as new dock standards), you will need to ensure that consistency is demonstrated. An alternative approach is to also use the old comprehensive update submittal checklist and fill out the appropriate Shoreline Master Program Periodic Review Checklist

Sarah Fox

From: Van Zwalenburg, Kim (ECY) <kvan461@ECY.WA.GOV>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2020 4:06 PM
To: Sarah Fox
Subject: Waterward limit of jurisdiction

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi Sarah:

I left on Friday with the feeling I had forgotten something, and I had! I forgot to send on the information regarding the extent of jurisdiction in-water. Below is an excerpt from Chapter 5 of our Shoreline Master Programs Handbook, Chapter 5 Shoreline Jurisdiction.

In-water jurisdictional boundary

Local shoreline jurisdiction applies to the area waterward of the OHWM out to the local government's legal in-water jurisdictional boundary. Note that RCW 35.21.160 extends jurisdiction to the middle of water bodies such as bays, sounds, lakes and rivers, and RCW 35A.21.090 extends control of streets over tidelands. These sections of the RCW may affect the waterward shoreline jurisdiction boundary for some local governments.

The statutory language says the following:

RCW [35.21.160](#)

Jurisdiction over adjacent waters.

The powers and jurisdiction of all incorporated cities and towns of the state having their boundaries or any part thereof adjacent to or fronting on any bay or bays, lake or lakes, sound or sounds, river or rivers, or other navigable waters are hereby extended into and over such waters and over any tidelands intervening between any such boundary and any such waters to the middle of such bays, sounds, lakes, rivers, or other waters in every manner and for every purpose that such powers and jurisdiction could be exercised if the waters were within the city or town limits. In calculating the area of any town for the purpose of determining compliance with the limitation on the area of a town prescribed by RCW [35.21.010](#), the area over which jurisdiction is conferred by this section shall not be included. [[1969 c 124 § 1](#); [1965 c 7 § 35.21.160](#). Prior: [1961 c 277 § 4](#); [1909 c 111 § 1](#); RRS § 8892.]

This means the city jurisdiction extends to the middle of any waterway, or across the entire waterway if the city has jurisdiction of the shorelands on either side of the waterbody.

Hope that helps. Kim

From: [Jenna Kay](#)
To: "kkri@aol.com"
Subject: RE: [Contains External Hyperlinks] Re: [Contains External Hyperlinks] Re: [Contains External Hyperlinks] Re: Shoreline
Date: Friday, December 20, 2019 8:21:06 AM

Hi Manoj,

Thanks for your follow-up. I will add your additional email to the project website.

Also, I am confirming that we will use the current DNR lake and stream data for the labels on water features on our updated SMP map. So, Mill Pond will be labeled.

Regards,
Jenna



Jenna Kay
Planner II
COMMUNITY PLANNING

564.397.4968



From: kkri@aol.com [mailto:kkri@aol.com]
Sent: Thursday, December 19, 2019 9:59 PM
To: Jenna Kay
Subject: [Contains External Hyperlinks] Re: [Contains External Hyperlinks] Re: [Contains External Hyperlinks] Re: Shoreline

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of Clark County. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello Jenna,
Thank you for your note.

Since you are posting our communications to the project site, if I may ask, please add this reply as well so the loop is complete. .

I appreciate you discussing my concern (I sent to you earlier) with Ecology and City of Camas. Thank you.

From my lay person's understanding of Govt processes, it is my understanding that I as a member of the public through public comment am required to inform each agency that currently is using a Map with errors, so maps can be corrected before the final publication.

I forwarded to you what Ecology sent to me in Nov 2019 (I emailed you the copy/paste of RCW 43.30.294).

RCW 43.30.294 (3)

Whenever the board on geographic names has given a name to any lake, stream, place, or other geographic feature within the state, the name **must be used in all maps**, records, documents,

Therefore wherever I see a Map that shows Mill Pond connected to Round lake and not correctly reflecting its formal name, I am making it known so each agency fulfills the obligation to correctly identify waterbody in their map with the formal name so it does not create any confusion.

As a side note, I have reached out to the City, County and the State. I understand City of Camas has the primary responsibility within City limits. However if State, County or any other agency uses an incorrect map I am making it known so all agencies can correct their Maps before published in their SMPs..

