

CITY OF FIFE SHORELINE MASTER PROGRAM UPDATE

TASK 5.5 RESPONSIVENESS SUMMARY - DRAFT

PREPARED FOR:



CITY OF FIFE
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
5411 23RD STREET EAST
FIFE, WASHINGTON 98424

PREPARED BY:

GRETTE ASSOCIATES, LLC
2102 NORTH 30TH SUITE A
TACOMA, WASHINGTON 98403
(253) 573-9300

151 SOUTH WORTHEN, SUITE 101
WENATCHEE, WASHINGTON 98801
(509) 663-6300

DRAFT – JULY 2012



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	1
2	COMMENTS AND RESPONSES	2

1 INTRODUCTION

Task 5.5 of the Shoreline Master Program update process requires jurisdictions to draft a responsiveness summary.

The specific requirement by the department of Ecology is as follows:

“Prior to approval of the draft SMP by the local elected body (e.g. city council, county commissioners), the local government must prepare a summary responding to all comments received during the public hearing and the public comment period, discussing how the draft SMP addresses the issues identified in each comment”

The City of Fife was proactive in seeking public comment during the Shoreline Master Program Update Process. Multiple public information meetings were held pursuant to the Public Participation Schedule. In addition, the City created an email response system on their website that provided a 24 hour, 7 day a week opportunity to comment. All draft documents provided to the Washington State Department of Ecology were also placed on the website for review and comment. In order to serve citizens and other commenters who preferred not to use the internet or did not have internet access, City staff was available by phone and appointment during normal business hours. In addition, the address of City staff was also provided at public meetings should commenters choose to submit their comments in writing.

This document addresses questions and comments received by the City of Fife during the Shoreline Master Program Update process efforts conducted from April 2010 to July 2012.

2 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

The comments and responses received during the update process are summarized below. Comments are generally provided in the order in which they were received by the City. For each comment received the name of the commenter is provided, the comment date including other identifying data such as meeting type as available, and the specific comment. The response column includes are City of Fife staff and/or consulting staff responses.

Name of Commenter	Comment Date	Comment	Response
Unidentified Citizen	Community Visioning Meeting Conducted on January 10, 2011	Allowing both continuing and new agricultural uses within the shoreline jurisdiction but outside of the required shoreline buffers is important to the community	The agricultural policies and regulations within the Shoreline Master Program, SMP 9(A), allow for agricultural uses outside of the shoreline buffer in all shoreline designations.
Unidentified Citizen	Community Visioning Meeting Conducted on January 10, 2011	Public access along the levee is important to the Citizens of Fife	Public access along the Puyallup River is supported by updated Shoreline Master Program policies and regulations, SMP 7(D).
Unidentified Citizen	Community Visioning Meeting Conducted on January 10, 2011	Industrial uses within the shoreline jurisdiction are not preferred. Visual barriers, such as vegetation buffers, should be required to shield industrial uses from residential uses.	Industrial development is prohibited within the following shoreline designations: Conservancy, Shoreline Residential, and Aquatic. Upland commercial and industrial uses are required to be screened from adjacent residential or recreational areas by fences, berms, and/or vegetative

			buffers SMP 9(D)3(e) and 9(G)3(h).
Unidentified Citizen	Community Visioning Meeting Conducted on January 10, 2011	Maintaining and/or improving the flood control provided by the Puyallup Levee is important to the Citizens of Fife.	Specific focus on this concern was addressed throughout the drafting of SMP 7(H). The resulting text is addresses this concern and is also consistent with the SMA [RCW 90.58] and associated guidelines [WAC 173-26].
Unidentified Citizen	Community Visioning Meeting Conducted on January 10, 2011	Where possible, restoration of habitat should be focused on the Hylebos in order to obtain the greatest amount of benefit.	The Restoration Plan includes specific focus on restoration along the Hylebos in response to this comment.
Mike Galizio, Pierce County Public Works	April 12, 2012 Part of the SEPA comment Period open from March 29, 2012 to April 12, 2012.	Pierce County asks that the phrase “agencies and among utility providers” be included in Utilities regulation #3h as follows, “Utilities shall be coordinated with local government agencies and among <u>utility providers</u> and provide for the multiple use of sites and right-of-way to minimize shoreline impacts.”	City staff concurs and has included the text in the Final draft SMP.
Mike Galizio, Pierce County Public Works	April 12, 2012 Part of the SEPA comment Period open from March 29, 2012 to April 12, 2012.	Pierce County identified an inconsistency between the Use Matrix and the text located within the	City staff agrees and a footnote was provided on the Use Matrix table specifying what utilities are permitted

3	2012	the Shoreline Master Program?	<p>as drafted. The Lahar Study was drafted to estimate the economic losses to the region in the event of a Lahar from Mount Rainier. The Shoreline Management Act was adopted by voters to “prevent the inherent harm in an uncoordinated and piecemeal development if the state’s shorelines.” The SMP regulates development along the shorelines, where the Lahar study estimates losses caused by a catastrophic eruption from Mount Rainier resulting in a Lahar.</p>
---	------	-------------------------------	---