

Thurston County Shoreline Master Program Open House and 10/20/21 PC Public Hearing Comments

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment	Affiliation / Geo. Area
1	8/13/21	Bruce	Galvin	Well, I am currently going through the tedious process for a nonconforming property want to do an addition. The proposal sent to the county planners is to add 500 square feet away from the water (property on Eld Inlet). This process starting in February of this year. The examiner has required me to complete a survey with high water marks, topographical survey and geotech survey which all cost money. I now have to take this information and complete a RUE with the county. It looks like under the new rule since the addition does not exceed 500 ft I would not have to go through any of this process. Just trying to figure where I stand at the moment.	Eld Inlet
2	8/16/21	Lorri	Avery	So, if it's so important to protect creek shorelines and stop erosion, Why do you allow my neighbor to be "grandfathered in" and he weed whacks his entire Woodland Creek shoreline every year "so he can see the creek" from his house? No natural foliage, just barren. Plus, he wanted to create an ATV track along the creek, and he still might! Makes no sense, no one should be able to continue to destroy natural growth like that - every year.	
3	8/20/21	John	Garrett	I am a retired Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife Biologist, and was a part of the initial implementation of the Shoreline Management Act (SMA). Personally and professionally, I'm very supportive of the provisions of the SMA. The problem that I have always been aware of is that Washington State Counties responsible for enforcing the provisions of the SMA, have never dedicated the necessary financial resources to the program. When I was working in Skagit County 20 to 30 years ago, Skagit County did not enforce the provisions of the SMA, and now I live in Thurston county, and Thurston County DOES NOT enforce the provisions of the SMA. I have submitted addresses, photographs, and other pertinent information (related to obvious SMA violations on the lake where I live in Thurston County) to the appropriate Thurston County Planning Department employees and they indicate that they DO NOT have the staff or resources to pursue resolution to these obvious violations. So it seems to me that this revision effort is once again an exercise in futility, as the document have not enforcement "clout" behind it, and will sit on shelves collecting dust until someone decides that it needs to be revised again. If this revision effort is serious, please provide the necessary resources to the program (SMA), so that the program (SMA) serves the purpose for which it was intended. "Preserving the shorelines of Washington State." Thank you!	
4	8/21/21	Steven	Berg	you made the print so small on the postcard you made it difficult for me to read the internet address! You should of considered the lower vision levels that seniors have	
5	8/13/21	Evelyn	Rowland	My niece owns property on the Skookumchuck on Steelehead Ct (Tenino) that has a doublewide mobile on it. The mobile has been destroyed. She wants to remove it an either put another in it's place, build a small stick built home or sell the property. She was told the property is under some sort of shoreline rule now that won't allow her to do any of those things and that her only option if she removes the mobile is to let the property just sit there vacant. Is this correct?	
6	8/21/21	Steve	Odd	In reviewing the Master Plan draft I could not find App A. Is it at a different site or web page?	
7	8/22/21	Meredith	Rafferty	1. Where can I get information about Options A and B for marine buffers? How do the options work, get applied? 2. What is the width of the marine Shoreline Jurisdiction so I can determine whether my house is within it? 250 feet?	Boston Harbor
8	8/23/21	Leila	Willard	Our house and property has undergone a lot of distress since 2020. We'd just purchased our house and it was destroyed by the Tacoma Power Company when they flooded us out. We are still recovering from this. Our home and land are not fully restored. My husband is a 100% disabled veteran and I'm caring for him as well as our children. I do not have time to go through hundreds of pages to see WHAT MIGHT be done with our house/property due to the notice we just received. I need it spelled out for me. Is our house/land being seized? Are you proposing to take part of our land? Are you going to dictate what we do with it? I'm on 6th Ave 98513. Again, I do not have time to peruse through hundreds of pages or try to figure out all the fancy jargon. I just need it spelled out for me. Thank you for your time and attention to this message.	
9	8/24/21	Evan	Olsen	Hi Andrew, Just a heads up that the tinyurl that you provided on the postcard mailer is incorrect. It sends you to Sportsdaily. Also, the font on the mailer is really small and difficult for older americans and people with visual disabilities. I found the correct information online, but people may be frustrated when typing in the incorrect tinyurl. Thanks.	
10	8/24/21	Ben	Paylor	will the proposed designation to shoreline residential effect how my property taxes are calculated? My property does not touch the water but the designation is being changed from rural to shoreline residential.	
11	8/24/21	Bob	Whisler	I find it difficult to determine exactly what impact the proposed changes will have on my property or my use of that property. My address is 1523 Delphi Road, Olympia 98512. Can you provide a brief description of how my property is defined today vs any new definition that is or may be proposed?	
12	8/24/21	Allen	McDonald	Dear Sandy, I'm reaching out to find an answer to a 4"x6" postcard I received I received (08-23-21) in my rural mail box for Allen McDonald, 2637 140th Ave SW, Tenino, WA 98589-9457 which is the address for this writer. The message, written in very fine print, conveyed the idea that my property might affected by CPED rule changes and that CPED wants to hear from me. So , being curious as to why my input might of interest to any official body in Thurston County, I typed in the address as printed on the postcard: https://tinyurl.com/y6n938c I did this three times, thus verifying that I had indeed reached a Dailey Sports Website, from my computer, using the above address. So here is some input. I've occupied this 4.78 acre property since 2014, an active creek runs along the Eastern edge of the property line where the land slopes up a lengthy way to a level area where the house Sits. The was designed as a horse keeping property with loafing sheds around the acreage. I'm keeping The place, as is, with no inclination to, sub divide or attempt to build at this time. I like the space around me along the flora and fauna that live with me. In the second quarter of next year I'll be 80. I'm still curious about these rule revisions that might affect my interest property wise, so please refer or inform me of what rules are being considered for change or enhancement. Thank you for your kind courtesy, Dr. Allen McDonald	
13	8/24/21	Bob	Whisler	I have went through the virtual tour of the SMP but it is difficult to ascertain the impact on my property. I've owned that property for approx 35 years. Shortly after purchasing it I had a septic tank and drain field installed with the intent of someday building a small vacation home there. What I want to know is how the newly proposed designations will impact my plans and what I can do with that property? I am also anticipating that any change to its designation that would prevent building a home will have a significant impact on the property value. Any comment for that.	
14	8/24/21	Scott	Wall	I own property with two homes on Eld Inlet. I purchased said property in 2003. Several years ago I volunteered to have the two existing septic systems (one for each house) tested by the County. Somewhat to my surprise both systems were leaching effluent into Eld Inlet. Shortly after learning that I had a system designed, permitted, and installed to alleviate the problem. The current system is working as designed and is regularly inspected. I remain pleased with the results of learning that my property was causing some amount of the problem associated with failed septic systems and was able to rectify the situation. I suspect that the vast majority of waterfront owners in the County opted NOT to participate in the voluntary inspection process. I also suspect that there are a significant number of older septic systems that are not functioning to the current standard hence potentially causing harm to the adjacent body of water. It strikes me that there should be a MANDATORY inspection of all waterfront property septic systems rather than a voluntary one if we are seriously concerned about the health of our inlets and waterways.	Eld Inlet
15	8/24/21	Nicole		Do you have a key for all the acronyms scattered throughout the pdfs/documents?	
16	8/24/21	John	Suessman	Feedback on SMP: I have concern with the rules being imposed on pre-existing waterfront property which have docks and bulkheads since the 1940s. So language that grandfathers pre-existing property and structures is needed. This plan has too many must does. It's not a vision plan. It's calling for permits to fix a dock or trim a tree. We need to pull weeds that impede fishing and swimming. I totally understand new construction rules and set-backs and Ensuring septsics are properly functional. Not being allowed to trim a tree without county approval is way overboard. Great work on the written description of each lake and river. I think the climate change data is not needed. There is continuous climate change over millions of years, this is a given. My feedback is that this plan is too regulatory and not visionary in nature. It's a great plan for new construction. Requiring permits for doing dock repairs, pulling lake weeds and yard work is excessive and needs to be removed from the plan. Thank you for your hard work!	Pattison Lake
17	8/24/21	Ray	Lynn	I received a post card stating that you are planning changes and a website to view them. The site does not work. Please send a corrected web address or tell me how to view the information. Thanks.	

Thurston County Shoreline Master Program Open House and 10/20/21 PC Public Hearing Comments

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment	Affiliation / Geo. Area
18	8/23/21	Julie	Peters	We received a post card, - Save the Date for discussion in regard to Thurston County Shoreline Master Program Virtual Open House. The Post Card is confusing as there is not date specified to save..... That being said, we would certainly like to talk with someone. Our house when purchased July 2017, was stated to be in a flood zone, we live on Pattison Lake. The previous owners (who lived here 35 years) were never in a flood zone. What Changed? Trying to talk with someone about it has proved impossible. None of my neighbors to the left or right are in a flood zone just us. We want to be involved and do have questions, however, this postcard is reflective of the kind of thing we run up against.... You say you want to hear from us, send a confusing postcards with Save the Date, "August 13 – October 20" with no time frame and the tiniest tiny URL that you can't read it! C'mon. If you would, I would love to hear more – and we would like to talk. Please have someone get back with me who has answers and can talk with me. I do not want to hear from anyone who has to refer me to someone who will refer to someone else. Thank you, very concerned and would love to know and talk and participate, but, tired of trying to chase people down. I am available via telephone, 360-489-0924 or we could schedule a zoom meeting.	Pattison Lake
19	8/24/21	Meredith	Rafferty	Thank you, Andrew, for the prompt response. I will look into buffer options A and B. As for the 200 foot shoreline jurisdiction, I would appreciate knowing if our property is also affected by a Critical Area or if the standard 200 foot applies. Our address is 618 77th Ave NE, 98506 in the Boston Harbor community. I will also submit a separate email about the unexpected change in our SED designation from Shoreline Residential in the 2017 Update to Rural Conservancy in this 2021 draft -- please see the marked area of the attached 2017 map. The neighbors in this revised stretch of shoreline submitted comments in 2016 and 2017 supporting the Shoreline Residential designation because these properties are part of the original platted Boston Harbor with the rest of the community, have been developed and used for residential purposes and are without shellfish farms, are recognized as part of the Boston Harbor LAMRID, and are served by the community- initiated Boston Harbor ULID, as the rest of Boston Harbor is. The shoreline characteristics are also similar to stretches of the Shoreline Residential SED along Dover Point designated for the rest of Boston Harbor. Prior message dated 8-22-21 included in email string: 1. Where can I get information about Options A and B for marine buffers? How do the options work, get applied? 2. What is the width of the marine Shoreline Jurisdiction so I can determine whether my house is within it? 250 feet?	Boston Harbor
20	8/24/21	Emily	York	Thank you for the opportunity to comment. My family has lived in Olympia for over 150 years. I grew up here and have a deep connection to this place. I currently manage a climate change program and my education includes a graduate degree in sustainability, and undergraduate degrees in planning and environmental science. I can trace this path back to my childhood days of climbing trees, picking berries, and swimming in the bay. Through that direct connection with nature, I committed myself to being part of the movement toward restoration, healing, and regeneration. Now, I have two children of my own and I would like to raise them in this place that raised me. I would like to be able to remodel our modest home, so that each of my children can have their own bedrooms. We do not desire an extravagant footprint, but we do desire a comfortable living. For instance, we would like to have a place where we can hang our coats and boots to dry. We also have plans to de-pave a part of the driveway and install a rain garden. We are wanting to be stewards of this land. We want to invest in this place so that one day our children can pass it on to their children and say that "our family has lived in Olympia for over 250 years". The existing SMP has been prohibitive of the updates we would like to make to this little home. It is not valued very high to begin with, so 50% of it's assessed value does not stretch very far (especially with the cost of materials these days). We strongly support the new proposed SMP that does not place a cap based on a structure's value. Our family would also benefit greatly from the ability to expand a little (not towards the shoreline) to include an entry room to wipe our feet and hang our coats. Thank you for proposing these changes that would enable our family to live more comfortably in this beautiful place. We are crossing our fingers that the proposed SMP moves forward so that we can pursue our vision of a remodeled home next year.	
21	8/24/21	Patrick	Shannon	currently owned property borders the Skookumchuck river. approx 300 ft. The required setback from the river is excessive at 250ft. That setback takes up nearly the entire depth of the property between Skookumchuck rd. and the river. Added to that are the Oregon White Oaks on the property. There are several scattered on the property when combined with the water setback makes my property nearly useless for anything other than growing grass. The river setback should not exceed 100 ft. and the oak protection needs to be reduced also. The prop. # is 11510210104.	
22	8/25/21	Mark	Malome	Generally I like the changes. My family has owned lake front property for 3 generations. It had a cabin built in 1960, but over the years was not well maintained. When I acquired the property I was told by the county that any significant changes to upgrade would require a fire or natural disaster. And/Or expenses in fees for variances and permits which were prohibitive and may or may not be approved in the end. The opportunity to build a modest retirement house on property I have owned and paid taxes on for years is very appealing. Historically, we have had access to a beach and a dock in various iterations over the years. My firm intention is to maintain this access. When the vegetation growth has gotten out of hand, the plants have primarily been those the county considers noxious or invasive and charges me full rate at the dump to dispose of. So, the requirement for not cutting vegetation in the buffer is not one I completely support. I do support a reasonable shoreline management plan that provides for habitat and clean water and believe that a good landscaping and maintenance plan would benefit both the land owner and the public good. And speaking of management plans, the lake next to my property right now has a problem with milfoil. While there can be multiple arguments on how this became a problem, the most likely source is public use. The solutions that I have heard all involve expense and effort by the owners of lake property. It would seem to me that if the government is enforcing rules for public access, habitat, and water quality then the government, as the steward for public interest in that part of the lake deemed public, should be responsible for the effort and cost of maintaining same as the neighboring landowners. That said, I would welcome changes that would allow me to build and maintain a modest home on my family property, in a manner that would be environmentally friendly, and at a reasonable cost in effort and money.	
23	8/25/21	Mark	Malome	The online county map has some gross errors in property boundaries. At least as it concerns my property. If this very important and most obvious/significant feature is inaccurate, then it is hard to have confidence in other features. If county staff are going to use these maps (which I have witnessed) in discussing what may or may not be required for property development, then they need to be accurate.	
24	8/25/21	Bob	Lanouette	19.400.100 - Do not use the term non-conforming. This term is divisive and has been a topic of citizen comments in numerous Planning Commission Meetings. Use the term existing structure.	Long Lake
25	8/25/21	Jim	Plaff	I received a postcard from Thurston County Community Planning and Economic Development. I am wanting to know if my property is/will be impacted, and if so, to what degree? I tried accessing the web address printed on the postcard provided, but it is incorrect. My address is: 16801 162nd Ln SE, Yelm, WA 98597- 8570.	
26	8/25/21	Allen	McDonald	Repeat of Comment #12	
27	8/25/21	Karen	Parker	You sent a postcard inviting me to a 'virtual open house' on changes to the Shoreline Master Program. The website doesn't work and there is nothing on the Thurston County website explaining what the changes are. Please send details about what is changing and how it will affect my property.	Scatter Creek
28	8/25/21	Albert	Nelson	Reviewing GEO Data site I am not clear on how far the Buffer extends into my property ...my parcel is : 11932440102 . Is it 100 ft ? and what is the function are the Review Areas detailed there at 300ft ? As far as proposed changes it appears to me that the only change that affects me is that if I need a building permit in the future I have to go thru the SMP permit path. Finally what is the SED designation for Woodland Creek that is at the back of my property ?	
29	8/26/21	John	Suessman	I/we my family respect the lake and water front and/but we are apposed to anyone regulating how we care for our property. If you believe the waterway belongs to the State of Washington than why isn't the owner of the waterway is not doing anything to clean up the overgrown pond weed, milfoil and toxic algae issue on these lakes. In other words, the State and County want to regulate everything but they are not willing to fix it or pay for it. Milfoil gets in the lake from boats visiting and using the WDFD boat launch. There is no language mandating the State clean up the boat launch, put in approved sanitation facilities, and clean up the litter at the launch. We as waterfront owner have great pride in our property and the resource. Please, respectfully, stop adding regulations. Also, putting dollar values on dock repairs is a good example In todays dollars, \$7500 in repairs might completely rebuild my dock. In 10 to 20 years, that figure is completely outdated. We are told that input from the lake owners and lake association has been given before and no one adds their ideas to this Shoreline Plan. The feeling is the plan is being written by County and State Officials and the land owners better live with it. As I drive through Olympia, Lacey, Tumwater and Thurston County and see countless camps, tent cities, and garbage, complete unsanitary properties and no one addressing this is an example of rules and laws that currently exist and our City, County, and State are looking the other way, like you really can not see the graffiti, campfires, tarps, trash, and stolen shopping carts. We as a community don't address this issue, but were going to fine, or charge a lake front owner who wants to improve his dock without a permit. I/we completely appreciate the work on this plan. We do not agree with added regulations, rules, and fines for not agreeing with the State or County on how we wish to enjoy our 60 feet of water front. Remember we live here and understand the value, gift, and beautiful place this is. You/government do not have to write regulations to control, direct, and have control over water front property owners.	Pattison Lake

Thurston County Shoreline Master Program Open House and 10/20/21 PC Public Hearing Comments