Thank you for your help,

manoj

-----Original Message-----

From: Jenna Kay <Jenna.Kay@clark.wa.gov>

To: 'kkri@aol.com' <kkri@aol.com>

Sent: Thu, Dec 19, 2019 1:26 pm

Subject: RE: [Contains External Hyperlinks] Re: [Contains External Hyperlinks] Re: Shoreline

Hi Manoj,

Thanks again for reaching out the other day. I wanted to let you know that I will be getting your emails and attachments posted to our project website today.

I also wanted to reconnect with you regarding the Mill Pond information you provided, now that I have had a chance to review it in more detail and coordinate with the City of Camas and Department of Ecology.

Since Mill Pond is entirely within the City of Camas, you will want to continue working with the city on your Mill Pond requests and feedback, as it falls under their jurisdiction. The county's Shoreline Master Program only applies to waterbodies in the unincorporated areas of the county and, therefore, does not cover Mill Pond.

I recognize that the county's official shoreline map shows the shoreline areas in the cities, which is confusing. We are going to work on improving our maps so it's more clear that the county's Shoreline Master Program only applies to the unincorporated area.

Please let me know if you have any additional questions or would like to discuss this topic further.

Regards,
Jenna



Jenna Kay
Planner II
COMMUNITY PLANNING

564.397.4968



From: kkri@aol.com [mailto:kkri@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, December 10, 2019 1:38 PM
To: Jenna Kay
Subject: [Contains External Hyperlinks] Re: [Contains External Hyperlinks] Re: Shoreline

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of Clark County. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello Jenna,
I was reviewing the notes posted to the County website under public comments. I did not see my request/comment I submitted on Nov 11th as included. I am a bit puzzled as to how to have my concerns addressed so would like to ask if you need my comments in person ? O do I need to mail them to be part of the process you are undertaking so my request is included as Public comment during this update.

Please advise,
Thank you
manoj

-----Original Message-----
From: kkri <kkri@aol.com>
To: Jenna.Kay <Jenna.Kay@clark.wa.gov>
Sent: Sat, Nov 16, 2019 1:47 am
Subject: Re: [Contains External Hyperlinks] Re: Shoreline

Hello Jenna,
Additional info arrived from Olympia today which I wanted to share with you so you have the supporting information. The email I received pointed me to RCW 43.30.294 as copied below for a quick reference . She also encouraged me to share the info with local Jurisdiction which I already have by sharing with you. Thank you again. and I will wait for your confirmation and results of your research. Thank you , copy paste is below.

*****Start of Copy _____

RCW [43.30.294](#)

Board on geographic names—Adoption of names—Publication in the Washington State Register—Official names.

(1) The board on geographic names shall consider the recommendations made by the committee on geographic names for adoption of names. The board on geographic names must either adopt the name as recommended, or refer the matter back to the committee on

geographic names for further review.

(2) All geographic names adopted by the board on geographic names shall be published in the Washington State Register.

(3) Whenever the board on geographic names has given a name to any lake, stream, place, or other geographic feature within the state, the name must be used in all maps, records, documents, and other publications issued by the state or any of its departments and political subdivisions, and that name is the official name of the geographic feature.

***** End of Copy _____

]Thank you
manoj

-----Original Message-----

From: kkri <kkri@aol.com>
To: Jenna.Kay <Jenna.Kay@clark.wa.gov>
Sent: Tue, Nov 12, 2019 11:05 am
Subject: Re: [Contains External Hyperlinks] Re: Shoreline

Hi Jenna,
You are awesome !! Thank you.

Just to help I am attaching some maps that I received from WA DNR just in case it helps you save some time digging for them. Thank you again,
manoj

-----Original Message-----

From: Kay, Jenna <Jenna.Kay@clark.wa.gov>
To: 'kkri@aol.com' <kkri@aol.com>
Sent: Tue, Nov 12, 2019 10:56 am
Subject: RE: [Contains External Hyperlinks] Re: Shoreline

Hi Manoj,

Thanks for bringing Mill Pond to our attention. I will do some research on this item and then circle back to you.

Also, attached please find excerpts of the shoreline map I was trying to link you to; as you noted, Mill Pond is not labeled on the map.

Regards,
Jenna



Jenna Kay
Planner II
COMMUNITY PLANNING

564.397.4968



From: kkri@aol.com [mailto:kkri@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 12, 2019 10:19 AM
To: Kay, Jenna
Subject: [Contains External Hyperlinks] Re: Shoreline

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of Clark County. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Good morning Jenna,
Thank you for your prompt reply.

