

COMMENT RESPONSE SUMMARY – OCTOBER 22, 2014

ABERDEEN, COSMOPOLIS, AND HOQUIAM SHORELINE INVENTORY AND CHARACTERIZATION

Source ^a	Comment	Response
Memorandum	1. The document size, particularly the maps, is very large, which could make it difficult to access for the general public. The download time, on a well-supported state computer, is very long. Please consider using smaller-sized file formats to allow easier access to these documents.	Revised maps were separated by city and figure number. File sizes are much smaller (below 12 MB) as a result.
Memorandum	2. The report would benefit from inclusion of representative photos and maps inserted directly into it to aid the reader in understanding the context and geography of the discussion.	Representative photos of reaches have been added to the report. Map file size was reduced. Figures uploaded to the SMP update website were kept as separate PDFs. File sizes are now much more manageable.
Memorandum	3. The document lacks discussion about local regulations that are pertinent, particularly Critical Area ordinances for each city, but also other regulations that may be applicable (clearing and grading ordinances, stormwater ordinances, flood hazard ordinances etc.). Please add this to Section 1.2 Regulatory Framework. We recommend there be city-specific sections both here, and throughout the document where it makes sense. This will allow citizens and elected officials to quickly locate the information pertinent to their jurisdiction.	Section updated to address Ecology's comment.
Memorandum	4. The report would be more coherent if the reach discussions were compiled in one location and were more comprehensive. As written, discussion of reaches is scattered throughout the document, thus it is difficult to get a comprehensive understanding of the reach conditions and how the reach functional assessments compare with the narrative. The descriptions of ecological function and existing shoreline modifications are highly generalized, and, at times contradictory, especially given the clear evidence in the mapping about the existence of some of these factors (for example, while it appears that most of the Grays Harbor South Bank reach is leveed, it is also clear that there are extensive estuarine and freshwater wetland systems and the reach is described on page 52 as "one of the few undisturbed estuarine shorelines in the City).	Reorganized the report sections so that reach-specific information is compiled under headings for each City. Expanded functional assessment discussion to reflect key elements of the shoreline characterization.
Memorandum	5. The discussion of shoreline reaches within each jurisdiction would be much more useful if each reach was described comprehensively including ecological functions, existing critical areas, and existing and future land uses. At times it is unclear what the narrative description of the reach has been based on but there are a number of areas that aren't consistent with the evidence in aerial images or Ecology's on-the-ground experience at these locations.	Reorganized the report to consolidate information. Expanded functional assessment discussion to reflect key elements of the shoreline characterization including functions, critical areas, and land use.
Memorandum	6. Some of the reach data sheets have inaccurate shoreline lengths within the cities. These sheets should display the information specific to the reach. For example the Grays Harbor South Bank Reach shows 11.21 miles of stream shorelines, 3.12 miles of salt marsh and 1.69 miles of eelgrass. Are these really the correct numbers for that reach?	Recalculated in GIS to determine shoreline length within each reach. Previous calculation was of the length of shoreline <i>jurisdiction</i> , which frequently included wetlands, floodway, etc.
Memorandum	7. Please ensure you speak to the issue of channel migration. Along many of the shoreline reaches, it is clear this won't be a concern either due to the character of the water body or the presence of human-made structures (for example: roads or levees).	A discussion of channel migration was added to each reach discussion.
Memorandum	8. The shoreline use analysis should estimate future demand for shoreline space and potential use conflicts. Aberdeen, Hoquiam and Cosmopolis all have designated harbor areas that need to be considered when doing this. However, there is little clear discussion in the report about port-related industrial uses, the potential for development and the need (or not) for additional shoreline space. Finally, please consider the potential for aquaculture in these jurisdictions, particularly those with extensive riverine shoreline.	Paragraphs were added to each City's Shoreline Use Analysis sections to address these comments. Existing uses and vacant lands were described in more detail. Aquaculture is currently prohibited by the Department of Health.