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment	Affiliation / Geo. Area
30	8/27/21	Larry	Weaver	I have a 2 acre site within the "Conservancy Shoreline Environment" Can you tell me how the draft new Shorelines master plan will affect this property?	
31	8/27/21	Meredith	Rafferty	Yes, any information on the history of the shoreline designation would be appreciated and also information of whether I have a say. I have followed the SMP update process since 2015 and it seems there's always something I miss. As a citizen, I can't compete with the business and regulatory/legal entities who work these issues day in and day out. Thank you for your prompt responses and information.	Boston Harbor
32	8/28/21	Pamela	Holsinger-Fuchs	I received a postcard to log in to a site for a virtual open house and when I do it takes me to a sports page. I fear that the link that was included on the postcard has an error in it. Can you please provide the correct link?	
33	8/26/21	Dan	Vaughn	The SDP document is confusing to me,,,,,, Exemptions to the SDP includes: "Maintenance and repair of existing structures, ". If I need to repair my dock, say replace a few boards, does this mean I do not need any permits at all to repair my dock? I assume if under the approx \$7K limit in the SDP description. It does say "The County will issue a letter of exemption for activities which are exempt." What is this process and what are the expected costs associated with this? I would offer that as the guidelines are being discussed this type of added information is crucial to public acceptance of the new guidelines. If we are not made aware of these issues then your org will be accused of hiding information etc. I would like to receive an answer regarding the repairing of a dock for instance.	
34	8/27/21	Bob	Lanouette	I would expect a comparison with specifics on how the update SMP is more or less restrictive than the WAC and Department of Ecology rules.	Long Lake
35	8/27/21	Bob	Lanouette	If for some reason my property does not comply with the new SMP what are my responsibilities?	Long Lake
36	8/27/21	Bob	Lanouette	If I want to make a change to the waterfront of my property, what is the impact of having some aspects of my property not in compliance?	Long Lake
37	8/27/21	Bob	Lanouette	19.150.185 and 19.600.125: 19.150.185 mentions "watercraft" 19.600.125 mentions "boats". At the least the two paragraphs should be consistent. In addition, many waterfront homeowners have more than five watercraft, (a boat, a fishing boat, 1 or more kayaks, canoe, paddle board). This implies a homeowner operates a Boating Facility. Is this the intent and if so, what is the purpose of this intent?	Long Lake
38	8/27/21	Bob	Lanouette	Shoreline Residential buffers should remain at 50 feet. That is what the majority of properties are based upon. To come into compliances with the SMP would be impractical, and an increase will have a negative impact on any new construction.	Long Lake
39	8/27/21	Bob	Lanouette	19.500.100.C If my activity falls into the Exemption Category, do I have to apply for an Exemption? I could not locate a process or requirement to do this.	Long Lake
40	8/27/21	Bob	Lanouette	10.600.160.C.4.e Grating is not conducive to a family friendly environment. Grating should not be required on residential properties, and for sure not on water bodies that do not support salmon.	Long Lake
41	8/27/21	Bob	Lanouette	Decks should be considered pervious.	Long Lake
42	8/29/21	Rion	Groves	"New and replacement bulkheads are allowed in the proposed SMP update, subject to regulations. They are allowed primarily to protect existing structures - ONLY when other methods of shoreline stabilization are not suitable." My questions are: 1. What would happen if an existing bulkhead collapses. Is the homeowner allowed to repair and/or replace it? Are current structures grandfathered? 2. I'm troubled by the comment "ONLY when other methods of shoreline stabilization are not suitable". a. What are these "other methods?" b. Can you provide examples of properties where "other methods" have been applied? c. Who would determine what "other methods" are suitable? d. What process would be used to make this determination? e. Are there emergency provisions to address a collapsed bulkhead? i.e. repairs to prevent further erosion and provide bank stabilization. f. What is the methodology applied to the decision process? g. What rights does the homeowner have in the decision process? i.e. rights for homeowner to comment, rights to a hearing, rights to an appeal including higher levels of authority? Thank you.	
43	8/29/21	Kirsten	Harma	Thank you for all of your work updating the Shoreline Master Program. I am a shoreline homeowner on Eld Inlet and appreciate shorelines and their values every day. As you know, shorelines provide critical functions for fish and wildlife in our region, and are being degraded at a rate faster than they can be restored - your regulations need to be as protective as possible and they need to be enforced. I would encourage you to expand the extent of the "natural" designation that has been added for Green Cove. This is a rich and rare estuary, and is essentially wild all the way from creek inlet to estuary mouth. This cove is completely unprotected outside of shoreline regulations. Please expand the "natural" designation all the way to the mouth to protect this important ecosystem before it is lost. Additionally, I support the most protective buffer width option, which appears to be "option B." Thank you for your consideration.	Eld Inlet
44	8/30/21	Robert	Jensen	I have submitted several written and oral comments regarding the Thurston County Shoreline Master Program (TCSMP) to the Planning Commission. These advocate for restriction of residential septic systems on shoreline lakes in Thurston County. This is necessary to halt the growing incidence of toxic blue-green algae blooms on these lakes. Today, August 30, 2021, The Olympian warned of a toxic algae bloom on Long Lake. Earlier this summer, Pattison Lake was contaminated with toxic algae blooms. The owners and visitors of these lakes were advised by the County Health Department in these circumstances, not to swim in these water bodies. My proposal is to amend the TCSMP to: 1) regulate septic systems to eliminate their contribution to the phosphorous loading on the lakes; and 2) prohibit them in all future residential development thereon. We must not sit by and watch the private and public enjoyment and use of these lakes disappear before our eyes. I implore the Planning Commission to incorporate this proposal into the draft TCSMP.	Pattison Lake
45	8/30/21	Robert	Jensen	I have advocated in writing and orally to the Planning Commission, for amending the Thurston County Shoreline Master Program. It must regulate septic systems in the county shoreline lakes, to eliminate toxic blue-green algae blooms. These systems are the primary source of phosphorous loading on the lakes. It is well accepted: phosphorous is the limiting factor in the creation of these toxic blooms. I propose the TCSMP be amended to: 1) regulate residential septic systems to eliminate the continuous leaking of phosphorous into the lakes; and 2) to prohibit the installation of new residential septic systems on the lakes. We must not permit the private and public use and enjoyment of these water bodies disappear before our eyes. I implore the Planning Commission to include my proposals into the draft TCSMP. Thank you for your consideration.	Pattison Lake
46	8/31/21	Gary	Ritchie	How are marine buffers distances determined: distance from 0-tide line, distance from MLLW line, or what?	
47	9/1/21	Fran	Clifton	I received an e-mail regarding a virtual open house, however the listed url does not work. What is the correct site for this open house?	
48	9/1/21	Craig	Smith	Andy, very snazy and informative website. I have a couple of questions: Where to I go to get details on SMP property type shoreline residential? Like are AUDs going to be allowed etc. Is there funding for beach rehabilitation on ROWs yet? Thanks and good work.	
49	9/1/21	Mike	Wilkerson	I am curious to learn more about the proposed designation of a parcel I own on Blue Lake inside Clearwood in Yelm. It appears that all of the properties around the lake have a proposed designation of shoreline residential, except for my parcel, that is proposed to be designated rural conservancy. The parcel is currently vacant, but the proposed setbacks under rural conservation would leave no feasible building envelope. I am sure you are swamped with similar questions and requests, but it would be great if you have a few minutes to discuss the proposed changes and how they might impact my parcel.	Blue Lake

Thurston County Shoreline Master Program Open House and 10/20/21 PC Public Hearing Comments

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment	Affiliation / Geo. Area
50	9/5/21	John	Woodford	Can one of you please give me to login for the SMP Virtual Open House? My old eyes just cannot read the small font on that postcard.	Chair, Thurston County Shoreline Stakeholders Coalition
51	9/7/21	Flint	Calvin	We are in favor of allowing docks.	
52	9/9/21	Donald	Redmon	I'm a Home Owner at 2009 West Summit Lakeshore Rd., Olympia. I reviewed the SMP on line virtual tour, and applaud the efforts to preserve our shorelines, in Thurston County and Everywhere in the NW / Nation. I want to make sure, these NEW Guidelines / Ordinances / Laws that are being discussed and put up for Vote, that consideration is given to all Existing Lake Front Home Owners. That allow them to continue to make improvements / upgrades to protect the Quality and Value of their homes, for decades to come. My property is a Older Cabin, that has been upgraded over the years, and may need to be Replaced at some point and time. Allowing myself, and others, to rebuild and preserve our Lake Front way of life, should not be altered in any way as these new Rules and Regulations are put into place. Lake front property owners must be allowed to submit for improvements / upgrades / rebuilds and not meet resistance, based on the these new R & R's. Question: Well Home Owners on Summit Lake, based on these new rules and regulations, be able to Rebuild without huge resistance? (knowing permits and fees well need to be followed)? Thank you for your time and efforts to preserve our beautiful and important Thurston County Shorelines. Please respond to my questions above asap.	Summit Lake
53	9/10/21	Barry	Halverson	Andrew, way back in February 2021 we had an email discussion about this matrix and I talked about it at a PC Meeting. I was hoping to see it included in the DRAFT document you sent out, but it is not there. As you are aware there are numerous problems with this matrix. In particular the matrix identifies cutthroat trout, coho, searun cutthroat and winter steelhead as being in Lake Lawrence. All of which was never true and all of which was previously debunked by WDFW Fish Biologist Riley Freeman. Question: Has this matrix been updated with accurate data? If not, why not?	Lake Lawrence
54	9/12/21	Larry	Brubaker	I have lived on a waterfront property on Gravelly Beach Loop for 26 years. In looking at your proposed changes to shoreline designations, I noticed that Gravelly Beach Loop and points further north on the west side of Eld Inlet are proposed to be designated as Rural Conservation, while neighborhoods to the south of us along Sunset Beach Road and Madrona Beach Road are proposed to be designated as Shoreline Residential. I don't understand why there is any difference between these areas for Shoreline designations. All of these neighborhoods have waterfront homes of similar density, with almost all waterfront parcels being already developed. Looking at areal maps, I don't see any difference in the waterfront parcel sizes, or the degree to which these parcels are already developed. So it seems very arbitrary to designate lands south of Green Cove Shoreline Residential and north of Green Cove Rural Conservation.	Eld Inlet
55	9/14/21	Pete	Hackett	I cannot seem to get the Tiny URL listed on the postcard to work. https://tinyurl.com/y6n9738e I typed it in manually several times and get "This site can't be reached" Clicking on the tinyurl link on the press release page, https://www.thurstoncountywa.gov/tchome/pages/newsreleasedetail.aspx?List-ID=2190 , seemed to work fine. Also, on future mailings could you please use a bit easier-to-read font.	Summit Lake
56	9/14/21	John	Skog	Almost a year ago, the County completed Critical Area Review Project Number: 2020102936 Folder Sequence Number: 20-107703 XD Tax Parcel Numbers: 65303100400, 6503300700 Site Address: 3323 Boston Harbor Rd NE. I'm planning a remodel and would like to add a second floor deck that extends over the existing deck. Part of the existing deck is non-conforming. Your department told me that: "Additionally, attached decks, porches, and patios may be altered in their existing footprint, excluding the addition of permanent roof structures. A second floor open deck would be considered a roof structure" Will this change with the new update?	
57	9/14/21	Barry	Halverson	Andrew, I have been talking about this issue since February 2021. When I first brought it up you told me you would work with WDFW to determine which lakes contained salmonoid, etc. Who at WDFW are you talking with about this? I talked with Riley Freeman, our Regional WDFW Fish Biologist back in March 2021. WDFW has a list of lakes that support salmonid/cutthroat Trout, etc. This should already be done. Frankly I'm tired of having to bring this subject up. It needs to be fixed now!	Lake Lawrence
58	9/16/21	Jeffrey	Pisetzner	Greetings. My wife, Judy, and I now own 4.77 acres along the Skookumchuck river in Tenino. It's the last bit of a large diary farm that spanned both sides of the river owned by my wife's parents and grandparents dating back to 1962. They owned homes on both sides of the river at one time or another and could enjoy the sight and sound of the Skookumchuck day and night. We now would like to build a modest home and enjoy the same pleasure, but we have learned about the most recent setbacks that would put the river out of earshot and eyesight. For 60 years our family's presence on the river has not impacted the river environment in any lasting way - the salmon still spawn, the steelhead still run, the trout still play, and the blackberries still encroach to keep wildlife looking for new paths to the river to drink, eat, and wash. We didn't buy the property from our family in order to stick a home by the road, but we are being pushed in that direction. I would propose that smaller homes (1,600 sq. ft. or less), with no more than three bedrooms, be exempt from the current setbacks and any future increase of them. If lot size is maintained as well as flood zoning, I don't see any practical or environmental purpose in moving small homes further away from riverfronts. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input. I hope it is taken seriously.	Skookumchuck
59	9/16/21	John	Woodford	Is there any plan to share questions, concerns and thoughts of responders and staff exchanges with those responders concerning the Open House with either the Planning Commissioners and the public at large? This kind of sharing is is the primary value of any open house. Will we be seeing a truly transparent Open House? Or, will each exchange be kept secret?	Chair, Thurston County Shoreline Stakeholders Coalition
60	9/18/21	Greg	Dibble	More of a question. I have been planning to build a garage on my property which would be compliant with current setbacks and buffers. In your options, the buffer for my property will either stay the same or be increased from 50' to 85'. If I submit my plans (drawn and engineered by a Centralia firm) before this is adopted, will I be grandfathered in if the buffer is increased? If so, when will this take effect?	
61	9/18/21	Paul	Fischer	I live on Lake St. Clair at 3716 Thornton Rd SE. The SED proposed is 'Natural' for my specific property address. My property (which since early 2021) has our new home built upon it is on what is called the "The Orchard". Is there a way to redesignate my property to be 'Shoreline Residential'. I am worried that the new SED will prevent my family's access to the lake due to constraints of keeping the habitat 'Natural'. I would be interested in the plan for home such as mine that were built during or after the initial review and planning of the new Shoreline Master program.	Lake St. Clair
62	9/19/21	Kirk	Van Landeghen	Pages 57&58 of 427 - I believe the Shoreline Residential buffer for Freshwater Lakes should remain at 50'. There already exists an additional 15' building setback making an effective 65' buffer. Further provisions in the proposed SMP address using pervious pavers/decks etc. to allow for water permeation. Expanding the buffer becomes a slippery slope that can continue to confiscate developable land without just compensation. Page 114 of 427 - I agree with striking the requirement to consider alternate moorage prior to allowing piers or docks. Piers and docks are safer to access residential uses of lakes. Page 114 of 427, C.1.e - "...approval authority may consider the length of dock required to reach an appropriate mooring depth...". What is "an appropriate mooring depth?" This sounds subjective and could use further clarification. I think the intent is good (as some shallow areas extend out further than others), but could use further expansion. For example, Black Lake drops two to three feet every summer. What would this mooring depth be based on? Page 116 (and others) of 427 - I agree with striking the requirement for grating on lakes that do not contain salmon. Grating is inherently dangerous to children and not welcome for bare- foot water-sport activities that commence from residential docks. Page 117 of 427 - I agree with shortening the distance between pilings in lakes to 8'. The twenty-foot requirement requires heavier beams that in turn need bigger diameter pilings that have more impact on the lake floor. Residential docks don't carry the sort of load that is needed by a 20' expansion. Page 117 of 427, C.4.a - I agree with increasing the pier width to 6 feet from 4 feet. A six foot width is safer when boarding/disembarking watercraft. Pager 154 of 427 - I agree that decks should be considered pervious. Thanks for taking public comment on this. It is evident a lot of thought has already gone into this Public Hearing Draft. I appreciate deleting section 19.400.35 (view blockage) in its' entirety. This violates all sorts of private property rights and made adjacent land-owners defacto owners of your property.	