The first link below did not work the second did bring up the list of the water bodies.

I am asking for assistance as the Shoreline Map does not show the name of the water body known as "Mill Pond" this distinction and separation would be very help full as Round lake is in the program, and typically both show up on the maps together (they are connected). Not having the name Mill Pond and showing the name Round Lake makes it appear that both water bodies are Roundlake. It would be greatly appreciated to insert the name as the smaller water body now has its official name since 2013.

If i need to do anything else please advise.

Thank you for you help
manoj

-----Original Message-----

From: Kay, Jenna <Jenna.Kay@clark.wa.gov>
To: 'kkri@aol.com' <kkri@aol.com>
Sent: Tue, Nov 12, 2019 9:46 am
Subject: RE: Shoreline

Hello Manoj,

Thank you for your inquiry.

The following link will take you to a copy of the current shoreline map which includes labels for most of the lakes and streams in the program:

https://www.clark.wa.gov/sites/default/files/dept/files/community-planning/County_SD_Poster_Mapbook_36x44_Revised_SDs%5B1%5D.pdf.

Also, the Clark County Code includes a complete list of all the waterbodies in the program. Here is a link to the relevant section: <https://www.codepublishing.com/WA/ClarkCounty/?ClarkCounty40/ClarkCounty40460/ClarkCounty40460210.html#40.460.210>.

Please let me know if you run into any issues with the links or have additional questions.

Regards,
Jenna



Jenna Kay
Planner II
COMMUNITY PLANNING

564.397.4968



From: kkri@aol.com [mailto:kkri@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, November 11, 2019 8:40 AM
To: Kay, Jenna
Subject: Shoreline

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of Clark County. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Good morning Jenna,

I missed the open house in Sept and wanted to ask which is the main map that is used by the County for the shorelines master program that shows the names of the different lakes and streams in Clark County? I understand different layers are used in map building, however where do the names of lakes and streams come from?

Thank you
manoj

This e-mail and related attachments and any response may be subject to public disclosure under state law.

This e-mail and related attachments and any response may be subject to public disclosure under state law.

This e-mail and related attachments and any response may be subject to public disclosure under state law.



WASHINGTON STATE DEPARTMENT OF
Natural Resources

PETER GOLDMARK
Washington State Commissioner of Public Lands

ENVIRONMENTAL AND LAND USE HEARINGS OFFICE

May 22, 2012

Manoj Kripelani
27615 SE Robinson Road
Camas, WA 98607

RECEIVED

MAY 22 2012

Dear Mr. Kripelani,

Congratulations! At the May 18, 2012 meeting of the Washington State Committee on Geographic Names, the Committee voted to send your application to name **Mill Pond** to the Washington State Board on Geographic Names with the Committee's recommendation to approve.

The Committee's recommendation, along with all information provided in the proposal, will be presented to the Board for consideration at their July 3, 2012 meeting. If you have any questions, please call me at (360) 902-1280 or email me at caleb.maki@dnr.wa.gov.

Thank you for your interest in geographic names.

Sincerely,

Caleb Maki, Executive Secretary
Washington State Committee on Geographic Names
P.O. Box 47030
Olympia, WA 98504-7030
(360) 902-1280
caleb.maki@dnr.wa.gov

Feature Detail Report for: Mill Pond

ID: 2750141
Name: Mill Pond
Class: Lake ([Definitions](#))
History: Named for a former mill near the site
Description: 3.5 acres; located just W of Round Lake, 1,500 ft. SE of Lacamas Lake, 1 mi. N of the City of Camas; Sec. 47, T1N, R3E, Willamette Meridian
Citation: U.S. Board on Geographic Names. Geographic Names Post Phase I Board/Staff Revisions. 12-SEP-2013.
Entry Date: 13-Sep-2013
*Elevation: 180/55

*Elevations in feet/meters from the [National Elevation Dataset](#)

Board on Geographic Names Decisions

Name	Authority	Decision Type	BGN
Mill Pond	Board Decision	Official	2013

BGN Subject Folders: (Click arrow to open folder)

Correspondence: 


Forms: 

Counties

Sequence	County	Code	State	Code	Country
1	Clark	011	Washington	53	US

Help Data Download Services

Find address or place



Scale: 1:18,056
Zoom Level: 15

-122.384 45.611 Degrees

WASHINGTON STATE LEGISLATURE

Legislature Home WACs > Title 237 > Chapter 237-990 NOTE: HTML has links - PDF has Authentication Print This Page

House of Representatives
Senate
Find Your District
Rules & Agency Rules
Bill Information
Agendas, Schedules, and Calendars
Legislative Committee

Chapter 237-990 WAC Last Update: 12/15/17

APPENDIX—DETERMINATION OF GEOGRAPHIC NAMES

118-0210 W (reading). Approved 9-13-83.