Memorandum	9. Section 8 sets forth proposed environment designations for the various reaches, a number of which are problematic given the noted inconsistencies with the reach data and narrative descriptions. We are particularly concerned by the apparent priority given to the existing zoning rather than the existing land use which includes consideration of the condition of the ecological resources within the reach.	Shoreline Environment Designations were revised and individual comments were addressed.
Comments Inserted in Draft SIC Report		
KV, Cover	Grant # is G1400451	Accepted change.
KV, P. ix	This is a really limited set of terms. I recommend you either expand this or just clearly define terms in the body of the document.	Expanded list.
RM, P. ix	Odd definition. Not consistent with guidelines or local SMPs. Suggest revising any definitions that are inconsistent with WAC.	Revised to be consistent with WAC.

Source ^a	Comment	Response
KV, P. ix	Because this is an incomplete definition (since fill activities can occur on the upland as well), I recommend you delete this and just define in the text where you are discussing historical practices.	Revised definition. Retained in list since the term is used extensively throughout the document.
KV, P. x	From DNR (teacher's guide): Surge Plain —a unique area where tidal salt water surges or pushes fresh water out over wetlands.	Revised accordingly.
RM, P. x	Where does this definition originate? Why 25% Cowardin is 30% Is this meant to combine PSS and PFO. If so, please clarify. Alternately, consider using Cowardin definitions if such information is desired since these vegetation classes are what is used in NWI.	It is not a wetland classification and is not synonymous with Cowardin wetland classifications that are used in the NWI. However, it is used as an indicator of where scrub shrub and forested wetlands may be present. Areas of mapped NWI wetlands are provided for each reach in Appendix C. Clarified definition and added additional information in the body of the report. Woody wetland is a land cover classification used by the National Land Cover Database.
RM, P. xiii	Consider writing in present tense. It makes the document more “alive.”	Comment noted.
KV, P. 1	This section lacks a discussion of relevant local regulations e.g. CAOs, grading and clearing ordinances, flood ordinances etc. Please add this. I recommend there be a separate subsection for each city so that citizens and elected officials can easily find the appropriate information.	Added to <i>Regulatory Framework</i> section and cross-referenced in sections discussing each City.
KV, P. 2	I'm not sure what you are referring to here. The 2002 amendments to the SMA involved the \$\$ threshold for substantial development permits and agricultural activities. The SMA does not explicitly speak to “no net loss.” The Shoreline Guidelines are where this term is used. These were adopted in 2003.	Paragraph was revised to reflect the WAC update in 2003 to include No Net Loss and the SMA amendment in 2002 to increase the cost threshold that triggers a substantial development permit.
KV, P. 3	Ecology's records show adoption of the original SMP in 1975 and approval of the GHEMP amendment in 1988.	Changed adoption date of SMP to 1975 and approval of GHEMP amendment to 1988.
KV, P. 3	Ecology's records indicate adoption of the original SMP in 1974 and approval of the amendment in 1988 to include GHEMP. No other amendments have been approved by Ecology.	Changed adoption date of SMP to 1974.
KV, P. 3	It's not clear what these amendments entailed but Ecology's records indicate the following: Adoption of the original SMP in 1976 followed by approval of amendments in 1980, 1985 and 1988.	Reviewed the code, and kept amendments as is.
RM, P. 3	Local Critical Areas Ordinances and Floodplain Regs? Need this additional section for each jurisdiction.	Added to <i>Regulatory Framework</i> section and cross-referenced in sections discussing each City.
KV, P. 4	Feasibility??	Changed verbiage from feasible to feasibility.
KV, P. 6	Please be more specific to these communities. They are not required to plan under GMA but must have CAOs. You could just delete this section and deal with it in the (currently missing) section for local government.	Deleted section.
KV, P. 6	Consistent with your Acronym list	Changed.
KV, P. 6	?? This doesn't make sense. I recommend the sentence is deleted.	Corrected sentence.
KV, P. 7	This needs to be added to your Acronym list.	Added to acronym list.
KV, P. 7	Please clarify whether or not the cities have UGAs for which they are pre-planning. This isn't clear.	This paragraph was re-written to be clearer.
