

PROJECT MEMO



TO: John Light, Public Works Director
City of Gold Bar
107 5th Street
Gold Bar, WA 98251

FROM: Brad Medrud

DATE: December 10, 2010

PROJECT: Gold Bar SMP Update

OUR FILE NO.: 209372.30, Task 2

SUBJECT: Response to Questions on Draft Task 2 Report

Civil Engineers

Structural Engineers

Landscape Architects

Community Planners

Natural Resource Ecologists

Land Surveyors

Neighbors

Andrea Halverson provided the following questions to the City by e-mail on October 25, 2010.

1. I would like to have details regarding public access to the waterways.
 - a. What does that involve?

The SMP Guidelines require local governments to “identify public access needs and opportunities within the jurisdiction and explore actions to enhance shoreline recreation facilities” (WAC 173-26-201(3)(d)(v)).

Sites that currently provide public access, both physical and visual access, such as existing public parks and open space, are identified during the shoreline inventory process and documented in the shoreline inventory and characterization report. Additional public access opportunities may be identified during the inventory or through the public process.

- b. Is it mandatory to include public access?

It is mandatory that the SMP update “identify public access needs and opportunities.” Actually meeting those needs will likely come through existing land owned by the City now or as future opportunities, such as land purchases by the City or a land use action, such as a subdivision.

- c. Also, will property owners have input regarding what is acceptable maintenance for our shoreline land?

Yes. According to the Department of Ecology, the state Shoreline Management Act requires people representing different community interests develop local shoreline programs and permit processes. These interests usually include shoreline property owners, developers, businesses, environmental and conservation groups, recreation organizations, Indian tribes, farmers and agricultural interests, and local and state governments.

TACOMA

2215 North 30th Street
Suite 300
Tacoma, WA 98403-3350
253.383.2422 TEL
253.383.2572 FAX

SEATTLE

1200 6th Avenue
Suite 1620
Seattle, WA 98101-3117
206.267.2425 TEL
206.267.2429 FAX

SPOKANE

827 West First Avenue
Suite 301
Spokane, WA 99201-3912
509.252.5019 TEL
509.315.8862 FAX



The City of Gold Bar adopted a formal public participation plan at the start of the SMP Update process that guides how the City ensures that public participation occurs for this update. The next major opportunity for input from property owners in person will be the Open House scheduled for the evening of January 11, 2011.

Susan McCarrell provided the following questions in an e-mail on November 10, 2010.

1. The designation of "Undeveloped" is ambiguous and leaves the door open for many interpretations. Who came up with this particular terminology? It is not a phrase that David Pater of DOE has ever heard before. He said it is either Natural or Conservancy. The area in question is along May Creek and the current land use designation is "Natural." According to the update, the SMP designation is "currently undeveloped" although there are no indications of that in Section 3.0 tables.

The shoreline inventory and characterization report has been edited to address this concern. The term "undeveloped" refers to the existing land use in a particular segment of the City's shoreline; it does not refer to an environmental designation used in an SMP.

2. The maps in Appendix C are vague and some incorrectly marked. Figure 8 (Existing Zoning) has the same area marked as "Residential". Again, it is "Natural."

We have updated and corrected maps as needed. The designation of "Residential" on the existing zoning map is correct. The designation of "Natural" is the environmental designation used by the current SMP for that area.

3. There are no wetlands mapped along May Creek in Figure 2.

For the SMP process, the Department of Ecology guidelines call for the use readily available scientific data, not to perform new scientific studies. No information on potential wetlands was included in the base GIS data that was provided for the SMP update process. However, the shoreline inventory and characterization report does identify a number of potential wetland areas that would likely be formally delineated (mapped) and classified as part of a future development proposal.

4. There are many inconsistencies throughout the document and still many omissions that need to be filled in.

Comment noted.

5. I have many more concerns but this will have to do for now.

Comment noted.



John Light provided the following questions and notes for corrections from City of Gold Bar Staff and Gold Bar Planning Commission by e-mail on November 12, 2010:

1. All acronyms in the document must be defined.

Complete.

2. Section 1.1 of the Introduction; Background and Purpose, first paragraph, eighth line: explain 'landscape-scale processes'.

Terminology modified and defined.

3. Section 1.2 of the Introduction; Shoreline Jurisdiction, last paragraph, last line: add Wallace River and May Creek as shoreline.

Complete.

4. Section 1.3 of the Introduction; Study Area, fifth sentence: add 'in Gold Bar' after the words Skykomish River.

Complete.

5. Section 1.3 of the Introduction; Study Area, ninth sentence: does the SMP include the PAA or not?

The SMP does not include the Potential Annexation Area (PAA); language was added to reflect this.

6. Section 1.4.1 of the Introduction; Geographic Context, second paragraph, second sentence: what are the 'associated wetlands'? This is too vague and needs more definition.

Ecology's definition of 'associated wetlands' added to text.