MILL POND: Lake; 0.01 km² (3.5 acres), located N of the City of Camas in Round Lake County Park; Named for the local paper mill; Clark County, WA; Sec. 47, T 1 N, R 3 E, W.M.; 45° 36' 3.813" N, 122° 24' 17.921["] W. Approved 2/5/2013.

Sarah Fox

From: kkri@aol.com
Sent: Friday, November 15, 2019 5:10 PM
To: Phil Bourquin; Sarah Fox
Subject: Re: Mill Pond and SMP Shoreline

Thank you Phil and Thank you Sarah

I appreciate you giving me some of your valuable time.
 Suggestion below is AWESOME, it clears a lot of doubts for me personally as well as it will help the new talent coming in to the City.

Thank you again and have a great weekend.

With my Kindest regards,
 manoj

-----Original Message-----

From: Phil Bourquin <PBourquin@cityofcamas.us>
 To: kkri@aol.com <kkri@aol.com>; Sarah Fox <SFox@cityofcamas.us>
 Sent: Fri, Nov 15, 2019 4:36 pm
 Subject: RE: Mill Pond and SMP Shoreline

Manoj –

I spoke with Sarah earlier in the day. The City will update the Shoreline map identifying with words Mill Pond together over this body of water together with an asterisk * that will include a note something to the effect that the Mill Pond is not a body of water regulated under the Shoreline Management Plan. This map will be included in the update that is currently underway.

I believe, in doing so the concern of which we do not disagree will be mitigated.

Sincerely,



Phil Bourquin
Community Development Director
 616 NE 4th Avenue
 Camas, WA 98607
www.cityofcamas.us | pbourquin@cityofcamas.us
 Phone: 360.817.1562

From: kkri@aol.com <kkri@aol.com>
Sent: Friday, November 15, 2019 4:27 PM
To: Sarah Fox <SFox@cityofcamas.us>
Cc: Phil Bourquin <PBourquin@cityofcamas.us>
Subject: Re: Mill Pond and SMP Shoreline

Hello Sarah,

Respectfully - Lets forget about Shoreline Management Plan - SMP for a few minutes, and pretend that we are a bunch of college kids and heard there is a 3 and a half acre water body in Camas called Mill Pond that became an issue for a property owner and the City of Camas 10 years ago and Court recognized this water body, so similar to them I am asking a simple question.

Where is Mill Pond and its shoreline? Which City document states the name MILL POND and shows where this "DISTINCT" water body is ? Simple , short question.

Reason I am asking is

- 1) As a Tax payer and /or/a visitor/ and or a property owner in Camas - Where do I go to find Mill Pond and distinctly be able to see, feel, walk around this 3 and a half acre water body?
- 2) I stopped by the City office today and asked them if they can show me on a OFFICIAL CITY MAP where this water body is ? They could not.
- 3) In the recent past I talked to a consultant hired by the City of Camas in the City Hall where I saw a map showing the water body that Court recognized as Mill Pond is marked "slough" Once again, like NARROW LAKE a map is floating in the City Hall because a highly paid consultant hired by the City of Camas does not know that "slough" is wrong and he has ALTERED a proper name, that was officially adopted almost 7 years ago.and recognized as MILL POND.
- 4) I have asked you where can I see Mill Pond and I have yet not received anything in this email chain that tells me where in City's Documents or Maps, has the City recognized what the Court recognized with these words. (see attachment),

I am asking what do I need to do ? Are you asking me to go back to Court who recognized this and ask them for more clarification ? Even though City has gone through a plan modification each year since the decision, I dont see any map pointing to Mill Pond.

Please advise.