KV, P. 8	Is this specifically highlighted in the text? I don't recall seeing future uses discussed in this context.	Removed reference to Grays Harbor Estuary Management Plan.
KV, P. 8	Garbled sentence	Revised.
KV, P. 9	Please clarify if any of the cities have a defined UGA (with shorelines) that has not yet been annexed. If they do, please be clear whether or not they are pre-planning for these areas.	There are no defined UGAs within Grays Harbor County.
KV, P. 9	This term isn't shown explicitly. Please clarify what is meant by “management area” either here or on the maps. Is it synonymous with city limits?	Revised to clarify.
KV, P. 12	It may be appropriate to relocate this table to the relevant section to help address my earlier question.	Table relocated. In general, we put tables as close as possible to where they are referenced but in some cases it is further than desired so as not to break the table onto multiple pages or leave too much wasted white space on a page.
KV, P. 12	Note that your maps now show Chehalis River Reach – North and Chehalis River Reach – South (Figure 9.4) in response to our earlier comments (thank you). You might want to revise this table consistent with the mapping.	Clarified in table.
KV, P. 12	Note that your maps now show Hoquiam River Reach – East and Hoquiam River Reach – West (Figure 9.1) in response to our earlier comments (thank you). You might want to revise this table consistent with the mapping.	Clarified in table.

Source ^a	Comment	Response
RM, P. 13	Consider changing to water-oriented species. Many species are primarily associated with riparian areas without being primarily aquatic. (e.g. shorebirds, mink, common yellowthroat, heron, Townsend's vole, etc.)	Changed to "aquatic and shoreline-dependent" consistent with WAC 173-26-201.
KV, P. 13	Perhaps you can say aquatic and riparian species to avoid terminology that has specific meaning in the context of the SMP.	Changed to "aquatic and shoreline-dependent" consistent with WAC 173-26-201.
KV, P. 14	This confuses me since "hyporheic" functions are associated with stream/river systems not lakes. Delete the word in this table and just call this groundwater/surface water connections.	Revised function categories. Term "hyporheic" is no longer used in this context.
KV, P. 15	See my comment above re: hyporheic and lakes.	Revised section and "hyporheic" is not used in this context.
RM, P. 17	Would this approach devalue the ability of mudflat to perform some of these functions. Admittedly, they do not trap sediments, but clay soils found in such habitats are some of the most effective at chelating heavy metals.	Comment noted and clarification added to the report. Not all potential functions are captured in the assessment due to limitations of available data. For example, although cover by certain types of vegetation is mapped and indicates the potential for water quality benefits, it does not reflect water quality functions related to certain substrates and their ability to remove heavy metals, even in the absence of vegetation.
RM, P. 17	Native vs. non-native? Non-native <i>Zostera</i> is a state-listed noxious weed. Probably need to differentiate if possible since presence of non-native could skew functional scores. This is an important issue for Grays Harbor.	Specified "native."
RM, P. 17	Dunegrass is not an estuarine plant. It is not found below the OHWM. It has habitat functions, but for water-oriented species.	Clarified: "riparian."
RM, P. 19	Is there a quantitative standard that was used in determining high vs. moderate vs. low? Number of features per river mile, or???	Quantitative data were not identified so this is a qualitative assessment. Reworded to degree of "complexity" instead of level of features. Already discussed under data gaps.
KV, P. 23	Consistent with the List of Acronyms and Abbreviations	Corrected.
KV, P. 24	Middle Fork of what?	Clarified.
RM, P. 24	Hoquiam?	Clarified.
KV, P. 24	Does this repeat the information in the first sentence? And who manages the industrial diversion? What is the quantity removed with that system?	We are not emphasizing these because they are outside the City limits. Clarified that in the text.
KV, P. 24	I presume this is in addition to the diversion at the Wedekind-Wynoochee confluence?	Yes. Clarified.
KV, P. 24	This is for what? The industrial area of the city? Is it separate from the city's municipal supply? Is there information on how much is diverted?	Yes. Revised to clarify water usage and amounts.