Thurston County Shoreline Master Program Open House and 10/20/21 PC Public Hearing Comments

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment	Affiliation / Geo. Area
63	9/22/21	Paul	Fischer	Thank you Andrew. I reviewed all of the documentation that you referenced as well as "re- reviewed" the SMP documentation. Again, I am concerned that my freedom to live and enjoy my home and parcel at 3716 Thornton Rd SE, Olympia, WA 98513 will be placed in jeopardy with any new mandates or policy regarding use of the shoreline for our personal enjoyment. Is the public hearing still scheduled for tomorrow afternoon @ 6:30 at the Lacey Community Center?	Lake St. Clair
64	9/22/21	John	Woodford	<p>See Original Comment for Attached Letter (Too Long To Copy Below)</p> <p>This is the list of Coalition key issues that I will pass out to those attending the Community meeting tomorrow evening. I didn't want it to be a last minute notice if you first saw it at the Lacey Community Center. I know that it's still quite late, but I've just finished writing the document.</p> <p>Attached Letter from Thurston County Shoreline Stakeholders Coalition 7541 Holmes Island Rd SE, Olympia, WA 98503-4026 September 23, 2021</p> <p>To:Thurston County shoreline residents, From: John H Woodford, Chairman Re:Coalition's Key Shoreline Master Program (SMP) Issues Neighbors, The CPED Community Planning staff is currently hosting the virtual SMP Open House online now...until October 20, 2021. At 7:00 PM, October 20, the Planning Commission will hold the Public Hearing on the SMP. Now is the time to get involved, ask questions and make your thoughts and concerns known. Log into the Open House: https://www.thurstoncountywa.gov/planning/Pages/shorelines-update-open-house.aspx Take a good look the SMP Open House Fact Sheets, Maps and Posters...then contact Planning staff with your concerns and questions. The very first document listed on the SMP Virtual Open House home page is Shoreline Master Program Public Hearing Draft (PDF)...just click on it. On this SMP draft you will find yellow highlighted text boxes, such as Staff note, Option for Public Hearing, Planning Commission Option, etc. These options are important. They represent issues not yet pinned down in the SMP. Both the Planning staff and the Planning Commission will look closely at the number and content of the public communication. I am going to first address key yellow highlighted text boxes and state the Coalition's position. Please relay your thoughts on these issues to the Planning staff; email Andrew Deffobis.</p> <p>1) Ch 19.400.100. The labeling of all existing legally built homes and/or accessory structures already located within the buffer should be "conforming," not "legally non-conforming." State law recognizes these structures as "conforming." So should Thurston County. This is a hot button issue with lots of people.</p> <p>2) Ch 19.400.120. Buffer widths should stay as presented in this July 28, 2021, draft SMP. Shoreline Residential buffer widths should be 50-feet for both marine and lake properties...as they have been since the 1990 SMP, and longer.</p> <p>3) Ch 19.400.120.D.1.b. and Appendix B, Section B.2.c. Decks and Viewing Platforms properly constructed to be pervious should not be required to be "...adjacent to residential structures..." There should be no limit on size or location and there should be no requirement for a shoreline variance to build such a deck.</p> <p>4) Ch 19.400.120.D.1.e. We agree with the Option. Limit water-oriented accessory storage structures to residential uses only.</p> <p>5) Ch 19.500.075 and 19.500.100.B.2. We agree with the Options: Substantial Developments Permits, Conditional Use Permits and Variances should be processed administratively rather than having to undergo a public hearing before the Hearing Examiner.</p> <p>6) Ch 19.600.150. The Coalition supports the option to prohibit industrial development in Shoreline Residential Environmental Designations.</p> <p>7) Ch 19.600.160.C.1.r., Ch 19.600.160.C.4.f. and Ch 19.600.160.C.5. We agree with each of these Options. Strike the requirement for pier, dock, float or ramp grating on lakes that do not contain salmon.</p> <p>8) Ch 19.600.160.C.3.b. We agree with this Public Hearing Option, "Consider a shorter distance (than the specified 20-foot spacing) for spacing of residential pilings (supporting piers and/or docks) in lakes..." 8-foot</p>	Chair, Thurston County Shoreline Stakeholders Coalition
65	9/23/21	Paul	Fischer	Andrew, you have been very helpful. I am going to hand you a hardcopy of the enclosed file regarding. Needing the Shoreline Assessment for 3716 Thornton Rd SE, Olympia, WA 98513 (Lake St. Clair) adjusted. I believe it is an oversight by the initial planning effort in designating a property plat that was zoned residential/rural when we purchased the property and obtained the building permits/occupancy permits. Please ensure that the designation is changed for our property as it is designated for my neighbors. See Original Comment for Referenced Map	Lake St. Clair
66	9/23/21	John	Wolfe	Thank you for the forum. I am concerned with the proposed 75' setback. I would like that setback to remain 50'. Please do not increase the setback, as it will complicate maintenance, including yard maintenance and and septic system maintenance for many landowners. This does not make sense, as well maintained lands, buildings and septic systems are much more protective of our waters and shorelines that those that are not.	
67	9/24/21	Emma	Hyde	I really did not see anything in the slideshow that explains storage structure size in Unincorporated Thurston County in the 250ft buffer zone. It has been confusing for me and my neighbors out here on the size we are permitted. I was told by a lady in the permit office that its 250ft not 50ft buffer from high watermark. Which I found confusing and stopped looking into it.	
68	9/24/21	Meredith	Rafferty	As residents in Boston Harbor, we are trying to identify the Boston Harbor properties at the points where the proposed SEDs change between Rural Conservancy, Residential Shoreline, and Natural. The maps we have so far are not detailed enough to determine this. Could you help with this information? Perhaps provide a detailed parcel map of the area that is marked with the proposed SEDs?	Boston Harbor
69	9/24/21	Jessica	Converse	<p>See Original Comment for Referenced Attachment</p> <p>Great presentation last night! You handled the public really well, but I wanted to reach out with some questions and comments I had myself. I can only imagine the haranguing you've endured attempting to meet the requirements of Ecology, Thurston County, and the public, but I was curious if you'll be weighing lakeshore property owners concerns more heavily than those beyond the shoreland area. I ask because as a Thurston County resident, I am concerned about the water quality of these aquatic ecosystems as they recharge critical aquifers and provide habitat for other species. Not to demonize all lakeshore property owners, but I have seen several laugh at the fishing line stuck around a goose's bill to which they said, "We should put more fishing line out!" If only they knew that their lawns attracted more geese to graze there. The insensitivity of these comments and those spoken about the public who have very little access to these lakes reminds me that they may not be looking out for the community's best interests. Furthermore, they DO NOT own the water. It is not my intent to criticize you, but I could hear folks scoff whenever you said, "Science says..." I think these communities would benefit from more information and education about why we should care about the health of our shorelines and why Washington State cares enough to legislate its protection. I also think they'd like to know - as one person pointed out last night, "How do I even know enough to argue against the buffer widths?" I interpreted their comment as an attempt to suggest as much to the other community members. As a scientist myself, I know that scientific literature is not easily interpreted nor is it provided widely, but you have an opportunity whenever you communicate with the public to cross that divide. I hope some of that information makes it onto the SMP pamphlet as well. I referenced the SMA and its SMPs in my recent policy position for the North American Lake Management Society (NALMS). The position highlights the importance of lake shorelands and the steady decline of lake water quality. Maybe you could reference the National Lake Assessments in your presentations? The studies include several Washington lakes.</p> <p>Washington's SMA is more comprehensive than others I've read in that it aims to protect 200 feet of shoreland and wetland structures. It must be understood that once they are developed, they will never be "natural" again. Even if we tried, restoration costs more than protection.</p> <p>Freshwater is of the utmost importance especially in light of our warming climate and the increased prevalence of toxic cyanobacteria blooms. I worked with Long Lake on a stormwater study for my graduate research and do not corroborate John Woodford's comments that stormwater is the leading contributor of pollution to their lake. It is the lack of vegetation on their shorelines. I worked with the Washington League of Women Voters on their study of the efficacy of the SMA, providing research for their efforts. I found out from SMP developers such as yourself as well from the Department of Ecology that we cannot know its true efficacy without ensuring that we are collecting data (e.g., littoral condition - composition of microorganisms, sediment types) to assess shoreline health. I know that Washington Fish and Wildlife recently published a minimum tree height necessary to provide adequate stream health. I would like to see or learn if this will be included in Thurston County's SMP. I am including my lake shoreland protection piece and some other documents if you wish to read them, but I know you all have done your research as well. Thank you for all your hard work and for taking the time to read this. Attachment titled 'Examining Shorelines, Littorally' by Kellie Merrell, Eric Howe and Susan Warren</p>	North American Lake Management Society

Thurston County Shoreline Master Program Open House and 10/20/21 PC Public Hearing Comments

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment	Affiliation / Geo. Area
70	9/24/21	Susan	Draper	<p>I respectfully submit the following. Nothing in the Thurston County SMP should be more restrictive than State requirements.</p> <p>Ch 19.400.100. The labeling of all existing legally built homes and/or accessory structures already located within the buffer should be “conforming,” not “legally non-conforming.” State law recognizes these structures as “conforming.” So should Thurston County.</p> <p>Ch 19.400.120. Buffer widths should stay as presented in this July 28, 2021, draft SMP. Shoreline Residential buffer widths should be 50-feet for both marine and lake properties.</p> <p>Ch 19.400.120.D.1.b. and Appendix B, Section B.2.c. Decks and Viewing Platforms properly constructed to be pervious should not be required to be “...adjacent to residential structures...” There should be no limit on size or location and there should be no requirement for a shoreline variance to build such a deck.</p> <p>Ch 19.600.160.C.1.r., Ch 19.600.160.C.4.f. and Ch 19.600.160.C.5. Strike the requirement for pier, dock, float or ramp grating on lakes that do not contain salmon.</p> <p>Ch 19.600.160.C.3.b. We agree with this Public Hearing Option, “Consider a shorter distance (than the specified 20-foot spacing) for spacing of residential pilings (supporting piers and/or docks) in lakes...” 8-foot spacing is a move in the right direction; we would like to see 6-foot.</p> <p>Ch 19.600.160.C.4.a. Again, we agree with this Public Hearing Option...and more. The maximum width of single-use and joint-use piers should be 8-feet, and more if the applicant can demonstrate the need.</p> <p>A companion pamphlet must be completed simultaneously with the SMP to guide the public through the SMP requirements, including development restrictions, acceptable native plants for the buffer (with specific examples), and permitting requirements. Without the guidelines that the pamphlet can provide, property owners will be at a loss to understand the regulations, requirements and restrictions buried deep within the full-blown SMP document.</p> <p>The Shoreline Environmental Designation (de facto, the zoning) of any property should not be changed to a more restrictive classification or added to the SMP jurisdiction without due process. Some 2,700 properties are facing this new designation or re-designation. This issue must be resolved for each one of these properties before the SMP moves forward. Open House Fact Sheets #3 and #10 present some SED information, but nothing about how to determine your SED or to appeal a new designation.</p> <p>Establish fresh water (lake) requirements for decks, docks, piers, floats and bulkheads and address the unique habitat characteristics associated with shoreline residential use. Maximum dimensions must be increased for single use piers, and floats (both mooring and recreational) in Shoreline Residential SEDs; docks with their piers, ramps and floats on lakes are places of water access for swimming, fishing and other water-oriented family play and enjoyment.</p> <p>In the SMP, Buffer is defined as “a non-clearing area established to protect the integrity, functions and values of the affected critical area or shoreline...” What if your waterfront yard is a lawn? Is it a buffer? ...a setback? This needs to be clarified. Several changes should be made to the chapter “Definitions.” Examples include - Add: Conforming, Eutrophic Lakes, and Letter of Exemption. Delete: (Legally) Nonconforming.</p> <p>Ch 19.200 has several unnamed lakes now subject to the County’s SMP. How are property owners adjacent these lakes, ponds and mines going to know that they are now subject to this new designation? Without names, known to all, these water bodies should not be included in the SMP jurisdiction. The policy statements, Ch 19.300, and development standards, Ch 19.600, concerning public access to publicly owned areas of the shoreline, there is no mention of ADA compliance. Why not? The SMP must include the requirement for Thurston County to regulate the management of all stormwater outfalls to filter out contaminants from entering our marine, lake and river waters. For example, here on Long Lake there are thirteen outfall pipes that drain from County roads into the lake...most of these outfalls drain directly into the lake with no pretreatment. Stormwater runoff accounts for 75% of the pollution of our waters.</p>	
71	9/25/21	Ed	Cogan	<p>The current status of our property is Conservancy. The proposed is Rural Conservancy.</p> <p>I have spent a few hours reading through the proposed plan and could not find the difference between the two.</p> <p>Am I missing the obvious? If so please guide me to the right section. If not, what is the difference between the two?</p>	
72	9/25/21	Thomas	Clingman	<p>I see a handful of mining lakes are proposed for inclusion in SMA jurisdiction in the Update. The Ecology SMP Handbook provides specific guidance to exclude lakes created by mining from jurisdiction : "During the active mining period, Ecology recommends that gravel mine ponds be treated as industrial water bodies not subject to the SMA ". See Chapter 5,including page 7 (general criteria for excluding a particular waterbody) and page 13 (specific guidance on mine ponds.) I support following this guidance,to keep Thurston County SMP effort focused on waterbodies which provide habitat, public access and other values consistent with the intent of the SMA. As detailed in the Handbook, gravel mines can be inactive for long periods but are still in process of extraction under their DNR permit. I anticipate providing this comment in the on-line open house, but wanted to make sure I understand the specifics of these ponds. I could not figure out where they are from the written documents or from the maps. And thanks again for your good work at the Lakes open house.</p>	Mining Lakes
73	9/25/21	John	Suessman	<p>Thank you for your presentation on September 23, 2021 at The Lacey Community Center. Here are some comments, thoughts, and requests for the record. I’m a lake front property owner on Pattison Lake and according to the maps you have posted, our property is currently zoned Rural. It is my understanding the proposal renames this to Shoreline Residential.</p> <p>#1. I think one of my major concerns is the proposal to increase the buffer beyond its current width of 50 feet. I do not feel it is appropriate for any government agency, City, County, State or Federal to come in and change the buffer, or a right of way, without meeting with each property owner individually, and reaching a financial settlement to make parts of their property unable for them to use as the owners see’s fit. Changing/extending the buffer is taking property and control of our property from us without our consent. The States access, and right to control ends at the high water mark. We, my family, are extremely respectful of the lake, our ability to enjoy it, use it, and we do more than our part to preserve the fish, wildlife, and water quality. To include Wood Duck nesting boxes, catch and release fishing, and removing derelict rafts that have been cut loose. This leads to another question or issue. If you change the buffer, where and when does this stop? Does this mean the next time the Shoreline Management Program is updated in (10, 20, 30 years) do you have the right to increase the buffer to 100, 150, 200, feet? The buffer is the buffer and increasing it takes control of my property from me and my family. We respectfully oppose any alteration to the buffer for the designation “Shoreline Residential”. Thank you!</p> <p>#2. As I review your documents and see that the category Shoreline Residential accounts for less than 4% of the Shoreline in Thurston County, and that all Shoreline Residential is built out, and that Shoreline Residential will not impede or alter the goal of "no net loss to the shore line ecological functions and processes". There are an abundant number of pages including multiple sketches on pages 146 through 153 all with diagrams of the residence and the buffer and set back. Why has so much effort is being put into describing Shoreline Residential when it is currently all built out in Thurston County. With this said, where in the document do pre-existing homes and properties have a Grandfathered provision in the ordinance. At the public meeting on Thursday you told me I was good to go. I want to see that in writing. This entire document makes it look like the lake front homeowners are going to have someone from Thurston County stop by in a year after this takes affect and say, remove that dock, your buffer is not large enough, remove the bulkhead, and so on. Here's a copy of the new shoreline rules and you are out of compliance. When we built our home the set back was 60 feet. We did everything the county asked, to have different rules now with no provision to protects us is extremely concerning.</p> <p>#3. We are concerned with the verbiage used to describe a buffer. “A non-clearing area”. from our front porch, to the lake is 60 feet of lawn. We mow it once a week. This verbiage makes one believe that we are not allowed to weed, cut, manicure, or make the yard/lawn a place to enjoy and play on. Worse yet, currently there is a serious pond weed and milfoil weed issue on Pattison Lake. The county weed control person recommended we rank the weeds so we can fish and swim. We and our neighbors are in the process of becoming a lake association so we can hire a professional to helps us deal with the weed and blue algae issue. The owner of the waterway, “Washington State” is absent and doing nothing to help. In other words, neither the County, nor the State are involved or have money or resources to clean up the water in “their” waterway. The language above is a good example of verbiage that gets into an ordinance written with good intentions, but is not realistic in application. Not to be rude or misconstrued, but I will continue to rank the lake weeds, and mow my lawn for as long as I live on this earth, my home and my yard are my castle. I have a right to keep it my way. Please do not write language into a County ordinance which down the road will result in code enforcement knocking on my door to say stop mowing your lake side front lawn. If a buffer is an area of no buildings then say so. But to make it a buffer like you’d have on the Nisqually River is wrong. Residential Shoreline is different than Rural Conservancy or Natural. This wording must be fixed or deleted or not applied to Shoreline Residential. Thank you!</p> <p>#4. We too are concerned with the language in CH 19.400.100 of conforming and legally non conforming. This is confusing and without a “Blacks Law Dictionary” definition of these terms. It gives someone the opinion that structures or boat houses, docks, small cabinets for life jackets, etc are illegal. The county should not be making rules more restrictive than State Law. The County does not own the lake, nor my property. So why is it the county needs to write rules more restrictive than what the State is asking for? This piece is ambiguous and would put bad labeling on structures on someone’s property.</p> <p>We oppose this type of labeling and would ask that it be eliminated from the proposed code. Thank you!</p>	Pattison Lake

Thurston County Shoreline Master Program Open House and 10/20/21 PC Public Hearing Comments