Thank you for your help,

manoj

-----Original Message-----

From: Sarah Fox <SFox@cityofcamas.us>
 To: kkri@aol.com <kkri@aol.com>
 Cc: Phil Bourquin <PBourquin@cityofcamas.us>
 Sent: Fri, Nov 15, 2019 9:30 am
 Subject: RE: Mill Pond and SMP Shoreline

Manoj,

The map is attached and is Appendix A. The map was adopted in 2012 and is consistent with the court decision. I am truly not understanding why you feel that it has changed recently?

2.1 Applicability

1. This Program shall apply to all of the shorelands and waters within the City of Camas that fall under the jurisdiction of RCW 90.58. Such shorelands shall include those lands extending **two hundred (200) feet** in all directions as measured on a horizontal plane from the ordinary high water mark (OHWM), floodways and contiguous floodplain areas landward two hundred feet from such floodways, associated wetlands, critical areas with associated buffer areas, river deltas associated with the streams, and lakes and tidal waters that are subject to the provisions of this program, as may be amended; the same to be designated as to location by Ecology, as defined by RCW 90.58.

Within the City of Camas the following waters are considered "shorelines" and are subject to the provisions of this Program: Lacamas Creek, Fallen Leaf Lake, Lacamas Lake, and Round Lake. The Columbia and Washougal Rivers are further identified as shorelines of statewide significance. A copy of the *Camas Shoreline Designations Map* and its UGA is shown in Appendix A.

The City is pre-designating shorelines within its adopted UGA. Until annexation occurs, all development in these areas will continue to be regulated by the Clark County Shoreline Master Program. The City's SMP will apply concurrent with annexation and no additional procedures are required by Ecology at the time of annexation (WAC 173-26-150) unless a re-designation is occurring as specified per Table 4-1 of this Program.

From: kkri@aol.com [mailto:kkri@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, November 15, 2019 2:50 AM
To: Sarah Fox <SFox@cityofcamas.us>
Cc: Phil Bourquin <PBourquin@cityofcamas.us>
Subject: Re: Mill Pond and SMP Shoreline

Sarah,

It has been two days. It is important for me to see where City has made the distinction between Mill Pond and Round lake. I do not see any Map that shows this distinctly either on a Map or in words. Can you help me with a link or email me a copy of the official map, or point me to the Muni Code where Courts decision is listed as ordered ?

Please advise.
 Thank you
 manoj

-----Original Message-----
From: kkri <kkri@aol.com>
To: SFox <SFox@cityofcamas.us>
Cc: PBourquin <PBourquin@cityofcamas.us>
Sent: Wed, Nov 13, 2019 10:57 am
Subject: Re: Mill Pond and SMP Shoreline

Sarah,
 Thankyou for the reply.

If SMP map for 2020 will not show the official name of the water body and if SMP map will not change during this update process, then is there a different Map with the City Of Camas that I can download which shows the current official name of the water body as was adopted 7 years ago by the State of WA and shows on USGS maps at the Federal level.

I guess what is a reasonable number of years a Tax payer in Camas should wait to see the "official" name of Mill Pond on City's current map ?

What do I need to do so my request is officially accepted where City's maps show the water body with its official name ? In City's maps both water bodies Round Lake and Mill Pond get published **together** however the official name of "Mill Pond" is missing but Round Lake does get printed and creates a false image .

Thank you
 manoj

-----Original Message-----
From: Sarah Fox <SFox@cityofcamas.us>
To: kkri@aol.com <kkri@aol.com>
Cc: Phil Bourquin <PBourquin@cityofcamas.us>
Sent: Wed, Nov 13, 2019 9:44 am
Subject: RE: Mill Pond and SMP Shoreline

Manoj,
 Yes, we have begun the process of reviewing our shoreline plan for consistency with state requirements. At this early stage, there are a few mandatory amendments to the regulations, but none to our map. At this time, I am unaware of any state mandated changes that would affect the shoreline regulations to your property.

The city's current shoreline maps are consistent with the court decisions, and there aren't any proposals to change the map.

I will be working to keep the city's webpage current as the project progresses ("Shoreline Master Program" tab). I will include draft documents and notices about upcoming meetings. I will also add you to the list of those interested in receiving project updates.
<http://www.ci.camasa.wa.us/planning/planningenvironmentalshoreslinemaster>

Best,
 Sarah

From: kkri@aol.com [mailto:kkri@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 13, 2019 8:07 AM
To: Sarah Fox <SFox@cityofcamas.us>; Phil Bourquin <PBourquin@cityofcamas.us>
Subject: Fwd: Mill Pond and SMP Shoreline

Good morning Sarah,
 Congratulations on your win in Vancouver.