KV, P. 24	See comment on previous paragraph. Is this a municipal source or industrial source?	Removed this section and clarified under <i>Regional Overview</i> .
KV, P. 24	I'm not sure I understand this statement.	Clarified.
KV, p. 30	I found this section a bit frustrating. It's got management area subsections but these are pretty general in nature, and provide little quantification of existing uses/land cover. If this is meant to be a summary, that should be clarified. If there is additional information elsewhere in the document that builds on this summarized information, please point to that. If this is really just a general summary, then it doesn't support the intent set forth in the second sentence of the introductory paragraph.	Report reorganized to combine discussions for each City.
KV, p. 30	I'm not sure I understand this added phrase. Shorelines of Statewide Significance (SSWS) are a limited subset of shorelines of the state. I think it would be more helpful here to identify those water bodies which are SSWS: Chehalis River, and Grays Harbor Estuary. This is where these use preferences apply. The remainder of the shorelines are governed by the three major policies of the Act, preferred uses, public access and ecological protection.	Section clarified.
KV, p. 31	Please see our reach-specific comments.	Comment noted.
KV, p. 33	In this, and the other management areas, it would be helpful if the reach discussions were handled separately as subsections.	Added to discussion.
KV, P. 33	Isn't this where the Grays Harbor National Wildlife Refuge is located? Please add this to the discussion.	This was separated because it is discussing the water-oriented use categories specifically.
KV, P. 33	It would be easier to follow the discussion if the reach descriptions were in one place. Why is this discussion here separated from the Grays Harbor Reach description in the first paragraph above?	Discussions consolidated.
KV, P. 36	There is little additional discussion about where these actually occur. For example, Map 5.2 shows a completely leveed shoreline within the Grays Harbor South Bank Reach, and the reach data sheet indicates 3385 feet of levee. However, this is not clearly discussed anywhere. Please note: this same reach sheet describes the stream shoreline as 11.21 miles, clearly inaccurate when discussing the City of Aberdeen. Please correct this length.	Clarified that is an overview and more detail provided under each City section. Corrected reach sheets to state "length of shoreline" instead of "length of <i>stream</i> shoreline."

Source ^a	Comment	Response
RM, P. 50	This comment is for all cities: there is no significant discussion of associated wetland presence or extent in any of the shoreline management areas or reaches. This is a significant omission and should be augmented to better capture the overall function and ecosystem condition of the reaches.	Expanded discussion of each reach in <i>Functional Assessment</i> section to include wetland presence.
KV, P. 56	Please contact Grays Harbor County Public Health Department, which is working on an Active Transportation plan called Connect Grays Harbor. They have been compiling information on trails, many of which are within shoreline jurisdiction. http://www.healthych.org/page.aspx?id=713816 Grays Harbor Council of Governments also has some of the trails mapped.	We contacted the Health Department and received information on existing and planned trails, which was added to the SIC document.
KV, P. 56	I'm not sure I understand why this is about public access "structures." It should simply describe public access sites and this should include trails. It appears there may be a trail along the south side of the Chehalis River extending downstream from the Hwy 101 bridge to the Bishop Athletic Complex.	Revised; "structures" was removed.
KV, P. 56	There is an associated trail. This should be mentioned along with the trail and public access site adjacent to the Aberdeen Walmart.	This was removed.
KV, P. 57	It's not that the proposed environment designations must be consistent but that when the SMP update is completed, there is consistency between the Comp plan and the SMP policies and regulations. Sometimes, the existing ecological conditions and land use will suggest that the jurisdiction's Comprehensive Plan and zoning may need some revisions.	We have decided to leave the land use classifications at the management area level so we have removed the reach specific references and will not need to add a chart.
RM, P. 57	Please review this section and revise to include description and discussion of undeveloped lands. Presenting the existing land use patterns in a chart as percentages of certain use types would be helpful.	Revised statement.