7. Section 1.4.1 of the Introduction; Geographic Context: Do not wish to have the flood plain included if possible.

Language was added to reflect that the SMP only includes the floodway and not the flood plain.

8. Section 1.4.3 of the Introduction; Major Land Use Changes and Current Shoreline Condition, first paragraph, last line: need to find out exactly how many gravel quarries are in Gold Bar and include them in the information.

It is our understanding that there are none are located within the City limits, let alone the shoreline area.



9. Section 1.4.3 of the Introduction; Major Land Use Changes and Current Shoreline Condition, second paragraph, third line: where the 2000 census is referenced, replace that information with the 2010 census information.

Per the U.S. census website, the 2010 information has not yet been compiled and released. New population data from the 2010 census is not due to the federal government until 12/31/10. Any new info the City may have received can be included in the report if it can be provided to Otak or AHBL.

10. Section 1.4.3 of the Introduction; Major Land Use Changes and Current Shoreline Condition, fourth paragraph, second line: in reference to how storm water infiltrates, it needs to be addressed whether or not storm water in Gold Bar infiltrates uniquely.

There is not anything "unique" about how the stormwater infiltrates per documents we have read for this report.

11. Section 1.4.3 of the Introduction; Major Land Use Changes and Current Shoreline Condition, fourth paragraph: Add 'failing systems in a flood also contribute leakage into adjacent water bodies'.

Complete.

12. Section 1.4.4 of the Introduction; Development History: the entire second paragraph is redundant. It seems to be another intro to the city.

This is pertinent information regarding the development of the City and follows the format of typical SMP reports.

13. Section 1.4.5 of the Introduction; ESA Listings, first paragraph, lines seven and ten: clarify three versus four endangered species.

There are three species federally listed as threatened. A fourth species is listed as a species of concern. Language was added to clarify that three species are federally listed and a fourth is being "watched," and all four species use the water bodies in the City limits.

14. Section 3.0 of the Elements of the Shoreline Inventory; Table 1: move the table into the introduction. Also, needs the information filled in.

Information to complete table is not readily available. Table was deleted.

15. Section 3.0 of the Elements of the Shoreline Inventory; Table 2 and Table 4 have inconsistent verbiage.

These are separate tables that provide different information; it is unclear what verbiage is inconsistent.



16. Section 3.3.1 of the Elements of the Shoreline Inventory; Wastewater Utilities: the paragraph references a possible future sewer system. Is that something that Gold Bar is planning for in the future?

The paragraph quotes the City's Comprehensive Plan that there are policies in place regarding implementing a facility. This should not need additional explanation or a re-write to clarify language.

17. Section 3.3.2 of the Elements of the Shoreline Inventory; Stormwater Utilities, second paragraph: references the City's Comprehensive Plan. Has the Comp. Plan elements been adopted or are they pending?

This is information from the 2005 Comp Plan, which was adopted.

18. Section 3.3.2 of the Elements of the Shoreline Inventory; Stormwater Utilities, third paragraph, second line: define 'TMDL'.

Complete.

19. Section 3.3.2 of the Elements of the Shoreline Inventory; Stormwater Utilities, third paragraph, last line: references 'Evergreen Mini Park'. What is the zoning of the mini park?

There is no reference to the Mini Park in this section of the report. Found a reference to the park in section 3.6 and added the zoning information in that section.

20. Section 3.5 of the Elements of the Shoreline Inventory; Shoreline Modifications, second paragraph, first line: references erosion. Is there and action plan in place to deal with the erosion of the railroad embankment?

We are not aware of such a plan, but we think that would be the responsibility of the railroad as property owner to address those issues.

21. Section 3.6 of the Elements of the Shoreline Inventory; Existing and Potential Public Access Sites, first paragraph, fourth line: add Gateway Park.

Gateway Park is not located within the Shoreline planning area.

22. Section 3.6 of the Elements of the Shoreline Inventory; Existing and Potential Public Access Sites, second paragraph, second line: what is the proposed PSE Trail?

Added language to clarify.

23. Define 'Public Access'.

Described in Section 3.6 per Ecology's definition.



24. Everything in Section 3.6 of the Elements of the Shoreline Inventory; Existing and Potential Public Access Sites should be mapped.

Completed.

25. Section 3.7 of the Elements of the Shoreline Inventory; Critical Areas, eighth paragraph, sixth line: references FEMA's mapping. What year were the maps made?

Added citation for each FEMA reference in the text.

26. Section 3.7.1 of the Elements of the Shoreline Inventory; Wetlands, line one: does not show on map. Needs clarification.

Hydric soils along May Creek indicate the presence of wetlands, but do formally delineation mapping has been completed and shown in our mapping data sets.

27. Section 3.7.4 of the Elements of the Shoreline Inventory; Other Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas, second paragraph, fourth line: references a recommended Riparian Habitat Area. Who recommended it?

Recommended buffer by WDFW, language clarified in text.