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment	Affiliation / Geo. Area
74	9/26/21	Katherine	Knight	I am a property owner in Boston Harbor (Zangle Cove). I request that the Planning Commission re- characterize immediately the Proposed Shoreline Environmental Designation from Rural Conservancy to Shoreline Residential for my shoreline home area. My property and the property of my adjacent neighbors has been fully developed with residences since the early 1900's. I have two properties and two residents that were built in 1934. One was remodeled in 1965 and the other is exactly as originally built. I have about 90 feet on the shoreline. All water side homes in this community are sited very hear to the shore, or high tide line. The original homes were very small vacation homes for Olympia city dwellers. Current homes are larger and many were built on the bones of the original cabins. The houses are very close together, many closer than most homes in the city. This is very easy to see if you look at a map or chart of Boston Harbor and around Dover Point on both sides of the point. This Thurston County location has been a residential/recreational area for nearly 100 years. Homes were built close together for residential purposes and remain that way today. The entire community is served by a Sewer-Water System which is now managed by, Thurston County Public Works. All residents of Boston Harbor paid for this mandatory system which came on-line for all during the summer of 1970. As shoreline homeowners, we use our beach sand for furniture and children's play, swim in the salt water, paddle canoes and kayaks. We use SUP boards and all types of prams, row boats, etc. We have decks on our homes, some bulkheads, lawns and one homeowner has a boat house. Another has a boat house inside of home, which is not visible to outside. TO RE-STATE my request: WE on Dover Point are residents, families in a residentially dense area of Thurston County on the shores of Zangle Cove. My property is one of many that are part of the whole of Boston Harbor. We all look similar in footprint on the ground if you look carefully at the homes on a map, a fly over photo, or drive the lanes of this small community. The above mentioned Sewer-water System also unites us as a unified established residential community.	Boston Harbor
75	9/26/21	Patrick	Townsend	We were shocked to learn of the recharacterization of shoreline properties in some parts of the Boston Harbor area under the proposed SMP. There has not been adequate public discussion of this change which will have significant impacts on shoreline property owners. Boston Harbor is a dense residential community. Thurston County has previously recognized this fact by classifying the area as a LAMRID. Most of Boston Harbor is now proposed to be classified as residential under the new SMP. A small portion of Boston Harbor properties, between Dover Point and Zangle Cove (on Dover Point Way NE, 77th Avenue NE and Earling Street NE), are now proposed to be classified as rural conservancy, even though they are part of this dense Boston Harbor community. There is no actual difference between these properties and the distinction between these properties and the rest of Boston Harbor is arbitrary and artificial. Because of the increased buffer requirements, this reclassification punishes local shoreline property owners, many of whom have worked actively to improve the ecological conditions of their shoreland property. For example, we are currently working with the Thurston County Conservation District to remove a bulkhead on our second property at 636 77th Ave NE. Grants have been received for this work. Additionally, it is absurd to attempt to improve ecological conditions on the shorelands while ignoring the significant negative ecological impacts of industrial aquaculture on the tidelands. It should be noted+C76 that last year a federal judge terminated every single aquaculture permit issued by the Army Corps in Washington State due to environmental concerns and regulatory failures. This included over 900 permits covering thousands of acres of tideland. The entire process of developing the new Thurston County SMP regulations in regard to industrial aquaculture on our shorelines has also been deeply flawed. We ask that the Planning Commission schedule a session for public comments related to these property reclassifications as soon as possible, making sure that all shoreline property owners in Boston Harbor are notified of the session in a timely manner.	Boston Harbor
76	9/26/21	Meredith and Donovan	Rafferty	Please see our attached letter requesting recharacterization from a Rural Conservancy designation (as proposed in the 2021 draft of the shoreline management plan), to a Shoreline Residential designation (as previously presented in the 2017 SMP update and the 1990 Plan). Residents all along our shared shoreline are submitting requests for recharacterization. The residential density and similarity of our low bank shoreline to other sections of Boston Harbor are illustrated by the photos included in our letter. We request the Planning Commission's immediate consideration in order for a recharacterization to be included in the 2021 SMP Update. We are prepared to present our request immediately. Body of letter dated Sept. 26, 2021 As shoreline property owners in the Boston Harbor LAMIRD, we request that the Planning Commission recharacterize our property from a Rural Conservancy designation (as proposed in the 2021 draft of the shoreline management plan), to a Shoreline Residential designation (as previously presented in the 2017 SMP update and the 1990 Plan). Our property is part of a residential shoreline pictured in this letter. Homeowners along this shoreline are submitting requests for recharacterization. The features of our shared shoreline are illustrated in the photos included in this document. We support our request for the Shoreline Residential designation with the following: 1. Our dense residential use is recognized by the County as a LAMIRD. One of the requirements for a Residential Shoreline designation is to be in a LAMIRD, which we are. Our property is part of Boston Harbor which was platted in dense lots over 100 years ago. By the time of the Growth Management Act and the Shoreline Management Act in the 1970s, our shoreline properties were already developed. Thurston County recognized this dense residential use by establishing Boston Harbor as a LAMIRD (Limited Area of More Intensive Rural Development). 2. Our residential properties form a dense section of intense residential use. Our homes are clustered along a low bank shoreline as illustrated in the picture in this letter. Our homes are close to the high water mark, protected by bulkheads. There are boat sheds and docks, houses, decks and lawns, and boats and kayaks as part of our residential use. 3. The residential impact upon the shoreline is similar to that of other areas of Boston Harbor that are proposed as Shoreline Residential. We have collective residential impact on the shoreline as do other Boston Harbor properties proposed as Shoreline Residential (see enclosed pictures in original letter). We request the Planning Commission's immediate consideration in order for a recharacterization to be included in the 2021 SMP Update. We are prepared to present our request immediately.	Boston Harbor
77	9/26/21	Donna	Wolfe	I think it's imperative that the buffer width stay at 50-feet. Otherwise, it could be very difficult to do any kind of home improvement, re-modeling, or re-building. I also think that the labeling of all existing legally build homes/structures should be "conforming", not "legally non-conforming". Words matter.	
78	9/27/21	Maribeth	Duffy	I'm writing this letter to request that the Draft Shoreline Environmental Designation be revised to return my property's designation back to the Residential Shoreline in keeping with all our Boston Harbor Community neighbors. I oppose the drafted proposal to change our land use designation from Residential to Rural Conservancy. I have been a proud resident of Thurston County for over 20 years and a strong advocate of clean water, clean air, and responsible land use. I also own my waterfront home at 630 77th Ave NE Olympia located in the immediate Boston Harbor community, which is densely residential. I pay for community water and sewer services along with the rest of our planned community, benefiting the water quality of the south Puget Sound. Our property taxes are also quite high, despite the community density. I have only recently learned of this proposed change in designation effecting my land use, but in further investigation I discovered that this same concern was raised prior (in 2015-2016) and that at that time it was amended appropriately. It is unclear to me why this proposal to unduly restrict our property use is again being raised, restricting me more than other residents in my Boston Harbor neighborhood. The proposed restrictions that would be realized by me, if we were to be changed from Residential to Rural Conservancy would be unduly onerous, and frankly unfair given our same small lot sizes as those of the remainder of our Boston Harbor community, who in the current draft proposal, would remain designated Residential. I invite you to come out to our neighborhood and see why this proposed change has me and my immediate neighbors very concerned.	Boston Harbor
79	9/27/21	John and Reita	Marshall	The shoreline designation on the low bank properties located south of Dover Point along the west side of Zangle Cove should be designated as Shoreline Residential as they were on the 2017 Shoreline Master Program Update. The properties located west of Dover Point over to Jeal Point should also be designated Shoreline Residential. These properties should have the same designation as the rest of Boston Harbor. We are all served by the same sewer-water district that is operated by Thurston County. The sewer-water system was fully approved and construction began in 1990 and was paid for by local residents through assessments. Most properties designated Rural Conservancy are served by septic tanks and private water systems. Our properties are fully developed and situated close to the shoreline and actively used for residential purposes. The proposed designation on the Sept. 2021 Final Draft of Updated SMP is not justified. The proper designation is Shoreline Residential.	Boston Harbor
80	9/27/21	Lawrence	Seale	I live at 624 77th Ave. NE, which is a waterfront property on Zangle Cove in the Boston Harbor area. I have owned this home with my wife since 1990. It was built in 1979. The purpose of this email is to request that the portion of this shoreline containing properties on the north and west side of Zangle cove should be recharacterized as Shoreline Residential from the plan's current designation of Rural Conservancy. Shoreline Residential was the designation for this area in the 2017 draft of the SMP. I would like to appear and speak before any hearing on this issue and wish to be notified when that is scheduled. My main points are: The area that I live in does not differ from the portion of Boston Harbor on the west side of Dover Point and east side of Budd Inlet adjacent to the Boston Harbor Marina. We are a neighborhood of residences spaced much like any other portion of urban Thurston County. There is no undeveloped property in this shoreline area. We are all part of the Thurston County Operated Water and Sewer Utility, another indication that we are more urban and developed, than rural and having a natural, undeveloped character.	Boston Harbor

Thurston County Shoreline Master Program Open House and 10/20/21 PC Public Hearing Comments

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment	Affiliation / Geo. Area
81	9/27/21	Kimberly	Phillips	I am writing to request you reconsider the designation of the shoreline in Zangle Cove. I understand this area has been designated Rural Conservancy rather than Shoreline Residential in your current plan. I live at 544 Dover Point Lane NE, at the very end of Boston Harbor Road and on the west shore of Zangle Cove. This home was built in 1960, with a home up the hill and a small boathouse on the bulkhead. This home was connected to the community sewer and water system when that was built, along with the neighboring homes. It is a wonderful place to live, and part of the attraction is, we are part of the Boston Harbor neighborhood in spite of facing a different direction. Our homes sites were platted long ago in the original Boston Harbor design, and built to be part of the residential community around the marina. These homes are too close together to be considered rural. They are similarly spaced to the homes that line the shoreline north from Priest Point Park to Burfoot Park to the Boston Harbor Marina and further north to Dover Point. I believe Shoreline Residential is the appropriate designation.	Boston Harbor
82	9/30/21	Brian and Nancy	Muirhead	Thank you for your briefing to the Thurston County lake residents on 9/23/21. My name is Brian Muirhead and my wife Nancy and I are new residents on Pattison Lake as of Oct. 2020. We have two major issues we are bringing to your attention now and will provide additional inputs on a number of other items through the virtual Open House process. We agree strongly with one of the questioners at your talk that any buffer zone dimension should be based on specific criteria that the Dept. of Ecology (DoE) might have for changing any of the buffer dimensions away from the current ones, e.g. Shoreline Residential: 50 ft. We both work in scientific fields and we recognize that basing decisions on "science" must always be able to be validated, typically by independent sources of data, analysis and where possible, testing. I've tried looking for appropriate information on the DoE website but the varied nature and volume of documentation left me unable to find what I was looking for. Any pointers would be helpful. Therefore, our position on 19.400.120.B.1. is based on what we know at this time and we support the smallest number buffer zones for each designation: Shoreline Residential: 50 ft; Urban Conservancy: 100 ft; Rural Conservancy: 125 ft and Natural: 200 ft. With respect to the proposed SED changes - we need to challenge what looks like a redrawing of the boundary lines along parcel boundaries and redesignation of our parcel 11702140600 as "natural." Our residence is on the adjacent parcel 11702420100. We understand and happily accept that part of our parcel, 11702140600, is under a Department of Fish and Wildlife bald eagle management plan (due to a nest that was active in 1998), agreed to by the original owner of this property in 1998. However, the previous owners and now ourselves are using parts of parcel 11702140600 as active living space along with parcel 11702420100. We need to know how to properly update the SED map to show shoreline residential and rural conservancy designations as it is and has been being used and maintained, and finding agreement on a natural designation where appropriate. Thank you for hard work on this important document and working with the community to get it right.	Pattison Lake
83	10/2/21	Bruce	Womack	We have enough regulation now on the water. There should be no changes unless some regulations are being removed completely, absolutely none should be added. If you don't live on the water you should not have a say on what is done on the water. I protect the environment and what I have observed, is that the vast majority of the people on the water do the same. I sincerely doubt any input will be taken into consideration by the planning commission.	
84	10/2/21	Scott	Ferris	I wondered about cutting trees in our backyard on the Puget Sound. I also wondered about the neighbor's cutting of trees. Searched and searched online. Found the county's master plan. Lots of pages. Lots and lots of pages. Couldn't find the info I was looking for. If you want to be successful, please produce guidelines for waterfront property owners that are easy to find online, and simple to read/understand. 2 or 3 pages max. Diameter of tree, species of tree, distance from shoreline. What can be cut? What can be limbed? What must be left alone?	
85	10/3/21	Emma	Butler	I don't understand the postcard I received in the mail. It states our property will be directly affected by the changes. Please explain what kind of changes we will expect. 2719 140TH AVE SW, TENINO WA 98589	
86	10/3/21	Dan		This "presentation" is useless to the average user without being able to download a scalable SED map that can be zoomed in on. The interactive map with a satellite view is extremely annoying as it is difficult to see the actual waterways due to the vegetation. What really needed to be provided was a simple color map of "permit required" for improvements, and allowable improvements, within the given area on a map that can be zoomed in on with accurate property parcel outlines. Going forward, keep things simple! Shoreline property owners should be able to discover what areas are protected on a topographical map and see a list of what can and cannot be done within these given areas with no more effort than entering an address and a few clicks on the keypad. What currently exists is confusing to the layperson and most would rather beg forgiveness / plead ignorance than ask permission.	
87	10/3/21	David	Sommers	Codes work best when residents buy into them. It helps when people feel that the codes actually help preserve the quality of the water body. Currently many rural residents are skeptical about the county and resist getting permits, since the county is perceived as enforcing the codes arbitrarily. Most of the the changes seem to be in the direction of loosening the restrictions, so that will help.	
88	10/3/21	James	Bishop	Review my letter dated September 24,2021, subject Shoreline Master Program. It tells the whole story as to how most of my property has been restricted or destroyed by local government control. A few years ago, someone allowed building debris to be dumped in a corner of the Blake Drainage area. This debris came from downtown Olympia's Fourth Street. It included wood, plaster, etc. It was eventually stopped but this debris was never removed to prevent the contamination of local wells in this area as others in the down hill drainage. Your elaborate program states,"area water comes from wells." Are some of these blunders going to be cleaned up ? Is our local Indian Creek , which is dead now, going to restored ? OR are we just being subjected to more regulations ?	Blake Drainage System
89	10/3/21	Patty	May	I live on Black Lake and hope The SMP adopts the 75' buffer to better protect the shoreline. We need to protect the shoreline, and habitat for waterfowl and Oregon spotted Frog, etc. The summer boating activity is almost intolerable, and there is almost zero enforcement of the boating regulations sadly. I hope to see Black Lake closed to wake boats and hydroplanes! I believe we need to do a much better job of protecting the shoreline, so that seeing a heron, or mergansers, and buffleheads is not soon a thing of the past!	Black Lake
90	10/4/21	Reggie	Grantham	I am writing to voice my concurrence with the Lake Lawrence LMD, Lake Canal and HOA board members. As follows: 1. Buffer widths for lakes to remain as they were in the 1990 SMP . If this particular issue is changed to what the county staff want most of you will have your properties (on the lake/canal/community beaches) seriously impacted. 2. Pier, Dock, Float or ramp grating we want the option to exclude expensive grating for lakes that do not contain salmon. 3. Pier and Dock piling spacing: we would like the option to reduce spacing to 8 feet. 4. Pier and Dock Width (Issue #9 - in coalition letter) we would like the option to be able to make our piers/docks 8 feet wide or more if the applicant can demonstrate need. 5. Shoreline Environmental Designations (SEDs): we would like the changes we were able to make for residents of Lake Lawrence adopted by the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners.	Lake Lawrence
91	10/4/21	Shonda	Carrier	As a community member at Lake Lawrence I would like the following to be considered. 1. Buffer widths (Issue #2 in coalition letter) for lakes to remain as they were in the 1990 SMP . If this particular issue is changed to what the county staff want most of you will have your properties (on the lake/canal/community beaches) seriously impacted. 2. Pier, Dock, Float or ramp grating (Issue #7 in coalition letter) we want the option to exclude expensive grating for lakes that do not contain salmon. 3. Pier and Dock piling spacing (Issue #8 - in coalition letter) we want the option to reduce spacing to 8 feet. 4. Pier and Dock Width (Issue #9 - in coalition letter) we want the option to be able to make our piers/docks 8 feet wide or more if applicant can demonstrate need. 5. Shoreline Environmental Designations (SEDs) (Issue #12 in coalition letter) we want the changes we were able to make for residents of Lake Lawrence adopted by the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners.	Lake Lawrence
92	10/4/21	Fred and Cindy	Wahl	Please make sure that the following are passed. We have lived on Lake Lawrence since 1992 and would like to have these in place. 1. Buffer widths (Issue #2 in coalition letter) for lakes to remain as they were in the 1990 SMP . Please do not change these. 2. Pier, Dock, Float or ramp grating (Issue #7 in coalition letter) we want the option to exclude expensive grating for lakes that do not contain salmon. 3. Pier and Dock piling spacing (Issue #8 - in coalition letter) we want the option to reduce spacing to 8 feet. 4. Pier and Dock Width (Issue #9 - in coalition letter) we want the option to be able to make our piers/docks 8 feet wide or more if applicant can demonstrate need. 5. Shoreline Environmental Designations (SEDs) (Issue #12 in coalition letter) we want the changes we were able to make for residents of Lake Lawrence adopted by the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners. Thank you for your time and efforts on these matters.	Lake Lawrence

Thurston County Shoreline Master Program Open House and 10/20/21 PC Public Hearing Comments