RM, P. 57	This area is primarily a restored estuarine riparian area (mitigation for Stafford Creek Prison wetland impacts) adjacent to an recreational area (athletic fields). Please review for accuracy.	We have revised this statement and removed such references at the reach level.
RM, P. 57	This is an incomplete and misleading statement. There are no aircraft gas stations or churches in this reach. The southern half of Charley Creek Reach is an undeveloped, PSS/PFO high quality wetland.	Revised.
RM, P. 57	More description is needed. "Park" could include many degrees of intensity in land use. Most of this park is undeveloped, relatively undisturbed forest lands.	Revised.
RM, P. 57	East shore of Wishkah between Lafayette and Henry St. contains significant segment of undeveloped, forested shorelands.	Revised.
RM, P. 57	Please provide a graphic that supports this analysis. Aerial imagery indicates that much of the riparian area is forested and undisturbed, especially on the eastern shoreline.	Revised.
RM, P. 57	This reach also merges with Elliot Slough and is used for passive recreation. It is a very popular fishing area.	Revised.
RM, P. 57	The majority of the Newskah Reach is a mitigation site for wetland impacts associated with utility work at Stafford Creek Prison. It is protected in perpetuity via deed restrictions and conservation easements.	Revised.
RM, P. 58	Is this the actual land use, or the zoning?	This is the land use from the Assessor's classification.
RM, P. 59	This is inaccurate. A large portion of the reach is undeveloped, forested wetland or riparian area.	Revised statement.
KV, P. 59	There is a significant levee, public access and estuarine wetlands.	Revised statement.
KV, P. 59	Or 100 acres? See pages 57 and 62.	As there is no data to corroborate the 100 acres, we have removed that reference.
KV, P. 59	This is an odd statement located in a single reach. Is this a more general principle or is this particularly true in this heavily developed reach (including Fry Creek)?	Removed statement.
KV, P. 62	Why are there two separate sections? See also 4.1.1.2	Resolved this issue.
KV, P. 63	Add to restoration opportunities	Added discussion of piles to restoration opportunities section.
RM, P. 63	One cannot average scores in this manner, across disparate reaches, ecosystems and hydrogeomorphic settings. Numeric values like this do not acquire statistical significance or reflect the precision implied by their totals. Normal distribution of scores possible for most reaches (36 pt. maximum) would be 0-11= low function, 12-23 = moderate function, and 24-36 = high function.	Revised accordingly throughout.
RM, P. 63	Contrast with statement on p. 59.	Expanded discussion of Charley Creek land cover. Revised statement on p. 59.
RM, P. 63	Newskah score?	Added discussion.

Source ^a	Comment	Response
RM, P. 63	This reach would actually score “high” using a normal distribution of your point totals.	Revised throughout based on new ratings and normal distribution.
RM, P. 64	See comment above regarding qualification of these scores.	Revised accordingly.
RM, P. 64	Please explain this rating. This reach is well vegetated with dense herbaceous estuarine vegetation.	The score reflects water quality impairments (Ecology 303d listing) that suggest impaired function. This score now appears under criteria 6 in the revised table. Vegetation characteristics are captured by criteria 8 in the revised table and the stream is ranked “high” (3 points). Added relevant discussion under <i>Newskah Creek</i> .
KV, P. 65	What about the large remnant piling fields evident along the Chehalis River/Grays Harbor shorelines?	Paragraph added to consider this restoration opportunity.
RM, P. 65	? Maps dated 7/21/14 show Chehalis Reach – North and Chehalis Reach – South. As previously noted in preliminary map comments, the southern and northern shorelines have distinctly different environmental characteristics.	Clarified in table text.
RM, P. 67	Per aerial photos, the reach is primarily undeveloped and has extensive associated wetlands. Please review and revise to reflect actual land use.	We have removed this reference and other reach specific land use classification references.
RM, P. 67	Are these percentages of actual land use or zoning designations? Please clarify.	This is the land use from the Assessor’s classification.
KV, P. 69	Note that there are 2 subreaches.	Added statement.