28. Section 3.7.5 of the Elements of the Shoreline Inventory; Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas, second paragraph, fifth line: references a well. Is this an active well?

It is assumed that all four wells referenced in the City's Comprehensive Plan (2005) are still active.

29. Section 3.10.2 of the Elements of the Shoreline Inventory; Toxic or Hazardous waste Sites, first paragraph, second line: references two abandoned mines. Are these mines covered in the CAO?

The two abandoned mines within the City limits are not within the shoreline area. Presumably the mines are included in the CAO, but the CAO does not specify whether it considers only active and/or abandoned mines to be a geologically hazardous area.

30. Section 4.2.1 of the Conditions by Inventory Segment; Land use, last line: what is the current shoreline designation?

Complete.

31. Section 4.3.5 of the Conditions by Inventory Segment; Opportunity Areas: add 'removal of invasive vegetation' (i.e. blackberry bushes, etc.).

Complete.



32. Section 4.8.1 of the Conditions by Inventory Segment; Land Use: spell out 'large woody debris'.

Complete.

33. Section 4.8.5 of the Conditions by Inventory Segment; Opportunity Areas: references 'Green Building Techniques'. Gold Bar needs to encourage it, but can the City afford it?

It is our job to make recommendations that the City can potentially implement to help protect or restore the health of the shoreline. When the City decides to construct or develop a park in the Shoreline, there will be decisions based on the cost of the project as to what can be constructed. Many times, green building techniques are not more expensive (or the difference is small) than conventional construction.

34. Section 5.1 of the Analysis of Ecological Functions and Ecosystem Wide Processes; Overview and Landscape-Scale Processes: need more clarification of the first bullet point.

Additional text added to Water Flow discussion.

35. Section 5.1 of the Analysis of Ecological Functions and Ecosystem Wide Processes; Overview and Landscape-Scale Processes: second paragraph: needs to include information about the dyke/levee.

This is the first information we have seen regarding a dyke/levee in the City's shoreline area. We do not have anything to add at this point. If the City has information, I suggest that we add it to the Task 2 Report after DOE has completed their first review. I expect there will be other items for us to address from that review.

36. Section 6.1.2 of the Land Use Analysis; Visual Access to Shoreline, last paragraph: should be included in the Action Plan items.

Comment noted. Will address in SMP.

37. Section 7.1.1 of the Shoreline Management Recommendations; Environment Designation Provisions, second bullet point: include lots/areas currently zones residential, including undeveloped land.

Comment noted. Will address in SMP.

38. Section 7.1.1 of the Shoreline Management Recommendations; Environment Designation Provisions, third bullet point: what is the '10-year TOT'? Explain.

10-year TOT is defined in Section 3.7.



39. Section 7.1.2 of the Shoreline Management Recommendations; General Policies and Regulation, Shorelines of Statewide Significance: include Fish Trail off of Dorman Road and Big Eddy.

Both the Big Eddy and Fish Trail access are located outside of the City limits and would be included in the County's shoreline update.

40. Section 7.1.2 of the Shoreline Management Recommendations; General Policies and Regulation, Public Access, second bullet point: what is the BPA Trail?

Text added.

41. Section 7.1.2 of the Shoreline Management Recommendations; General Policies and Regulation, Shoreline Habitat and Natural Systems Enhancement Projects: references 'restoration projects'. Are they identified? Who identifies them?

A restoration plan is developed at a later date as part of the SMP update.

42. Section 7.1.4 of the Shoreline Management Recommendations; Shoreline Modification Provisions, Residential Development, last bullet point: references 'native grass planting at least 15 feet wide'. Why so specific?

This is a minimum buffer size to help filter run off and provide bank stabilization.

Proposed Amendments to the Maps for the Shoreline Master Program

1. Needs better definition of the SMA boundaries.

A note has been added to each map that reads, "SMA boundary based on the definition of "shorelines" found in RCW 90.58.030. Information that is more detailed is provided in the City's Inventory and Characterization Report.

2. Need online access to current map; also, provide copies of the map to the Planning Commission printed by a single source so the copies are identical.

AHBL can provide electronic PDFs of the maps so that the City can print the maps for their Planning Commission.

3. Put a City Limits layer on the top of the map image.

Comment noted, the City Limits layer is now the top layer on each map image.

4. More specific explanation in the legend needed.

A note has been added to each map that indicates, "More detailed information is provided in the City's Inventory and Characterization Report."



5. Maps need to be easier to read. More definition of colors represented.

AHBL has evaluated the maps and we have attempted to make the colors easier to read.

6. Need more current maps. The map used is from 2007.

The newest aerial available to AHBL was created and published by Aerials Express in 2007.

7. Make the disclaimer box bigger and easier to read.

The disclaimer box has been enlarged where possible to make it easier to read.

Q:\2009\209372\30_PLN\Deliverables_By_Date\Task 2\121010_Project_Memo_Responding_to_Comments_on_Draft_Task_2_Report_209372.30.docx