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment	Affiliation / Geo. Area
93	10/4/21	Frank and Frances	Forman	As a Shoreline property owner, LLW#21, I encourage you to keep the buffer widths as they were in 1990 . I also wish to control grating of lakes without salmon. Reduce piling spacing to 8 feet and allow dock width to be 8 ft., or more if proven necessary. Adapt the changes made on Lake Lawrence. Thank you,	Lake Lawrence
94	10/4/21	Barry	Halverson	Just wanted to provide an email input to the SMP open house. As a member of the Thurston County Shoreline Stakeholders Coalition I am in support of all 19 of the issues provided in the attached coalition issue paper. If you need me to provide you a detailed response on each issue please let me know. If my support for each of these issues will be recorded for each one by providing this email please let me know. (Content of referenced coalition letter is included as Comment #64)	Lake Lawrence
95	10/4/21	Marc	Spiegelberg	I see on the proposed shoreline master plan that the area to the south of my barn that is adjacent to the wet land buffer is under review. Can you please tell me why that is? My property address is 6639 Prather Road SW.	
96	10/4/21	Bill	Alkire	What is the SED consistency between the county SMP and the Cities SMP where the borders meet? Is there consistency in the implimention SMA when it comes to updates to master programs between the different jurisdictions in Thurston County?	
97	10/4/21	Jim	Hampton	The real issue is all the free protected campers crapping into Capitol Lake and most of the county wet lands. Ratface Ferguson and Gov. Dimslee stop all attempts to clean up their parties mess. So any changes are just another power grab to punish citizens who do the correct thing. What are you going to do with the coming rat infestations?	
98	10/5/21	Blaine	Edwards	Can you please let us know what the proposed changes are? I would like to understand what changes you are proposing so I know if I need to attend the Virtual Open House. A link the changes on your website will work also.	
99	10/5/21	Michael	Crosby	As a lakeshore property owner at 17035 Lake Point Dr. SE (Lot 4 Division 2) Yelm, WA, on Lake Lawrence, I would like the following to be included in the Shoreline Master Program: 1. Buffer Widths (Issue #2 in coalition letter) for lakes to remain as they were in the 1990 Shoreline Master Program 2. Pier, Dock, Float, or Ramp Grating (Issue #7 in coalition letter) I want the option to exclude expensive grating for lakes that don't contain salmon. 3. Pier and Dock Piling Spacing (Issue #8 in coalition letter) I want the option to reduce the spacing to 8 feet. 4. Pier and Dock Width (Issue #9 in coalition letter) I want the option to make our piers and docks 8 feet wide or more if an applicant can demonstrate the need for more space. 5. Shoreline Environmental Designations (SEDs) (Issue #12 in coalition letter) I want the changes we were to make for the residents of Lake Lawrence adopted by the Planning Commission and Board of Thurston County Commissioners. I sincerely thank you for your thoughtful consideration of my requests for these essential details in protecting the quality of our lake and environment in the future.	Lake Lawrence
100	10/5/21	Craig	Kiser	Mr. Deffobis: We own and operate a motor freight terminal on the property located at 3321 Maytown Rd. According to the County GIS site, part of our property is in the "Rural Conservancy" zone and part is in the "Under Review" category. I would greatly appreciate the chance to discuss this Plan with you and what these designations might mean for our site.	
101	10/5/21	Steve	Gilling	I am a resident on Lake Lawrence in Yelm and would like the following issues in the amended SMP document for approval. 1. Buffer widths (Issue #2 in coalition letter) for lakes to remain as they were in the 1990 SMP . If this particular issue is changed to what the county staff want most of you will have your properties (on the lake/canal/community beaches) seriously impacted. 2. Pier, Dock, Float or ramp grating (Issue #7 in coalition letter) we want the option to exclude expensive grating for lakes that do not contain salmon. 3. Pier and Dock piling spacing (Issue #8 - in coalition letter) we want the option to reduce spacing to 8 feet. 4. Pier and Dock Width (Issue #9 - in coalition letter) we want the option to be able to make our piers/docks 8 feet wide or more if applicant can demonstrate need. 5. Shoreline Environmental Designations (SEDs) (Issue #12 in coalition letter) we want the changes we were able to make for residents of Lake Lawrence adopted by the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners.	Lake Lawrence
102	10/5/21	Leslie	Sederberg	Please add a page or chart of all current and proposed changes with estimated costs. Thank you	
103	10/5/21	Raed	Gyekis	My wife and I are homeowners on Lake Lawrence, in eastern Thurston County. I'm also a 24- year veteran of our military, and we have spent nearly half of that time building a home and raising a family on this beautiful lake. We love Lake Lawrence, and want to do everything possible to ensure it remains a great place to raise a family, long after we've handed the keys off to our kids. A big part of that is both protecting it and ensuring our community has ownership and responsibility in it. We have some critical items to address with the County and those helping draft this product. If not managed correctly, this DRAFT Shoreline Master program has the potential to negatively impact the residents of our county in significant ways. If done right, it can successfully ensure the long term health, accessibility and functionality of our waterways. First, it is crucial to help us ensure that the Buffer widths for all lakes remain as they were in the 1990 SMP. This is not a wilderness area, and ensuring that we keep our human population engaged and connected to the lake and it's health is paramount to ensuring its long term health itself. These 1990 limits wisely balance competing requirements. We strongly oppose any attempt to increase buffer widths. Second, the one size-fits-all approach for Pier, Dock, Float or ramp grating misses the spirit of the intent: for lakes without salmon populations, members should be able to exclude this extremely expensive option. No Salmon? No grate needed. Third (and fourth, really): Pier and Dock piling should be optional to reduce to 8 feet as needed, and dock widths should be optional up to 8 feet if need can be demonstrated. Don't 'handcuff' residents with a one-size-fits-all rule set that doesn't offer common-sense options for less common circumstances. Finally, and critically, we need all of the Shoreline Environmental Designations (SEDs) changes we were able to make for residents of Lake Lawrence adopted by the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners. We all greatly appreciate the amount of work that has gone into this process, on all sides. Let's work to get it right and over the finish line in a way that continues to improve our communities engagement, ownership and responsibility for our lakes and waterways for this generation and the next.	Lake Lawrence
104	10/5/21	Richard (Tom)	Goldsby	Are there any zone or other changes to my property at 14149 Military Rd SE, Tenino WA 98589, property number 09560002000 ? If so, why?	Eld Inlet
105	10/5/21	Jennifer	Smith	I am a Lake Lawrence resident and I understand the SMP document is being drafted, and would like the following issues included. Thank you for your consideration. 1. Buffer widths (Issue #2 in coalition letter) for lakes to remain as they were in the 1990 SMP . If this particular issue is changed to what the county staff want most of you will have your properties (on the lake/canal/community beaches) seriously impacted. 2. Pier, Dock, Float or ramp grating (Issue #7 in coalition letter) we want the option to exclude expensive grating for lakes that do not contain salmon. 3. Pier and Dock piling spacing (Issue #8 - in coalition letter) we want the option to reduce spacing to 8 feet. 4. Pier and Dock Width (Issue #9 - in coalition letter) we want the option to be able to make our piers/docks 8 feet wide or more if applicant can demonstrate need. 5. Shoreline Environmental Designations (SEDs) (Issue #12 in coalition letter) we want the changes we were able to make for residents of Lake Lawrence adopted by the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners.	Lake Lawrence
106	10/5/21	Isaac	Smith	I am a Lake Lawrence resident and I understand the SMP document is being drafted, and would like the following issues included. Thank you for your consideration. 1. Buffer widths (Issue #2 in coalition letter) for lakes to remain as they were in the 1990 SMP . If this particular issue is changed to what the county staff want most of you will have your properties (on the lake/canal/community beaches) seriously impacted. 2. Pier, Dock, Float or ramp grating (Issue #7 in coalition letter) we want the option to exclude expensive grating for lakes that do not contain salmon. 3. Pier and Dock piling spacing (Issue #8 - in coalition letter) we want the option to reduce spacing to 8 feet. 4. Pier and Dock Width (Issue #9 - in coalition letter) we want the option to be able to make our piers/docks 8 feet wide or more if applicant can demonstrate need. 5. Shoreline Environmental Designations (SEDs) (Issue #12 in coalition letter) we want the changes we were able to make for residents of Lake Lawrence adopted by the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners.	Lake Lawrence

Thurston County Shoreline Master Program Open House and 10/20/21 PC Public Hearing Comments

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment	Affiliation / Geo. Area
107	10/5/21	Aldo	Leopold	<p>I'm writing to provide comments on the proposed change in shoreline designation status along a portion of Zangle Cove, designated reach MBU16, as part of the SMP update. I recently purchased the home located at 638 77th Ave NE, on Zangle Cove. A neighbor contacted me regarding the proposed changes and suggested that I review them and provide comments if I had any. I have reviewed the proposed update and offer the following input. My background is in natural resource management, and in particular, restoration of aquatic ecosystems. I've worked as an aquatic ecologist for over 25 years, in the private, non-profit, and public sectors. I have focused on implementing both estuarine and riverine restoration work, however I have also completed numerous wetland delineations and critical areas reviews in the past. Given this background, I am familiar with shoreline plans, and also very supportive of shoreline planning that provides maximum protection for nearshore ecosystems. I suggest that goal is best served by shoreline management plans based on sound science and that can be effectively implemented to achieve the goal of nearshore conservation and restoration. As an owner of shoreline property affected by the proposed plan, I also have a vested interest, but one that is tempered by my commitment to shoreline conservation and restoration. My comments are based on that perspective. My opinion is that the proposed SMP update inaccurately designates a portion of the MBU16 reach of shoreline as "rural conservancy", that should be designated "shoreline residential". The reason I believe this, is that while there are important ecological processes occurring along the reach, most ecological processes have been disrupted to some extent because the shoreline is not "ecologically intact". The reason I believe the shoreline is not "ecologically intact", is because of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Significant stretches of this reach of shoreline have bulkheads. 2. The shoreline vegetative community has been dramatically altered, is not comprised of a native plant community, and is heavily colonized by invasive exotic species. 3. All of the uplands within the shoreline management zone have been subdivided into residential lots and nearly completely developed for residential use. <p>Consequently, I suggest that the characteristics of the portion of reach MBU16 beginning at the MBU15 reach break, along the shoreline that is highly developed just past the end of 77th Ave NE, are more consistent with the definition of "shoreline residential". While there may be some exceptions within this section of the reach, they are limited and may warrant their own designation. The reasons I recommend this modification to the proposed designation are the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is more consistent with the shoreline designation definitions and more accurately reflects the conditions along this reach of shoreline. 2. It acknowledges historic uses more appropriately. 3. The shorelines management zone in this area is platted and developed for residential use. 4. The development is served by a municipal water and sewer system. 5. And finally, a designation of "shoreline residential" for this reach that is impacted by shoreline alterations, would not discourage shoreline restoration, while a change to "rural conservancy" would. <p>To further explain why I suggest changing the designation to "rural conservancy" will discourage restoration, I offer the following. With the change to conservancy, that requires mitigation for many projects within 150' of the shoreline as opposed to 50' for "residential" designation, property owners would be encouraged to reserve restoration opportunities for when they need mitigation. With that approach, classified as mitigation, restoration work would no longer be eligible for public funding, and consequently, would either not occur or be scaled back because of cost. I offer my own property as an example. The entirety of my shoreline has a structurally sound, 8' high, concrete bulkhead that fully disrupts nearshore processes. The home located on the property is almost completely within 150' of the shoreline. I would like to consider restoring this shoreline. However, even with my background, I have to pause to consider the personal implications of doing this altruistically, and consider reserving the opportunity in the event I wish to complete renovations to the exiting home, which is older and in need of improvements. If this shoreline was designated "shoreline residential", I would not be discouraged from seeking opportunities to implement restoration as none of the home is within 50' of the shoreline. I ask that in consideration of these comments, the planning department reconsider the boundaries of reach MBU15, and include the portions currently delineated as MBU16 that are intensively developed, within reach MBU15. Thank you for considering my input. If you or others involved with this issue would like to discuss my comments more, please don't hesitate to contact me.</p>	Boston Harbor
108	10/5/21	No Name Given		Prefer Option A in buffer setbacks.	
109	10/5/21	Ronald	Moore	i belive you are getting some wrong infor mation there is an ilegal earth dam north of highway 12 at the slew west of rochester that should be removed to allow better flow and also allow better fish migrating the water stops flooding as soon as the water starts going over this dam whitch gives you a false flood reading i dont know what restrictions the blue means but i know my land has never flooded in the last 3 100 year floods however i know it makes financing hard or inposible the way it is now	
110	10/6/21	Brian and Nancy	Muirhead	Thanks for your emails and thanks for the SED report. I was surprised that this is a final Draft but dated 6/30/13, interesting that there's been no updates since then, implying that any issues haven't been identified or worked since then. I'm familiar with the SED map tool but I don't know when the arial image was last updated. I'll look at my survey information and take some pictures to try and show where and why I think the designation is incorrect. I'll be sending in additional comments on the SMP through the virtual site (unless you'd rather I send them directly to you), and will be at the 10/20 meeting.	Pattison Lake
111	10/6/21	John	Woodford	This is not a transparent Open House! There is no way to see comments made by any other members of the public...or replies posted by the Community Planning staff. It is the sharing of this kind of information that is the greatest value of a true OpenHouse.	Chair, Thurston County Shoreline Stakeholders Coalition
112	10/6/21	Charles	Gilman	I have three concerns but first, those images of Lake St. Clair do not show a dramatic change. Some trees were removed in the top of the images while some grew significantly in the bottom. One house was built on an existing site in the middle and the only change was adding a roof and some landscaping. My concerns center on the language you've used. For instance, in the SMP Fact Sheet #2: "Lateral expansion of nonconforming (hyphenated earlier) structures required (are these rules not in effect?) a variance or reasonable use exception." In almost every sample language under the Current SMP, the language is inconsistent, non-descriptive ("a complex process"), seems to be deliberately confusing such as the quote above, and/or missing vital definitions such as "nonconforming" structures and lots or "mitigation." That you've failed to explain it's the SMP and this proposed SMP that will label buildings not currently found to be nonconforming as nonconforming is misleading at best. The second concern is the missing language. Under SMP FAQ 2, you fail to include any prohibited changes. For example, under "Expanding a Structure" under the draft SMP, you don't note lateral expansion will be prohibited. You also don't explain what mitigation would be required or even is. Under "Storage Structures" you list restrictions as though they're authorizations. They aren't restricted at all under the current SMP but you use language of "allowed up to" rather than "prohibited over." Finally, you seem to be attempting to usurp FEMA's authority. Also under the SMP FAW #2, under "Interior Remodel," current SMP, it reads the remodel value could not exceed 50% of the structure's original value. I couldn't find any reference to that in the current SMP but it is a requirement under both FEMA's Unit 8 and 44CFR 59.1. Are you claiming the remodel value can exceed 50% of the original value? Or, worse yet, are you stating those restrictions still apply but that you're adding additional restrictions making it appear as a newly authorized criteria?	Lake St. Clair
113	10/6/21	Dean and Wendice		Could you please tell us how the proposed changes to the SMP will affect our property at 9735 Yelm Hwy SE. The parcel # is 093500400 and is adjacent to Eaton Creek.	
114	10/6/21	Christopher	Collins	<p>I currently own property on Lake Lawrence and have worked closely with the county permit department over the past six years to build our house and put in a dock on the lake. The requirements of the current shoreline master program as currently written were followed closely and approved by the county. I have reviewed the proposed revision to the shoreline master program and would like you to consider the following changes to the proposal.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Buffer widths (Issue #2 in coalition letter) for lakes to remain as they were in the 1990 SMP . If this particular issue is changed to what the county staff wants we would have found it nearly impossible to use the portion of the property on the shoreline. 2. Pier, Dock, Float or ramp grating (Issue #7 in coalition letter) there should be an option to exclude expensive grating for lakes that do not contain salmon. 3. Pier and Dock pilling spacing (Issue #8 - in coalition letter) there should be an option to reduce spacing to 8 feet. 4. Pier and Dock Width (Issue #9 - in coalition letter) there should be an option to be able to make our piers/docks 8 feet wide or more if applicant can demonstrate need. 5. Shoreline Environmental Designations (SEDs) (Issue #12 in coalition letter) I would like you to adopt the changes made for residents of Lake Lawrence adopted by the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners. Please take the time to review these recommendations for Lake Lawrence in order to allow property owners here to live and use the lake in a safe and responsible manner. 	Lake Lawrence

Thurston County Shoreline Master Program Open House and 10/20/21 PC Public Hearing Comments