RM, P. 70	The north side of the river is almost wholly surge plain wetlands and tidal channels. Development of this area would be difficult from a regulatory perspective. Please add this descriptor.	This has been added.
KV, P. 70	Are there trails along Mill Creek and the Chehalis River?	This has been added.
KV, P. 70	Is there a trail on top of this levee?	It is unclear if there is a trail on top of this levee.
RM, P. 70	Thank you.	No change.
RM, P. 70	Again, see comments under Aberdeen for distribution of high, moderate and low function scores. A score of 27 would be “high.”	Revised accordingly throughout.
RM, P. 71	The shoreline appears to be well forested. Please explain this value.	Increased rating to moderate (under Criteria 2 regarding forest land cover for flood protection) based on review of aerial and land cover data. The forest density and coverage does not appear to appear to provide significant function related to maintaining temperature, particularly given the large size of the steam at this location, and is therefore ranked low (Criteria 5 in revised table).
KV, P. 72	Derelict pilings?	Added restoration opportunity related to derelict piling.
KV, P. 72	Note: there are 2 subreaches: east and west.	Clarified in table text.
RM, P. 73	This reach contains a significant portion of the Grays Harbor NWR.	Added to discussion of Grays Harbor Reach under Functional Assessment.
KV, P. 74	Trails along the Hoquiam River? What about Riverside Dike Park? There is also public access at Bowerman Basin on the National Wildlife Refuge.	Added in Riverside Dike Park and Bowerman Basin.
RM, P. 75	What is this use? Passive recreation, wildlife conservation? This area has been set aside as wildlife habitat. That is a “use.” Does this include Rennie Island?	Revised statement.
KV, P. 75	Is this the area in public ownership?	Yes, it is owned by the city. This is shown on the public lands map.
RM, P. 76	See previous comment/ question for Aberdeen on this table.	This is the land use from the Assessor’s classification.
KV, P. 79	Combine with the other public access section.	This has been combined..
KV, P. 80	Thank you	No change
RM, P. 81	Please explain this value. The river appears to have a majority (> 75%) of vegetated shoreline, including dense forest, shrub or emergent vegetation and no bank armoring.	Revised the value based on revised criteria, veg cover data, and aerial images.
RM, P. 81	Please explain this value for reason listed above.	Revised the value based on revised criteria, veg cover data, and aerial images.
RM, P. 82	Please see earlier comments for Aberdeen about averaging and the distribution of high, moderate and low function.	Revised accordingly throughout.
KV, P. 83	There should be discussion of demand for water-dependent port-type facilities. Is there adequate shoreline property available for future demand? What about other sorts of water-dependent facilities like marinas and aquaculture? Reasonably foreseeable future development includes industrial development.	Paragraphs were added to each City’s Shoreline Use Analysis sections to address these comments.

Source ^a	Comment	Response
RM, P. 93	This section does not incorporate results of the environmental analysis or consideration of the presence and extent of associated wetlands. Assigning an SED without consideration of the presence of critical areas and Priority Habitats will not adequately address “the biological and physical character of the shoreline.”	Shoreline Environment Designations were revised based on comments.
RM, P. 95	This recommendation may be appropriate for the northern, developed portion the reach that is within shoreline jurisdiction. It is not appropriate or supported by the analysis of undeveloped portion of the reach. Allowing high intensity land use in the southern part of the Charley Creek reach would likely degrade and result in a net loss of ecological functions.	Comment addressed by dividing the reach to a northern section of high intensity shoreline environment and a southern section of Urban Conservancy environment.
RM, P. 95	This is incorrect. The majority of the reach is relatively undisturbed riparian area.	Revised statement.
RM, P. 96	Portions of this reach north and south of the Sierra Pacific Mill contain relatively undisturbed riparian wetlands. These area may warrant a more protective SED.	It appears the area referred to here is actually unincorporated Grays Harbor County.
RM, P. 102	Consider a Natural designation, given the land’s status as a mitigation site. The reach meets the criteria for Natural.	Comment noted. Area left as Urban Conservancy. We will discuss the designation further with the City and the CAC.