I believe the City is going through the Shoreline Plan update and I wanted to start early and ask for your help on a couple of items.

1) Will the Shorelines around Mill Pond cause any issues for my property that I should be aware of so they can be taken into consideration in relation to the City's SMP update. If I need to do anything for my property rights or the proposed development plan I would like to know. Do you see any issues that will be new problems ?

2) I would like ensure that City's maps now show the separation of Mill Pond from Round Lake as was approved by the Shorelines Court along with WA DNR officially naming the water body Mill Pond as stated in RCW Chapter 237-990 as well as USGS maps show the name of the water body as Mill Pond.

Please advise if the City would need anything else from me to ensure the City's different maps and Maps included in SMP show the water body with its official name Mill Pond.

As always thank you for your help,
manoj

NOTICE OF PUBLIC DISCLOSURE: This e-mail account is public domain. Any correspondence from or to this e-mail account may be a public record. Accordingly, this e-mail, in whole or in part may be subject to disclosure pursuant to RCW 42.56, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.

From: [Jenna Kay](#)
To: "[William K Mathison](#)"
Subject: RE: Shoreline Master Plan feedback - Marinas
Date: Friday, February 7, 2020 7:55:04 AM

Mr. Mathison,

I am writing to confirm receipt of your comment and to thank you for your participation in the county's Shoreline Master Plan periodic review project.

In case it's helpful to know, in addition to the county's Shoreline Master Program review, each of the cities in Clark County will also be reviewing their Shoreline Master Programs over the course of the next year to year and a half, and will also be holding comment periods. I encourage you to share your comments with these other local jurisdictions as well.

Regards,
Jenna



Jenna Kay
Planner II
COMMUNITY PLANNING

564.397.4968



From: William K Mathison [mailto:outlook_B7B3E16CDC438A8B@outlook.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 6, 2020 4:36 PM
To: Jenna Kay
Subject: Shoreline Master Plan feedback - Marinas

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of Clark County. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Jenna,

One thing that needs to be improved with the Shoreline Master Plan is the marina situation in Clark County. Marina improvements at existing marinas and adding a Marina to The Waterfront in downtown Vancouver.

The Ridgefield Marina needs more transient moorage/boat rental slips and docks. It has a small/newer covered boat slip building that is very nice but the few uncovered docks and slips are so

primitive and rickety a boat would surely get scratched and dented using them, and the electrical looks scary. The few marinas, docks, and boat slips we have on Washington shores should be kept in first class condition NOT distressed.

The Waterfront development in downtown Vancouver made a huge mistake not expanding the ridiculously tiny little transient boat dock. With the new Waterfront Vancouver should be a boating destination. It should have a marina similar to the Riverplace Marina in downtown Portland. The excuses I have heard for not including a nice marina at the biggest City on the Columbia River Washington waterfront are very lame... I consider the excuses an abuse of power by environmental extremists who want everything off limits to humans. There needs to be more balance than that.

The Camas/Washougal Marina is very nice. Bottom line Clark County deserves decent Marinas in Ridgefield, Vancouver, and Camas/Washougal to cover the west, central, and eastern sides of the County. Steamboat landing is a nice private marina but not much of a destination for transient visitors.

This is not too much to ask. Just look at all the marinas on the Portland side. This would be a fraction of what they have. I am not a lone voice on this subject.

Sincerely,

William K Mathison
Battle Ground, WA
360-903-5951

From: [Jenna Kay](#)
To: "SHARLEEN JAMES"
Subject: RE: Shoreline program
Date: Monday, February 10, 2020 10:11:03 AM

Hello,

Thanks for reaching out.

There are no proposed changes in the county's proposal related to boater access on private property. Does that answer your question? If not, please let me know.

Also, in case it is helpful: the county's proposal only applies to the unincorporated areas in Clark County. If your property happens to be located in one of the cities along the Columbia, i.e. Vancouver, Camas, or Washougal, then the county's proposal would not apply to you.

Please let me know if I can provide any additional information.