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment	Affiliation / Geo. Area
115	10/6/21	Bonnie and Ken	Morimoto	We own four pieces of beachfront property on the west-facing side of Henderson Inlet. Three pieces are adjacent and total 300+ feet of beachfront. The fourth piece is non-adjacent and has 100+ feet of beachfront. Two of these lots are only about 300 feet deep. We share the Commision's concerns re: erosion and stability, garden runoff, driveway and roof runoff, and shade removal. We support and respect the Commision's desire to protect the natural state of Henderson Inlet and its beaches. However, we believe that a 250 foot set back for building is more than is needed to protect the aforementioned environment. It would mean that a building site plan for two of our properties would be extremely prohibitive. A house, garage, and septic system would need to be wedged into very small square footage. The building site plan for the other two properties would also be restrictive. We propose that a 200 foot set back would be more than adequate to protect the inlet waters and beaches, while giving owners the opportunity to use their properties and to be good and respectful conservators of the environment.	Henderson Inlet
116	10/6/21	Michael	Crosby	As a lakeshore property owner at 17035 Lake Point Dr. SE (Lot 4 Division 2) Yelm, WA, on Lake Lawrence, I would like the following to be included in the Shoreline Master Program: 1. Buffer Widths (Issue #2 in coalition letter) for lakes to remain as they were in the 1990 Shoreline Master Program 2. Pier, Dock, Float, or Ramp Grating (Issue #7 in coalition letter) I want the option to exclude expensive grating for lakes that don't contain salmon. 3. Pier and Dock Piling Spacing (Issue #8 in coalition letter) I want the option to reduce the spacing to 8 feet. 4. Pier and Dock Width (Issue #9 in coalition letter) I want the option to make our piers and docks 8 feet wide or more if an applicant can demonstrate the need for more space. 5. Shoreline Environmental Designations (SEDs) (Issue #12 in coalition letter) I want the changes we were to make for the residents of Lake Lawrence adopted by the Planning Commission and Board of Thurston County Commissioners. I sincerely thank you for your thoughtful consideration of my requests for these essential details in protecting the quality of our lake and environment in the future.	Lake Lawrence
117	10/6/21	Adam	Faussett	Is the critical area map new or was it mapped out before? I am at the Southeast End of Holmes Island and it encompasses my property. What does this change for me? Most of the area, including my complete shoreline, is lined with a bulkhead and my yard to the bulkhead is a lawn, so a critical area does not make any sense.. The area looks to go deep into my property and my house is a little over 50 feet from the waterline/bulkhead. The areas highlighted in the green do not make sense with the surrounding non-colored in areas. These green and grey shadings do not show up on any key the describes what they are marking other than the map is called a critical area map.	
118	10/6/21	Adam	Faussett	Here are my opinions on the yellow highlighted segments in the SMP Draft. 1. Labeling structures- existing permitted structures should be called conforming. They were conforming to all applicable rules when built, nothing has changed on their end and the description of them should not be changed to separate them from every other existing permitted structure built according to the rules existing at the time of building. 2. Shoreline residential buffer width should be 50 feet as it has been since it was first put in as a rule. Lakefront properties that have already been developed should not have the rules changed after the fact. 3. There should be no limit on deck size or location and a shoreline variance should not be required to build one. 4. I agree that a accessory storage structure should be for residential use only. 5. I agree that a SDP should be handled administratively as long as there is a public notification. 6. No opinion on net pens, etc 7. I agree that there should not be industrial development in Shoreline residential areas. 8. Docks should be allowed in natural environments for public use. 9/10. Alternative moorage should not need to be considered prior to allowing a pier or dock 11. No opinion on covered moorage for commercial uses 12/15. Dock grating should not be required on water that does not contain salmon. The bass like it under my dock. 13. Residential pilings should be closer together than 20 feet, 8 feet is still too far, 6 feet would allow them to be smaller and would have less of an impact on the lake floor. 14. 6 feet should be the standard for dock width.	
119	10/6/21	Mark	Larson	I have a neighbor Maureen Cox at 2233 113th ave SW Olympia WA 98512 who is and has been polluting the neighborhood and ignoring all building codes for years. She is currently leasing part of her property to a commercial tile manufacturing operation within the wetland, they grind silica containing materials out in the open all day long. You don't have to take my word for it, you can see the contamination from the parcel look up overhead photos. You can come sample from the surrounding wetlands. If you want to make a difference for the better within the sensitive are you are describing I suggest you take a look at this issue.	
120	10/6/21	Robert and Susie	Zych	As Shoreline Residential property owners, • I oppose extending the Buffer Widths on page 53 of the SMP Draft. The rationale for extending buffer widths for “net loss of shoreline ecological function” is not sufficiently compelling to justify the proposed further restriction on private property. • On page 63 b of the SMP Draft, allow decks and viewing platforms larger than 100 square feet as default option, & closer than 25 feet, without a shoreline variance. • On page 110 A of the SMP Draft, prohibit Industrial Development in e Shoreline Residential, Urban Conservancy, Rural Conservancy SEDs. • On page 116 A, 118 e, 119 5 of the SMP Draft, strike requirement for grating on lakes that do not contain salmon. • On page 117 3b of the SMP Draft, allow 8-foot distance for spacing of residential pilings in lakes. • On page 116 4a of the SMP Draft, allow 6 feet pier width as standard allowance, with up to 8 feet if applicant can demonstrate need.	
121	10/6/21	Darrell		How can I or anyone for that mater take this plan seriously when you can not get rid of the old tumbled down RVs parked along the road spuing all kinds of wast onto the road and down drains onto the sound.	
122	10/7/21	Glenn	Schorno	Who benefits from the update? Who's property loses value from the update? Is there a mechanism to fully compensate the landowners that lose value?	
123	10/7/21	Steve	Walton	I am a lakefront property owner on Lawrence Lake and I request acceptance of the following input in advance of the October 20 public hearing on the draft 2021 Draft Shoreline Master Plan (SMP): I am in general agreement with the position expressed on all of the 19 issues addressed in the September 23 Shoreline Stakeholders Coalition letter. I most strongly support the following issues: 1. Buffer widths (Issue #2 in coalition letter) for lakes to remain as they were in the 1990 SMP . 2. Pier, Dock, Float or ramp grating (Issue #7 in coalition letter) I want the option to exclude expensive grating for lakes that do not contain salmon. 3. Pier and Dock piling spacing (Issue #8 - in coalition letter) I want the option to reduce spacing to 8 feet. 4. Pier and Dock Width (Issue #9 - in coalition letter) I want the option to be able to make my pier/dock 8 feet wide or more if I can demonstrate the need. 5. Shoreline Environmental Designations (SEDs) (Issue #12 in coalition letter) I want the changes the coalition was able to make for residents of Lake Lawrence adopted by the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners. Thank you for your consideration of this input and overall work in this area.	Lake Lawrence
124	10/7/21	Richard (Tom)	Goldsby	Are there any zone or other changes to my property at 14149 Military Rd SE, Tenino WA 98589, property number 09560002000 ? If so, why? Please note: this is the second time I have sent you this email.	Eld Inlet

Thurston County Shoreline Master Program Open House and 10/20/21 PC Public Hearing Comments

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment	Affiliation / Geo. Area
125	10/7/21	Darlene	Edwards	I am concerned about the area under review on my property at 13315 Gunstone St SW Olympia WA 98512. Why would the current area shown as rural conservancy need to be enlarged? Actually, the current band of yellow that extends out from the buffer zone of Beaver Creek, which I was not aware of until studying this material, is confusing. I have lived here for twenty-two years and prior to that this property has been in my family since my grandparents purchased it in 1942. The area under review which is called Dry Creek (although your virtual map shows it as Beaver Creek) does not have Beaver Creek as its source, but rather its source is a spring which is in the wooded area between Maytown Road and Champion Drive of Scott Lake. I have hiked in this area and seen the small creek that flows out from there and gradually comes down to my property only in the winter depending on the rainfall amount. The flow is never anywhere close to twenty cubic feet per second. I wonder why the source of Dry Creek is not shown on the map? A call from you to discuss this would be greatly appreciated. My number is 360 556 8328. Thank you for your consideration of this matter.	Beaver Creek
126	10/7/21	John	Woodford	See Original Comment for Map Reference During last evening's Public Communications portion of the Planning Commission meeting several (Patrick, Larry, Mary Beth, Meredith and John) residents of the western shoreline of Zangle Cove in Boston Harbor opposed the re-designation of their residential properties from Rural (the "old" name for Shoreline Residential) to Rural Conservancy. The Thurston County Shoreline Stakeholders Coalition agrees whole-heartedly with their opposition. I had prepared these three screen shots a few days ago after scrolling through SMP Open House Buffer Chart Current & Proposed - Comparison (PDF). Last evening's testimonies prompted me to get this letter written ASAP. As many of you know, I am a retired architect. I like to see visuals...a picture is worth a thousand words. Zangle Cove with the 1990 SMP shoreline environmental designation superimposed. The western shoreline of the cove is designated "Rural." Zangle Cove with the 2021 draft SMP shoreline environmental designation superimposed. The entire shoreline of the cove is designated "Rural Conservancy." A very recent Google Maps view of Zangle Cove showing that the western shore is lined with existing homes typical of neighborhood designated "Shoreline Residential." This reach should not be re-designated; it should be "Shoreline Residential." Given that every re-designation appeal (+ 70 properties on Lake Lawrence and Offutt Lake) that has already come before the Planning Commission has resulted in the re-designation being overturned...and the obvious flaw shown above, illustrates the immediate need to re-examine the entire re-designation process and conclusions. Remember, some 2,700 Thurston County shoreline properties are scheduled for re-designation in the current draft Shoreline Master Program.	Chair, Thurston County Shoreline Stakeholders Coalition
127	10/7/21	Greg	Ireland	My name is Greg Ireland and I live at 15916 Lawrence Pl se, on Lake Lawrence in Thurston County. I understand you are considering ill advised changes to the Shoreline Management Program. Please record my thoughts into your deliberations, and please do not make it harder for homeowners on the lake to modify/build/or otherwise enjoy their property. My thoughts: 1. Buffer widths (Issue #2 in coalition letter) for lakes to remain as they were in the 1990 SMP . 2. Pier, Dock, Float or ramp grating (Issue #7 in coalition letter) we need the option to exclude expensive grating for lakes that do not contain salmon. 3. Pier and Dock piling spacing (Issue #8 - in coalition letter) we need the option to reduce spacing to 8 feet. 4. Pier and Dock Width (Issue #9 - in coalition letter) we need the option to be able to make our piers/docks 8 feet wide or more if applicants can demonstrate need. 5. Shoreline Environmental Designations (SEDs) (Issue #12 in coalition letter) we need the changes we were able to make for residents of Lake Lawrence adopted by the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners.	Lake Lawrence
128	9/27/21	James	Bishop	After receiving your card and giving much thought to the subject of, "plans to use or develop your property could be affected " I felt I must respond. I have spent most of my life on this property since 1938. My parents made it into a family farm to help in their survival. We had cows, pigs, chickens and raised hay. In those days we had a drainage system which drained into Indian Creek, headwater at Biglow Lake. Dairies and family farms finally disappeared and the land owners were told most of their property was declared WET LANDS and restrictions began. For a few years I was involved with the Blake Drainage Commission as a commissioner. Our job was to keep the drainage ditches open. We tried to do this until we had a on the job meeting, subject being, the wasting of our time. We received no help from either Thurston County or City of Olympia Public Works in cleaning and/or replacing culverts, the ones under 12th Ave NE and the major one under South Bay Rd between 7th and 8th Ave NE. Our decision was to dissolve the Blake Drainage System. At this time Thurston County was notified and the system was declared closed. About two years ago, the City of Olympia, made a change to its storm water system in the NE part of Olympia by running a drain line directly into property just south of my property. This was protested by local property owners who were ignored. It was believed the reason the drainage system was mis-managed was because the City of Olympia did not want this water to drain to their downtown treatment plant so the culverts under 12th Ave and South Bay Road were allowed to plug up which in the end KILLED INDIAN CREEK. We live in a forgotten area, an area which requires us to pay an annual Stormwater Tax of \$103.11 and wonder where our tax money is being spent, knowing that it is not spent in our area. Also this summer on drives around the area I have noticed many small growths of Tangy Ragwort and I am being taxed \$6.47 as a NOXIOUS WEED fee. What is being done with this money? Well, I now have spoken my words of wisdom. Thurston County and City of Olympia have already destroyed a large portion of my property and now I have to wonder what Thurston County Planning & Economic Development will be doing.	Blake Drainage System
129	10/7/21	Ronald	Phillipsborn	After looking at the map, it looks like our SED changed from Rural to Rural Conservancy. Where we were lumped in with the waterfront houses around Schirm Loop, the line has shifted so that we're now in another category. I kind of get that, because most of the Schism Loop homes are on smaller lots close to the beach, while we're on a larger piece of property, with our house set back from the Edgewater Beach high bluff waterfront. But since I couldn't find out what our buffer requirements are under the old system (on the interactive map, the SED's listed under Proposed and Current Designations have different names and the Fact Sheet only references the new ones), I can't really tell what effect the change will have on us. In a nutshell, like everyone else, I'm primarily interested in whether this will require any action on our part. Specifically, since we can't start any new construction here anyway under the terms of a Capital Land Trust Conservation Easement on our property, I would just like your assurance that there's no possible impact on any of our existing structures.	
130	10/7/21	Richard (Tom)	Goldsby	Thank you for your quick response. Are you aware proximity to the flood plain in our elevation certificates from 1978 and 2018 differ from the map the county is using? I sent copies to the county when we did them. I expect that may impact the designation; plus, our family has been here nearly 100 years and haven't seen it flood. The ever deepening of the river bed here, over the last 100 years, has likely lessened the risk it ever will. My grandfather and his father were loggers and grew strawberries and ran cattle on the property. You can still find barbed wire from the early 1900s embedded in the old fir trees along the river. We took the main house down in the 60s and built two new houses and out buildings in the 70s and 80s. We may build a smaller mother-in-law/retirement home on the property. Will a change in designation impact that process and increase costs?	Eld Inlet
131	10/7/21	James	Biehl	reading over smp site,concerned about buffers.Why make it different and more restrictive than state regulations.Your plan 'A' makes the most sense. Am also troubled by setback from hwm. in regards to existing structures. Are these proposals going to impact my heirs if they decide to sell?	
132	10/7/21	Leslie	Dalzell	I don't understand why we cannot clear vegetation from the buffer area, especially if it is dead. For example, if a tree falls and is dead, can it be removed? If not, why not? The way the language is written, it seems you need a permit even to just mow the lawn or pull weeds within a buffer zone.	Long Lake
133	10/7/21	Leslie	Dalzell	I would like clarity if a permit/CUP is needed to improve an existing bulkhead on a lakefront.	Long Lake
134	10/7/21	Leslie	Dalzell	Under 19.400.100, why would the labeling of existing legally built homes be different than what the state law recognizes the structures as? If the state recognizes these structures as conforming, then why wouldn't Thurston County follow suit?	Long Lake
135	10/7/21	Leslie	Dalzell	Under 19.400.120 why is there an option a and an option b? I could not find why there are two different proposals and what would make us choose one over the other. Also what is the scientific reason to change the shoreline residential buffer from 50 ft to 75 ft all of a sudden?	Long Lake
136	10/7/21	Leslie	Dalzell	Ch 19.400.120.D.1.b. and Appendix B, Section B.2.c. Decks and Viewing Platforms properly constructed to be pervious should not be required to be "...adjacent to residential structures..." There should be no limit on size or location and there should be no requirement for a shoreline variance to build such a deck.	Long Lake

Thurston County Shoreline Master Program Open House and 10/20/21 PC Public Hearing Comments