RM, P. 102	These areas are outside of shoreline jurisdiction.	Revised statement.
RM, P. 104	A portion of this reach on the eastern shore (addressed in earlier comment) may not support this designation. An approximately 1,600 foot portion of the eastern shoreline reach is undeveloped, forested riparian area.	Area referred to was changed to Urban Conservancy.
RM 108, P. 106	Please clarify that the UC is for the north side. Also, north side may meet criteria for Natural. Please review these criteria for this north reach.	Addressed this comment. We will discuss the natural designation with the City and CAC.
RM, P. 108	Much of this reach does not support this designation and such an approach would likely result in degradation of wetland and riparian conditions, resulting in a net loss of ecological functions.	Comment noted. Environment designation revised.
RM, P. 108	As previously noted, the existing land use pattern is undeveloped forested wetland.	Revised statement.
RM, P. 108	This is the primary land use and attribute of this reach.	Addressed this above.
RM, P. 112	Some portions of this reach do not support this designation. Specifically, areas adjacent to the Grays Harbor National Wildlife Refuge contain significant priority habitats and species, extensive mudflats, and estuarine wetlands. The environmental condition is generally considered extremely valuable to a suite of priority species. The proposed SEDs would likely result in a degradation of these characteristics and result in a net loss of ecological functions. Consider UC for portions designated and Natural Resources and/or meeting the criteria described above.	Comment noted. Environment designation revised.
RM, P. 116	Much of this reach does not support this designation. Much of the reach is relatively undisturbed riparian area or associated wetlands.	This comment was addressed by replacing High Intensity with Urban Conservancy.
RM, P. 116	These attributes do not support a high intensity or shoreline residential SED.	This comment was addressed by adding an Urban Conservancy area to the reach.
RM, P. 118	Please address Cosmopolis CAO specifically. Aberdeen and Hoquiam CAOs have been recently updated and probably meet the GMA BAS criteria.	Text added for clarity.
TJ1	1. 4.1.2.2 Public Shoreline Access (Aberdeen) Shoreline access areas to consider adding: a. Zelasko Park, Wishkah River Reach b. Bishop Athletic Complex, Newskah Creek Reach c. Chehalis River Trailway, Grays Harbor South Bank Reach d. Basich Trailway, Chehalis River Reach (wetlands) Grays Harbor Seaport, Chehalis River Reach, is not publically owned but affords public access.	Added Bishop Athletic Complex and Basich Trailway.
TJ2	2. 4.2.2.2 Public Shoreline Access (Cosmopolis) Shoreline access areas to consider adding: a. Mill Creek Park, Mill Creek Reach b. Basich Trailway, Mill Creek Reach (wetlands) c. Cosmopolis Treaty Grounds Park, Chehalis River Reach – South Cosi Levee Trail, Chehalis River Reach – South	Added Basich Trailway and Cosmopolis Treaty Grounds Park.

Source ^a	Comment	Response
TJ3	<p>3. 4.3.1.2 Public Access Structures (Hoquiam)</p> <p>Shoreline public access structures to consider adding:</p> <p>a. Grays Harbor National Wildlife Refuge boardwalk, Grays Harbor Reach</p> <p>The Grays Harbor Public Mark is a public access structure, outdoor seating/viewing, in the Hoquiam River Reach – East.</p>	Added Grays Harbor National Wildlife Refuge.
TJ4	<p>4. 4.3.2.3 Public Shores Access (Hoquiam)</p> <p>The Grays Harbor National Wildlife Refuge is public access, Grays Harbor Reach.</p>	Added to public access section.
TJ5	<p>5. 5.2.2 Results by Shoreline Management Area, Cosmopolis</p> <p>a. Last paragraph, check parcel data again, much of Cosmopolis Shoreline is <u>not</u> built out.</p> <p>i. Large parcel in Chehalis River Reach – North, owned by Weyerhaeuser is not built out and zoned M.</p> <p>Several parcels in the WA use zone in the Chehalis River Reach – South, are not built out.</p>	Removed statement.