Regards,
Jenna



Jenna Kay
Planner II
COMMUNITY PLANNING

564.397.4968



-----Original Message-----

From: SHARLEEN JAMES [mailto:sjames2996@aol.com]
Sent: Saturday, February 8, 2020 4:38 PM
To: Jenna Kay
Subject: Shoreline program

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of Clark County. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi. I happen to own tide lands along the Columbia River. Are you proposing any changes such as letting boaters up on our property such as Oregon does?

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Jenna Kay](#)
To: [Gary Medvigy](#)
Cc: [Lindsey Shafar](#); [Oliver Orjiako](#); [Christine Cook](#); [Kristin Davidson](#)
Subject: RE: Project Update: Shoreline Master Program Periodic Review
Date: Friday, June 5, 2020 1:03:00 PM

Thank you Councilor Medvigy. I can work with Kristin to get a call scheduled.

From: Gary Medvigy <Gary.Medvigy@clark.wa.gov>
Sent: Friday, June 5, 2020 12:40 PM
To: Jenna Kay <Jenna.Kay@clark.wa.gov>
Cc: Lindsey Shafar <Lindsey.Shafar@clark.wa.gov>; Oliver Orjiako <Oliver.Orjiako@clark.wa.gov>; Christine Cook <Christine.Cook@clark.wa.gov>
Subject: Re: Project Update: Shoreline Master Program Periodic Review

I have questions specific to Lacamas lake... maybe we can do a zoom call?
Best, Gary

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Jenna Kay <Jenna.Kay@clark.wa.gov>
Sent: Friday, June 5, 2020 10:06:20 AM
To: Gary Medvigy <Gary.Medvigy@clark.wa.gov>
Cc: Lindsey Shafar <Lindsey.Shafar@clark.wa.gov>; Oliver Orjiako <Oliver.Orjiako@clark.wa.gov>; Christine Cook <Christine.Cook@clark.wa.gov>
Subject: RE: Project Update: Shoreline Master Program Periodic Review

Good morning Councilor Medvigy,

We are writing to follow-up on the below email to see if you have any questions for us. Please let us know if you do. We know you are very busy with COVID-19 matters.

Regards,
Jenna



Jenna Kay
Planner II
COMMUNITY PLANNING

564.397.4968



From: Jenna Kay

Sent: Thursday, May 14, 2020 5:03 PM

To: Gary Medvigy <Gary.Medvigy@clark.wa.gov>

Cc: Lindsey Shafar <Lindsey.Shafar@clark.wa.gov>; Oliver Orjiako <Oliver.Orjiako@clark.wa.gov>;
Christine Cook <Christine.Cook@clark.wa.gov>

Subject: Project Update: Shoreline Master Program Periodic Review

Greetings Councilor Medvigy,

I am writing today regarding the Shoreline Master Program Periodic Review project. Shortly before the COVID-19 stay at home order went into effect, Community Planning had requested a conversation with Council to provide an update on the Shoreline Master Program (SMP) Periodic Review project. In lieu of an in-person discussion, attached please find a written update on this project and a proposal for next steps.

There are four items attached for your consideration, as follows:

- **Project update** memo
- Appendix A: **Summary of comments** received during a 30-day public comment period held in early 2020
- Appendix B: Copies of the ten (10) **comments** received
- Appendix C: Current **draft proposed amendments**. There are no major policy changes in the proposal. Amendments in response to comments are highlighted; many address feedback from Ecology to bring the SMP into compliance with updated critical areas requirements.

Please let Oliver and me know if you have any questions.

Thank you,
Jenna



Jenna Kay
Planner II
COMMUNITY PLANNING

564.397.4968



From: Van Zwalenburg, Kim (ECY) <kvan461@ECY.WA.GOV>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 8:20 AM
To: Sarah Fox
Subject: SMP Appendix C - CAO - follow up

Hi Sarah: I skimmed through the CAO in Appendix C again to see if I could narrow down (or even identify) where I have concerns. My review reminded me that while the CAO provisions refer to “wetland permits”, it also addresses how these get processed in 16.53.050 G. Wetland Permit—Processing, so I am ok with how that section reads.

16.53.050 G. Wetland Permit—Processing

1. Procedures. Wetland permit applications within shoreline jurisdiction shall be processed using the application procedures in this Program, Appendix B – Administration and Enforcement, unless specifically modified herein: ...