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment	Affiliation / Geo. Area
137	10/7/21	Leslie	Dalzell	Ch 19.400.120.D.1.e. I agree with the Option. Limit water-oriented accessory storage structures to residential uses only Ch 19.500.075 and 19.500.100.B.2. I agree with the Options: Substantial Developments Permits, Conditional Use Permits and Variances should be processed administratively rather than having to undergo a public hearing before the Hearing Examiner. Ch 19.600.150. I support the option to prohibit industrial development in Shoreline Residential Environmental Designations. Ch 19.600.160.C.1.r., Ch 19.600.160.C.4.f. and Ch 19.600.160.C.5. I agree with each of these Options. Strike the requirement for pier, dock, float or ramp grating on lakes that do not contain salmon.	Long Lake
138	10/7/21	Leslie	Dalzell	In the SMP, Buffer is defined as “a non-clearing area established to protect the integrity, functions and values of the affected critical area or shoreline...” What if your waterfront yard is a lawn? Is it a buffer? ...a setback? This needs to be clarified. Who is going to be the buffer police? How much money are we planning to spend to enforce this ruling?	Long Lake
139	10/7/21	Leslie	Dalzell	Pollution of Thurston County waters is only addressed in passing in the in this draft SMP...whether that pollution comes from: a) Faulty or inappropriately located septic systems, b) Use of inappropriate lawn and/or garden fertilizers, and/or c) Stormwater runoff directly into the County's marine waters, lakes and rivers should not be allowed. For example, here on Long Lake there are thirteen outfall pipes that drain from County roads into the lake... most of these outfalls drain directly into the lake with no pretreatment. Stormwater runoff accounts for 75% of the pollution of our waters. The Planning staff should provide new goals to ban the use of plastics by the shellfish industry on Thurston County tidelands and to establish new operational guidelines.	Long Lake
140	10/7/21	Leslie	Dalzell	A companion pamphlet must be completed simultaneously with the SMP to guide the public through the SMP requirements, including development restrictions, acceptable native plants for the buffer (with specific examples), and permitting requirements. Without the guidelines that the pamphlet can provide, property owners will be at a loss to understand the regulations, requirements and restrictions buried deep within the full-blown SMP document.	Long Lake
141	10/8/21	Kevin	Jensen	Good morning Andy, we seem to cross paths fairly often lately (virtually.) I have Riverbend Ranch out in Tenino. Anyway I have been behind on keeping up with my county notices, this seems to be a big one affecting a great deal of my property. My first question, there is a proposed "natural" area on my property on the south side of the Skookumchuck from SK-4/SK-5 through SK-6. I read the definition of the "natural" area, with minimal impact from man and trying to keep it that way, what are my new limitations as a land owner managing this property for grazing/long term timber with this new designation? My next question is more broad, as a significant amount of my land will be designated as "rural conservancy." These areas seem to be close to the 100 year flood areas, follow the 1990 designations for shoreline but with a new name and a bit of expansion. Again, what impact would this have on my active agricultural operation? Thank you for you time Andy look forward to speaking with you soon.	
142	10/8/21	Richard (Tom)	Goldsby	After I sent that last email I read portions of the SMP and “Shoreline Residential” seems a more appropriate designation, given the multiple single family structures adjacent, up river and surrounding, don’t you think? This address is often confused with the opposite side of the river. GPS often place this address at the driveway and barn directly across the river. We often get deliveries and even get mail from the county to pull Tansy Ragwort that is actually referring to the farm and fields on the other side of the river. Given this section of the river, historically, a portion of a Weyerhaeuser park, has always been a favored spot for steelhead and fly fishing and rafters, it seemingly falls under a different designation in many ways.	Eld Inlet
143	10/8/21	John	Debrick	We have substantial ownership on both sides of McLane Creek.. Our home also confronts. Please provide detal proposed changes. 1710 Delphi Rd SW	
144	10/8/21	John	Woodford	The Staff note following Ch 19.400.100 Existing Development of the July 28, 2021 Planning Commission Working Draft of the Shoreline Master Program states, “The Commission is interested in public comment on the topic.” The Thurston County Shoreline Stakeholders Coalition’s position on this matter remains the same as it was on August 31, 2020. Therefore, I am re-submitting the Coalition’s letter, Conforming vs. Non-Conforming or Legally Non-Conforming, so it may become a part of the SMP Open House Public Communication. We feel that that it necessary that the SMP must be consistent with the State of Washington RCW 90.58.620, (a) Residential structures and appurtenant structures that were legally established and are used for a conforming use, but that do not meet standards for the following to be considered a conforming structure. Plus, it’s just the right thing to do! Attached letter from Thurston County Shoreline Stakeholders Coalition dated August 31, 2020: Since the introduction of the draft Shoreline Master Program (SMP) in the summer of 2017, there has been a dispute between homeowners and the planning staff regarding the designation of legally built homes and appurtenant structures that may now be located wholly or in part within the newly defined shoreline buffers. Many older homes were constructed before there were any designated setbacks. Some homes may have been constructed closer to the waterline line because of a variance having been granted due to some other site restriction. Whatever the reason, these homes have always, until staff presentation of this draft SMP, been considered “conforming.” The State of Washington recognizes that such structures are “conforming” in RCW 90.58.620. RCW 90.58.620 New or amended master programs—Authorized provisions. (1)New or amended master programs approved by the department on or after September 1, 2011, may include provisions authorizing: (a)Residential structures and appurtenant structures that were legally established and are used for a conforming use, but that do not meet standards for the following to be considered a conforming structure*: Setbacks, buffers, or yards; area; bulk; height; or density; and (b)Redevelopment, expansion, change with the class of occupancy, or replacement of the residential structure if it is consistent with the master program, including requirements for no net loss of shoreline ecological functions. (2)For purposes of this section, "appurtenant structures" means garages, sheds, and other legally established structures. "Appurtenant structures" does not include bulkheads and other shoreline modifications or overwater structures. (3)Nothing in this section: (a) Restricts the ability of a master program to limit redevelopment, expansion, or replacement of overwater structures located in hazardous areas, such as floodplains and geologically hazardous areas; or (b) affects the application of other federal, state, or local government requirements to residential structures. [2011 c 323 § 2.] NOTES: Findings—2011 c 323: "(1) The legislature recognizes that there is concern from property owners regarding legal status of existing legally developed shoreline structures* under updated shoreline master programs. Significant concern has been expressed by residential property owners during shoreline master program updates regarding the legal status of existing shoreline structures that may not meet current standards for new development. (2)Engrossed House Bill No. 1653, enacted as chapter 107, Laws of 2010 clarified the status of existing structures in the shoreline area under the growth management act prior to the update of shoreline regulations. It is in the public interest to clarify the legal status of these structures that will apply after shoreline regulations are updated*. (3)Updated shoreline master programs must include provisions to ensure that expansion, redevelopment, and replacement of existing structures will result in no net loss of the ecological function of the shoreline. Classifying existing structures as legally conforming will not create a risk of degrading shoreline natural resources." [2011 c 323 § 1.]	Chair, Thurston County Shoreline Stakeholders Coalition
145	10/8/21	No Name Given		Would recommend that you revisit the height limitation for shoreline properties instead of limiting it to 35'. Asethetically, heights of homes on the water should be aligned with neighboring properties for visual continuity. I would suggest requirements that height may not exceed a certain % of the closest 5 properties on either side of the proposed building site. Additionally, an arbitrary 35' designation is inappropriate when taking in consideration of homes that may sit across from such a shoreline property whose view of saltwater may be negatively impacted by a taller property being constructed and thus impact its value and enjoyment. Many homes sit across from shoreline properties on hillsides and those property owners should not be negatively impacted by arbitrary height requirements for houses in front of them. Maintaining a formula and taking an average of the existing heights as a measure for determining appropriate building height of renovations or structures would make better sense. No one's home should be impacted negatively and the proposal of 35' is not appropriate in my opinion.	
146	10/8/21	Redmond	Kincaid	The county talks SMP's but still allow Wake Board Boats on small Lakes that tare up bulk heads and Shorelines. How does the county plan on stopping street / highway run off 's (drive ways) from draining directly into our lakes.?	

Thurston County Shoreline Master Program Open House and 10/20/21 PC Public Hearing Comments

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment	Affiliation / Geo. Area
147	10/9/21	Randel	Jones	Jack Hanemann and Randel Jones agree with this position and request that the SMP be stated as such. Attached email from John Woodford to Andrew Deffobis dated 10-8-21 "Good afternoon Andy, The Staff note following Ch 19.400.100 Existing Development of the July 28, 2021 Planning Commission Working Draft of the Shoreline Master Program states, "The Commission is interested in public comment on the topic." The Thurston County Shoreline Stakeholders Coalition's position on this matter remains the same as it was on August 31, 2020. Therefore, I am re-submitting the Coalition's letter, Conforming vs. Non-Conforming or Legally Non-Conforming, so it may become a part of the SMP Open House Public Communication. We feel that that it necessary that the SMP must be consistent with the State of Washington RCW 90.58.620, (a) Residential structures and appurtenant structures that were legally established and are used for a conforming use, but that do not meet standards for the following to be considered a conforming structure. Plus, it's just the right thing to do! Respectfully submitted, John H Woodford, AIA Emeritus Architect Chair, Thurston County Shoreline Stakeholders Coalition"	Lake Lawrence
148	10/10/21	Jon	Kime	I am all for keeping our shoreline in a good, healthy condition. And I understand why septic tanks are a problem, but do you know how much it costs to connect to the sewer system? If it is even available. To accomplish your goals of healthy shorelines shouldn't that be high on the to do list? Affordable sewage treatment? Your plan, as correct as your goals are, pushes all the expense off on the land owners. It's time for some infrastructure to b built.	
149	10/11/21	Bob	Whisler	I received the notice that the next virtual meeting will be October 20 and can be attended by Zoom. The message indicates that I cannot sign up for the meeting until we are one week out so I suppose that will be October 13th. As I review the information there does not seem to be a lot of difference between my properties current definition of Rural Conservancy vs Natural Conservancy. I have two fundamental concerns and a general question: 1. I purchased that property in 1982 to specifically use it for waterfowl hunting. I continue to use it for that purpose. The current county regulations for that areas as it relates to shooting and/or hunting is that is allowed for land owner and invited guests only which suits me fine. What I want to know is if the new classification to "natural" will impact this regulation in a negative manner for my purposes? 2. You mentioned the current buffer and I assume that is from the edge of McLane Creek or the high tide mark. I would like to know if a decision on the buffer has been made and if so, what is it? As I previously mentioned my property already has a septic and drain field installed. While I may never build on the property maintaining the ability to build and hook up to that septic is instrumental to the property value. 3. As a property owner, in general what changes and/or restrictions will my property be subject to moving from Rural to Natural?	
150	10/11/21	Howard	Glastetter	I've been out of town for three days. I was looking over my Shoreline Master Plan comments submission. I found a couple typos and a need to clarify a couple of my earlier comments. Please replace my October 6th comments with the attached October 11th ones. The following are my comments about the proposed Thurston County Shoreline Master Program. As my address indicates, I live in lower Nisqually Valley in the "channel migration zone" near the beginning of the Nisqually Delta. I have lived in the lower valley for over 50 years. I will give observations about issues I am familiar with. Mining: Page 112 of the plan indicates aquatic mining is prohibited. I live near Holroyd's gravel mine. They are attempting to get permission to mine as deep as 100 feet into the aquifer below their pit. I have recently sent you folks written reasons that this should not happen. I think that earlier information should also be in the "Shoreline" comments record. It has become quite popular for gravel mines to propose mining into aquifers and "leave a pristine lake behind" as a mine reclamation solution. This can compromise drinking water in areas surrounding a mined-out pit. It allows the mine owners to cheaply avoid proper pit reclamation. Drinking water is a worldwide diminishing asset that should be preserved. I think the ban on aquatic mining should include most mining into aquifers. The plan says mining will not be allowed in the channel migration zone (page112). Holroyd's pit was flooded in the Nisqually 1996 flood. Please see my earlier submission to your agency. They are "grand fathered" to mine in the valley, but not to mine below 20' above the mean water table. Channel Migration Zone: There is much discussion of the channel migration zone. However, there is a FEMA study that is changing the zone levels to conform to the February 1996 Nisqually flood. This isn't mentioned on the plan. The 1996 flood was the result of predicted 3-day severe storm. Alder Lake Dam was 17' below capacity when the storm hit. Tacoma Power Utility (TPU) simply allowed the reservoir to top off on the first day of the storm and were forced to dump. This caused \$20,000,000 damage to property below the dam, as well as a like amount to the TPU La Grande generators attached to the dam. TPU's FERC license has no fall / winter flood control responsibilities. They should have and the Shoreline Master Plan should call attention to this. The 1996 flood was not unique. The recent February 2020 Nisqually flood was the result of TPU purposely allowing the raising the reservoir level to almost 2' from capacity in late January during the 2nd rainiest winter recorded in Western Washington. TPU exacerbated both the above floods and several others over the years. The plan should include comments that say Thurston County will attempt to have FERC build some safety into the license or work with TPU to have a more conservative flood mitigation strategy during dangerous times of the year. FEMA has said they will be setting the zones as if the reservoir will always be full. If they do that, the county should appeal the FEMA decision. Bridges:The plan discusses bridge replacements and their allowed heights. Replacement of the I-5 Nisqually River bridges is on the horizon. One line of thought is to build the bridges much higher than now to prevent flood damage. The suggested price tag, of the four lane much higher bridges, is five billion dollars. I propose a different solution. As I mentioned in my "channel migration zone" comments TPU bears responsibility for much of the prior valley floods. Certainly, moderately raise the level of the new bridges, but also require TPU to operate more safely. This can easily be done by changing their FERC license to have a safe fall / winter maximum reservoir level and suggested evasive action as large storms approach. The financial impact to TPU would be miniscule. This could save a billion dollars or so in bridge costs and allow a park and ride / train / bus station to be built in Holroyd's gravel mine. Please see the prior suggestions I sent you folks about Holroyd's mined out north pit. I hope my observations are food for thought. I care about my neighborhood and the county where I live.	Mining Lakes
151	10/11/21	James and Ruth	Boyle	Members of the Planning Commission, We are writing today to voice our opinions that additional regulations and restrictions are not desirable for many of the lakeshore waters in Thurston County. The proposed Shoreline Master Program is implementing many issues that are going to have negative effects on property owners as we try to improve our dwellings and the lands they sit on. We all love our lakefront properties and our beautiful lakes. If we did not want to improve things and protect the waters we would not keep the properties and pay the high taxes that come along with this desired ownership. When looking at possible revisions to the SMP we request that you especially reevaluate the proposals on SMP issues #2,7,8,9 and 12. The regulations that are already in place keep things protected. We do not need more limitations! Our existing shoreline residential properties should not bear the brunt of these very restrictive regulations or the extreme costs and frustrations associated with them.	
152	10/11/21	Chris	Ireland	My name is Chris Ireland and I live at 15916 Lawrence Pl se, on Lake Lawrence in Thurston County. I understand you are considering ill advised changes to the Shoreline Management Program. Please record my thoughts into your deliberations, and please do not make it harder for homeowners on the lake to modify/build/or otherwise enjoy their property. My thoughts: 1. Buffer widths (Issue #2 in coalition letter) for lakes to remain as they were in the 1990 SMP . 2. Pier, Dock, Float or ramp grating (Issue #7 in coalition letter) we need the option to exclude expensive grating for lakes that do not contain salmon. 3. Pier and Dock piling spacing (Issue #8 - in coalition letter) we need the option to reduce spacing to 8 feet. 4. Pier and Dock Width (Issue #9 - in coalition letter) we need the option to be able to make our piers/docks 8 feet wide or more if applicants can demonstrate need. 5. Shoreline Environmental Designations (SEDs) (Issue #12 in coalition letter) we need the changes we were able to make for residents of Lake Lawrence adopted by the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners.	Lake Lawrence
153	10/11/21	Bob	Whisler	Thx Andrew, I'd like to add another question. Will there be any impact on my grazing horses on the property? Thx again	

Thurston County Shoreline Master Program Open House and 10/20/21 PC Public Hearing Comments

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment	Affiliation / Geo. Area
154	10/11/21	Tom	Clingman	<p>As a lake resident, my comments relate to lake shorelines. I have three basic points regarding this draft:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Residential lake shorelines must have SMP standards that are appropriate for the relatively very simple conditions on lakes. Lakes (without salmon) are much simpler than marine shorelines regarding natural resources and shoreline dynamics. The current draft includes attempts to reflect this difference. However, separate sections regarding lakes seem necessary to ensure appropriate standards are applied to lakes on all topics, and to ensure clarity for both staff and property owners. SMP regulations should follow the science. This includes avoiding applying marine shoreline science which does not apply to lakes. A few examples: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Science has documented the critical need for upland sediment sources to sustain Puget Sound beaches, which are vital habitat for forage fish and other species. Thus, bulkheading/armoring is a very important issue on marine shorelines. This is not applicable to lakes. • Studies have demonstrated the negative impact of dock-created shade on juvenile salmon migrating along marine shorelines. Thus, standards to reduce these impacts are very important on marine shorelines. This science and the resulting SMP standards are not applicable on lakes. • Due to wave and tide dynamics, the armoring of one marine property can create serious increased erosion on adjoining properties. Parallel dynamics exist on river shorelines. These complexities simply do not exist on lakes. The contrast between natural resources in marine and lake waters is stark. Take fish: Our marine shorelines are vital habitat for juvenile salmon and forage fish, which in turn support various native species including Orcas. In contrast, our lakes have no native fish; we have introduced bass, perch and bluegill, along with planted trout that cannot reproduce here. The SMP standards must reflect this significant contrast in natural resource values in marine versus lake shorelines. If the SMP fails to reflect these very significant differences in habitat and use characteristics, the SMP update will result in a.) Unwarranted overregulation of lake property owners, and b.) Failure to deploy limited County staff time in protecting endangered salmon and other vital marine natural resources. 2. "Letter of exemption" permits are outdated, overly complex and costly, and ineffective – at least for residential lakes. A new approach is needed that fits modern times and the simple nature of issues being addressed on residential lake shorelines. The SMA clearly lays out activities exempt from the Shoreline Substantial Development Permit. Anomalously, over time, a new "Exemption Letter" permit has emerged (the draft SMP has several different terms for these reviews; I am simplifying the terminology to "Exemption Permit" for discussion purposes.) This is a "sneaker" issue. The requirement for Exemption Permits is oblique and buried in the text. Terminology is inconsistent and requirements vague. The draft makes a minor attempt to clarify when there is an exemption to the Exemption Permit – but this approach will inevitably remain exceedingly unclear. A new approach is needed in place of "Exemption Permits." My key points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Exemption Permits" are outdated. The SMA is a very early land use regulation. In 1972, it was virtually unprecedented that property owners would need to comply with regulations to protect the environment. It was legitimate to require that property owners contact the County to ensure that their project met these unprecedented new requirements. In 2021, there are multiple land use and environmental regulations in place. These regulations rely on property owners to comply even when no specific permit is required. It is time for the SMP to join this host of modern land use regulations. • Exemption Permits are over-regulation. At least for residential lakes, County review of virtually all shoreline work as proposed is extreme over-regulation. There is no scientific basis for requiring such reviews to protect either natural resources or adjoining properties on residential lakes. Current cost for an Exemption Permit is over \$2,500. In many cases, the permit cost exceeds the value of the activities supposedly required to obtain these permits – a situation verging on the absurd. • Fostering stewardship, not processing permits, will be most effective in protecting lake habitat and water quality. Even with the most extensive requirements for obtaining permits, most activities by shoreline residents will not be covered by permits. Information on topics like the value of shoreline and aquatic vegetation, and fertilizing that avoids degrading water quality, should be provided – not intrusive requirements for Shoreline permitting that greatly exceeds the direction in the SMA. • Clear information for property owners is the best means to achieve implementation of the policy objectives and standards in the SMP. These should address the most common activities (for example, installing docks 	Mining Lakes
155	10/12/21	Adam	Faussett	<p>See Original Comment for Referenced Images</p> <p>I saw the maps you spoke of but the one is question is the background map on the critical area section. If you expand it you can see that the southestern/south side of Holmes island is shaded green or grey noting that smething is being labeled like the critical areas. There is not a map legend to describe what the green and grey denote. If you go to the SMP plan, Shoreline Master Program Update (arcgis.com), and then to "overview" and pan down to the second background picture, you see this:</p> <p>The highlighted area zooms to this, What does the green area represent????? The Geodata map does sow the areas marked on the critical area map by denoting a property line between the water and the land. What is does the land in between the property line and the water represent?</p>	
156	10/12/21	Jason	Gano	<p>My name is Jason Gano and I am the Government Affairs Director with the Olympia Master Builders, we met in person at the Long Lake community meeting a few weeks back. I have a few questions about the SMP if you don't mind. Is the county still changing the SMP to allow for a rebuild after a home is more than 50% destroyed? If the buffer is moved from 50 to 75 feet, would people that have homes within the buffer zone be able to still do a remodel? What are the current construction setbacks? Are they remaining the same?</p>	Olympia Master Builders
157	10/12/21	Glenn	Schorno	<p>Parcel 22728440100 is partly out of the current SMP but will be in the updated SMP. There has been livestock on this piece off and on for many years. The trees add shelter. Now, along with a few acres adjacent to this property, we wish to continue farming it but with Christmas trees rather than cattle. Farming operations often change types of agriculture to adjust for trends. Spending several thousands of dollars in permits and having new large buffers to continue farming this piece but as Christmas trees seems wrong. For future generations, I had planned on building a home on this piece. Not having this option severely detracts from the value of the property. The current SMP states agriculture as being a preferred use on flood plane property. Does the new SMP include such language? Is it possible to move the parcel boundaries east so a homesite could be used on our neighboring property? On another note the CRP and CREP programs are federal programs that ag land can be put into and out of over many years. How would the SMP rules affect land coming out of this program to farm again? I plan to read the proposed SMP this week. I will have some more comments soon.</p>	
158	10/12/21	Ronald	Phillipsborn	<p>Okay, thanks. I think we're getting closer to the information I'm actually looking for. Which is . . . Let's assume, as is likely, that the designation changes and the buffer is extended to the point where most of the structures on our property - house, garage, workshop, barn - are now in it, which they are NOT, at this time. What, exactly, does placing those existing buildings in the redefined and extended buffer(s) mean to us!? No change? Harder to get permits for upgrades, remodels or maintenance, such as a new roof (we can't do any new construction anyway because of the Conservation Easement)? We have to tear our house down? From your last email, it sounds like the main effect will be more flexible standards for "alterations to existing structures," since we sit back a short distance from the bluff, but again, I'd like to know exactly what that might mean. And is the "bluff buffer" something different than the "shoreline buffer"? Are the structures on our property currently in it - or about to be moved into it - even though we're not currently in the shoreline buffer? And, if so, what constraints does THAT put on us? I know a lot of this information is available on your web site, but it's a bit confusing for a layperson, and I just want to be sure I'm interpreting it correctly.</p>	
159	10/12/21	Debra	Martinelli	<p>Thank you for allowing comments and questions. I am a property owner on Summit Lake. As you may or may not know, most of the homes here depend on the lake as their sole drinking water supply. This is an area, where many areas are incapable of digging a productive well. I am wondering what specifically in your plan will protect Summit Lake's water for consumption by the residents and the plant, fish and wildlife that depend on this water supply. Will old septic systems continue to be grandfathered in, or will you finally establish a requirement that they be checked and certified on a regular cycle? Will regulations be put into place that prohibit the use of herbicides and pesticides on lawns and as part of logging operations? Could a prohibition to dumping chemicals, garbage and yard clippings be put into place? I would greatly appreciate a response to my questions. Thank you!</p>	Summit Lake
160	10/12/21	Darlene	Edwards	<p>I appreciate the time you took the other day to listen to my comments and answer my questions. I find the various levels you referred to as confusing. I just spent more time trying to find information about wetlands on this site and found none. Could you send me information about them and why they are included in the shoreline plan? Another comment I would like to make is in regard to the points I tried to make about the origin of Dry Creek when it causes the water to get built up enough so that it causes water to flow into Beaver Creek for a short time in the winter. You mentioned that Dry Creek was running perpendicular to Beaver creek and that is true a cross our property and adjacent properties to the east to a point. However , the water then turns north a little distance after it crosses under Maytown Rd. This is where it pools next to the railroad tracks. the has been coming to that point from a spring further north up the hill on the property which apparently belongs to the Menke Brothers (? on spelling it correctly. I referred to this in my earlier email. Thank you for all you are doing in dealing with this.</p>	Beaver Creek