TJ6	<p>6. Chapter 8 Shoreline Management Recommendations – general comments</p> <p>a. Are there any Reach maps with proposed shoreline environment designations? These maps appear to be missing making it difficult to comment.</p> <p>b. Many reaches in Aberdeen, Cosmopolis, & Hoquiam have two proposed shoreline environment designations, without reach designation maps or further explanation it is difficult understand how regulation of multiple designations in one reach would be accomplished.</p> <p>i. Map the reach designations and for reaches with two designations, map the proposed environment designation for each segment of the reach. Or alternatively or additionally -</p> <p>For reaches with two designations, discuss in the chapter what sections of the reach will fall under the different proposed designation – by Comprehensive Plan designation? By Zoning designation? Other?</p>	The Shoreline Environment Designation maps have been created. Text was revised to explain multiple designations within one reach.
TJ7	<p>7. 8.1.3.3 Grays Harbor Reach (Hoquiam)</p> <p>a. Shoreline Residential does not seem an appropriate proposed designation for this reach. The area of the reach that is zoned residential is a sliver of tidal mudflats south of SR 109, development of residential in this area is not realistic.</p> <p>The tidal mudflats between the Hoquiam Airport (to south) and SR 109 (to north) are the Grays Harbor National Wildlife Refuge (see Figure 16.1 Hoquiam – Public Access). Please consider this area for a separate reach with a proposed designation of Aquatic, Natural, or Urban Conservancy. The Refuge part of the reach has several WDFW Priority Habitat Fish Species & WSWF PHS Wildlife species and 303(d) category 5 water body making this area ideal for restoration/protection. This would allow the rest of the reach to have a single proposed designation of HI.</p>	Agreed. Area changed to Urban Conservancy.
TJ8	<p>8. 8.1.3.5 Little Hoquiam River Reach (Hoquiam)</p> <p>The Little Hoquiam River Reach is mostly zoned single family, the industrial district is a discrete parcel, and the commercial zone is not high intensity development (RV park). This reach may be better suited for a potential shoreline environmental designation of Urban Conservancy as the current uses would be compatible with this designation.</p>	Agreed. Environment designation was revised.
TJ9	<p>Figures:</p> <p>Proposed Reach Environmental Designation maps are missing.</p>	This has been corrected. Shoreline Environment Designations can be found in Figure 17.
TJ10	<p>The color air photo as a backdrop for all figures is distracting. Consider using a parcel background, blank, or a black and white background in some figure. The Floodway, Floodplain, & Wetland and Geological Hazards maps are very difficult to read with a color photo background.</p>	Maps revised.
TJ11	<p>1. Figure 5.1 Hoquiam – Shoreline Modification</p> <p>a. Port Terminals T-1 & T-2 may be missing as Over Water Structures.</p> <p>8th Street Landing & associated docks off of Levee Street may be missing as Over Water Structures.</p>	Overwater structures added to Figure 5.1.

Source ^a	Comment	Response
TJ12	<p>2. Figure 5.2 Aberdeen – Shoreline Modification</p> <p>a. The dock at the Grays Harbor Historical Seaport Authority (formerly Weyerhaeuser) may be missing as an Over Water Structure (south side Chehalis River Reach).</p> <p>b. The rail bridge over the Wishkah River may be missing as an Over the Water Structure (at the mouth of the Wishkah River about where the dotted line is).</p> <p>The dock at Rayonier Pulp & Paper may be missing as an Over Water Structure (Chehalis River Reach after river bend on west side very near Cosmopolis City limits).</p>	Overwater structures added to Figure 5.2.
TJ13	<p>3. Figure 12.1 Hoquiam – Public Land</p> <p>Rennie Island may not be publicly owned, publicly managed?</p>	Rennie Island is owned by Rayonier Properties. Verified with the City of Hoquiam, and the island is not publicly managed.

^aKV = Kim Van Zwalenburg, Ecology; RM = Rick Mraz, Ecology; TJ = Theresa Julius, Grays Harbor Council of Governments