I do, however, recommend you revise 16.53.050 Wetland permits, for a more robust list of minimization measures. All applicable minimization measures be used in order to get a reduction in the buffer widths required for High Intensity land use to the Moderate Intensity buffer widths. I have also done a minor edit which is shown below in red.

Disturbance	Measures to Minimize Impacts
Lights	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct lights away from wetland
Noise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Locate activity that generates noise away from wetland • If warranted, enhance existing buffer with native vegetation plantings adjacent to noise source • For activities that generate relatively continuous, potentially disruptive noise, such as certain heavy industry or mining, establish an additional 10’ heavily vegetated buffer strip immediately adjacent to the outer wetland buffer
Toxic runoff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Route all new, untreated runoff away from wetland while ensuring wetland is not dewatered • Establish covenants limiting use of pesticides within 150 ft of wetland • Apply integrated pest management
Stormwater runoff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retrofit stormwater detention and treatment for roads and existing adjacent development • Prevent channelized flow from lawns that directly enters the buffer • Use Low Intensity Development techniques (for more information refer to the drainage ordinance and manual)
Change in water regime	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infiltrate or treat, detain, and disperse into buffer new runoff from impervious surfaces and new lawns
Pets and human disturbance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use privacy fencing OR plant dense vegetation to delineate buffer edge and to discourage disturbance using vegetation appropriate for the ecoregion • Place wetland and its buffer in a separate tract or protect with a conservation easement
Dust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use best management practices to control dust

Existing language:

16.53.050 Wetland permits

C. Buffer Standards and Authorized Activities. The following additional standards apply for regulated activities in a wetland buffer to ensure no net loss of ecological functions and values:

1. Buffer Reduction Incentives. Standard buffer widths may be reduced under the following conditions, provided that functions of the post-project wetland are equal to or greater after use of these incentives.
 - a. Lower Impact Land Uses. The buffer widths recommended for proposed land uses with high-intensity impacts to wetlands can be reduced to those recommended for moderate-intensity impacts if both of the following criteria are met:
 - i. A relatively undisturbed, vegetated corridor at least one hundred feet wide is protected between the wetland and any other priority habitats that are present as defined by the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife*; and
 - ii. **All applicable measures to minimize the impacts of the land use adjacent to the wetlands are applied**, such as infiltration of stormwater, retention of as much native vegetation and soils as possible, direction of noise and light away from the wetland, and other measures that may be suggested by a qualified wetland professional.

- b. Restoration. Buffer widths may be reduced up to twenty-five percent if the buffer is restored or enhanced from a pre-project condition that is disturbed (e.g., dominated by invasive species), so that functions of the post-project wetland and buffer are equal or greater. To the extent possible, restoration should provide a vegetated corridor of a minimum one hundred feet wide between the wetland and any other priority habitat areas as defined by the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife. The habitat corridor must be protected for the entire distance between the wetland and the priority habitat area by some type of permanent legal protection such as a covenant or easement. The restoration plan must meet requirements in subsection D of this section for a mitigation plan, and this section for a critical area report.
- c. Combined Reductions. Buffer width reductions allowed under subsections (C)(1)(a) and (C)(1)(b) of this section may be added provided that minimum buffer widths shall never be less than seventy-five percent of required buffer width for all Categories I and II, or less than fifty feet for Category III wetlands, and twenty-five feet for all Category IV wetlands.
2. Buffer Averaging. Averaging buffers is allowed in conjunction with any of the other provisions for reductions in buffer width (listed in subsection (C)(1) of this section) provided that minimum buffer widths listed in subsection (C)(1)(c) of this section are adhered to. The community development department shall have the authority to average buffer widths on a case-by-case basis, where a qualified wetlands professional demonstrates, as part of a critical area report, that all of the following criteria are met...

Hope you have a nice weekend. I will try to call or link in to the meeting on the 21st to hear the discussion.

Kim

Kim Van Zwahlenburg, Senior Shoreline Planner
Department of Ecology - Southwest Regional Office
PO Box 47775 Olympia, WA. 98504-7775
(360) 407-6520 voicemail forwards to email; Cell: (360) 742-2074

WA State Department of Ecology Southwest Regional Office is not accepting walk-in service from the public until further notice as we adhere to a statewide effort to slow the spread of the coronavirus (COVID-19). Regional staff are available by telephone and email, and information is also available on our [website](#). We remain committed to service, so don't hesitate to reach out to us.