Thurston County Shoreline Master Program Open House and 10/20/21 PC Public Hearing Comments

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment	Affiliation / Geo. Area
161	10/13/21	Richard (Tom)	Goldsby	I very much appreciate you guidance. Thank you. I reviewed the plan designations as you suggested. While it may be appropriate for a few of the adjoining 40 acre parcels down river, where people have yet to build homes, your current designation for this and possibly other properties up river are incorrect. I will list the inconsistencies in an email later this week or next when they have more time. Thank you for your patience and again, your clear guidance.	Eld Inlet
162	10/13/21	Darryl	Kaurin	We live on Eld Inlet, west side, near Sanders cove. The current designation of the shore line is "rural" with the cove inlet being "conservancy". The proposed designation of the shoreline on our property is "shoreline residential" with the cove inlet being "natural". We have a spit as part of the shoreline, which I think is quite unique. We have otters, seals, eagles, osprey, king fishers, all sorts of ducks, and the everywhere present deer along the shore line, on the spit, and in the inlet. I counted 6 adult otters with 5 kits on the spit one evening last year. I have watched otters chase fish in the lagoon between the spit and our house. All species of salmon swim in front of us and into the cove, thumbing their noses at my fishing bait. I like the proposed "natural" designation in the cove. I think the "shoreline residential" outside the inlet for our property is a bad idea. It conflicts with the "natural designation" in the cove, and will suffocate it. I don't know if this will eventually lead to condominiums just outside the inlet. I think it makes the most sense to have the shoreline at least in front of the spit, or ideally 0.25 miles south of the spit stay to be "rural conservancy" or at a minimum "urban conservancy". We do have a cat-walk across the lagoon to the spit with a dock that has been in place since the 1960s, which we need to keep so we can get to the Sound side of the spit without walking on the neighbor's property. I raise oysters on the lagoon side and dig clams on the Sound side of the spit and would like to keep it that way. Eventually I would like a boat on our dock on the lagoon side, which prior owners had; I don't think that would conflict with "rural conservancy" or "urban conservancy". Thank you.	Eld Inlet
163	10/14/21	Brian	Stewart	<p>See Original Letter for Copies of Referenced maps and Figures</p> <p>Conservation Northwest would like to thank you for the opportunity to have community members and local organizations comment on your current draft of the Shoreline Master Plan. Importantly, the definitions and policies adopted in any master development plan should account for both climate change adaptation in flora and fauna and the need for functional wildlife corridors to exist for ecological systems and processes to be functional. We feel this is a unique opportunity to take advantage of a plan that will determine what shorelines will look like in the coming years. Our comments seek to elaborate and highlight the need for habitat and landscape connectivity considerations within any riparian corridor and what impacts that might have on the region's ecology and climate resilience.</p> <p>Climate Change: Riparian corridors act as buffers to extreme temperatures and offer climate refugia for some aquatic and terrestrial species (Seavey et al., 2009). In fact, nationally 91% of federally protected lands are connected in some way, by riparian corridors, resulting in expansive networks of semi-protected corridors. An opportunity arises to implement a Riparian Conservation Network (RCN) approach to protect land from the Coast to the Cascades in Washington State (Fremier et al., 2013; Seavey et al., 2009). In Washington State, 85% of wildlife rely on riparian corridors for both movement opportunity and habitat occupancy, highlighting the importance of contiguous riparian habitat for all species (Knutson & Naef, 1997). However, this need is intensified during times of swift environmental change. Interestingly, Hwy 12/101/8 and I-5 cross over numerous riparian corridors which originate in the Olympics and Cascades, corridors that should be prioritized for wildlife monitoring and conservation efforts. Many of the lowland riparian pathways in the region are necessary for local wildlife as they disperse or seek climate refugia (Capon et al., 2013; Krosby et al., 2018; Washington Wildlife Habitat Connectivity Working Group (WHCWG), 2011). Importantly, lowland riparian corridors in southwest Washington have already been identified as locations in need of restoration and conservation to improve local wildlife's ability to track climate change (Krosby et al., 2018). In fact, species that are unable to move and have fragmented populations will face up 50% higher rates of extirpation and extinction as climate changes and home ranges shift (Thomas, et al., 2004). Locally, temperatures rose +1.3°F between the years 1895-2011, and every season except spring has shown a statically significant increase in warming when compared to previous years (Snover et al., 2013). Climate predictions vary greatly depending on future Green House Gas emissions; however, on the current "business as usual" path we are on, temperatures could continue to rise as much as +6.7 °F. Thurston County is located in a region where intense precipitation events occur, and will continue to increase, which will lead to more powerful and frequent flooding events (IPCC, 2013; Snover et al., 2013). Surprisingly, precipitation and relative soil moisture level can impact wildlife and natural systems more dramatically than temperature increase alone (Westman et al., 2010).</p> <p>Connectivity and Climate Mapping: In 2010 Conservation Northwest started working in a long-term partnership with agencies and researchers in the Washington Wildlife Habitat Connectivity Working Group (WWHCWG). The WWHCWG began mapping the state for wildlife corridors and habitat cores, for a wide range of species Studies have included a state-wide analysis and climate gradient analysis, just to name few (WWHCWG, 2010, 2011). The WWHCWG produced climate gradient corridors based on temperature and precipitation, and potential adaptation strategies. Using previously developed Landscape Integrity (LI) models the researchers overlaid LI with the climate corridor outputs. The final maps (Fig.1) show white linkages connecting climate resilient landscape features, with a key corridor running through Thurston County, intersecting and intercepting with numerous of the Thurston County's streams, rivers, creeks, and shorelines (WWHCWG, 2011). Importantly, these corridors are associated with numerous ecological processes and pathways that have state-wide significance at a landscape level, thus the corridors meet the state-wide significance metric as well as local importance. Figure 1. Climate Gradient overlaid with landscape integrity, WWHCWG 2012.</p> <p>Recently the group has focused its efforts on the coastal southwest region of Washington State, which includes Thurston County (WWHCWG, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2021). Using 5 focal species (cougar, beaver, mountain beaver, fisher, and western gray squirrel) to represent habitat types, as well as a Landscape Integrity (LI) or "naturalness" model to develop a composite synthesis of the results , the WWHCWG identified priority</p>	Cascades to Olympics Program Coordinator
164	10/14/21	Kevin	Jensen	This is very interesting, who produced the analysis matrix? Whoever did must not be involved with habitat restoration or have any conservation background or even shoreline management whatsoever to call those "natural" areas and then to list under " Opportunities for Protection and Restoration" and check the box "none noted" shortly after saying there is potential for reduced cover from Ag impact and degraded shoreline. Anyone can look at the Google map and see potential for restoration on the entire Skookumchuck river on each bank, including my property (hence why I have restored more then a mile so far in the last few years.) I bring this up because if the 3rd party company that provided the county this "research" is truly calling out that there are is no potential for restoration, the balance of information that is provided, to me, is now questionable including the proposed natural designation on my property. The more I read into this the more concerns I have. I have looked at the critical areas map, wetland maps, all the layers on geo data, but this natural designation is disturbing mainly because I'm isolated out solely because I have more property then the neighbors and prefer to let those areas be more natural.	
165	10/14/21	Adam	Faussett	So the map shows my property as having a wetland on it. I would like it noted that this is not the case as I have a cement bulkhead from the 1950's that border my property and the water. This would also be the high water line as well as the low water line. My address is 7546 Holmes Island Road SE. The bulkhead starts about 3 feet in my neighbors yard to the NE and continues around the island clockwise all the way to the bridge. John Woodford lives 2 houses west of me and I'm sure he will comment on this too. I don't know how accurate or when this map was built, but since this is that far off, I would question the legitimacy of the entire map. At this point I am only concerned with my own property, but the county should be concerned with the rest.	
166	10/14/21	John	Woodford	The Meeting Agenda for the October 20th Planning Commission meeting will leave serious questions in the minds of many citizen attending the meeting, especially those not familiar with the protocol. If they want to talk about the SMP, do they raise hands for Public Communication? ...or for the Public Hearing? Further, I do not see any Open House SMP Comments...only some letters from late July and early August (Final Pre-Open House SMP Comments.pdf). I thought that the sharing of Open House comments was part of the plan. Hoping to see some updates,	Chair, Thurston County Shoreline Stakeholders Coalition
167	10/14/21	Eric	Webster	My property (currently an empty field of grass) has a small corner of the lot covered by the proposed Rural Conservancy designation. The rest of the property is outside of the zoning. If I wanted to build a single family residence (SFR), I see several statements in the proposed regulations: Some seem to indicate that a SFR would not require a permit ("SFR is exempt to Substantial Development Permit"). But then other regulations talk about buffer requirements. Since the zoning only covers a small corner of my property, would the SFR be ok as as long as the structure was outside of the corner covered by the designation? Alternatively, if I wanted to sell my property (without building a home), would these regulations affect my ability to sell it? Sorry if this email about a specific case is not an appropriate question for you. Thanks	

Thurston County Shoreline Master Program Open House and 10/20/21 PC Public Hearing Comments

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment	Affiliation / Geo. Area
168	10/14/21	Tom	Clingman	<p>See Original Comment for Full Text (Too long to copy below)</p> <p>I am submitting my comments via email as I provide suggested language revisions, which the web page does not show. I appreciate the Planning Commission's attention to this important issue. Property owner concern with the term “nonconforming” has grown significantly in recent years. I suggest that the Planning Commission and staff see this as a positive thing – that property owners are paying more attention to updated land use regulations, and want to ensure that unintended problems are not created when standards are updated. Broad use of “nonconforming” is no longer useful or appropriate. It detracts from the SMP and creates lack of clarity.</p> <p>RCW 90.58.620 allows “Legally established residential structures and appurtenant structures that are used for a conforming use to be considered a conforming structure even though they do not meet SMP standards for setbacks, buffers, yards, area, bulk, height or density.” However, my reading is that a use no longer allowed in a particular location by the updated SMP should be considered “nonconforming.” Such uses will be uncommon. I would put them second in the section, to focus on the much more common issue of pre-existing structures. The solution on terminology? I suggest using the term “grandfathered” for describing existing structures which do not meet current standards. (Interestingly, this is the term used to clarify the intent of the Planning Commission draft.) There is plenty of detail in the draft regarding how an existing structure, which now intrudes into a newly-defined buffer, may be expanded. Use of the term “nonconforming” detracts from the solutions that the draft provides for these situations. Tom C proposed revision: Here is how the SMP language might look using my proposed approach (I moved Structures ahead of Uses due to the relatively rare situation of nonconforming use. Focus on the most relevant part.)</p> <p>19.400.100 Existing Development</p> <p>B. A. Existing Structures</p> <p>1. Lawfully constructed structures which do not meet the standards of this Program</p> <p>a. Legally established structures occurring as of the effective date of this Program, which do not meet the standards of this Program for setbacks, buffers, yards, area, bulk, height or density shall be considered nonconforming to this Program, to include appurtenances as defined in 19.100.150. These structures shall be referred to as “grandfathered structures” in this Program. (Seems like the SMP should use the language in the statute that allows this approach.)</p> <p>b. All legally established nonconforming grandfathered structures may continue and may be, remodeled, repaired or maintained in accordance with the Act, this Program, and Chapter 24.50 TCC.</p> <p>c. For structures located partially within the shoreline buffer or setback, alterations shall be limited to the addition of height up to 35 feet above finished grade and landward expansion into areas outside the shoreline setback.</p> <p>d. For structures located entirely within the shoreline buffer or setbacks, alterations shall be allowed for the addition of height up to 35 feet above finished grade, or landward expansion the entire width of the structure, on the upland side of the structure, or both. Mitigation shall be required for any such expansions within the buffer. Structures may be expanded outside the shoreline buffer or setback, subject to other applicable provisions of Thurston County Code.</p> <p>e. Interior and exterior remodels and the addition of upper stories are permitted. Except as provided above, such additions shall not extend beyond the existing or approved building footprint.</p> <p>f. Any expansion of nonconforming grandfathered structures that further encroach on the buffer or setback towards the Ordinary High Water Mark or expansion on either side of the existing structure shall require a shoreline variance.</p> <p>g. Remodels, alterations, and reconstruction of structures which occur within the footprint of the existing structure shall not require a substantial development permit provided the site does not pose any human</p>	Mining Lakes
169	10/14/21	Diane	Oberquell	Thanks for the additional information. I guess my question now is: What is the difference between the current Shoreline Residential classification and the proposed Rural Conservancy? What is the impact on a current property owner? And what is the reasoning for the change ? Previous message dated 10/14/21: Andrew, Thank you for all your help. I am having a difficult time in locating where McAllister creek is located on the last two maps that you sent. If you could please zoom in so I can more determine where the creek meets the Sound I would appreciate it.	
170	10/15/21	Richard (Tom)	Goldsby	Thanks again for your quick response and your patience. As suggested, based on our review of the criteria for proposing shoreline designations, we have determined the designation of Natural for the property is incorrect. Current use is inconsistent in that, for one, it is not “... free of structural shoreline modifications, structures, and intensive human uses.” It is “Currently accommodating residential uses.” As I stated previously there exist multiple single family residences since approximately 1924 ; a portion of the property was farmed (strawberries) and raised cattle; a portion was forested, once a Weyerhaeuser park and “Currently provides public access and recreational use where medium density and residential developments and services exist and are planned”. Shoreline Residential is the appropriate designation. In addition, as requested I am sending your way a PDF copy of the most recent elevation certificate to initiate an amendment to the floodplain map. It is attached. It is consistent with the elevation certificates on file, completed by the county, when homes were permitted in the 70s and 80s. It should not be included in the floodplain. While the elevation of the land remains unchanged given the presence of hard pan and clay soils I have also observed that the elevation of the riverbed is substantially lower than it was 43 years ago.	Eld Inlet
171	10/15/21	Curtis	Cleaveland	I am a homeowner near Lake Lawrence, and a member of the Lake Management District financial committee. I fully support Barry Halverson’s recommendations concerning changes to the SMP as follows: 1) Buffer widths (Issue #2 in coalition letter) for lakes to remain as they were in the 1990 SMP . If this particular issue is changed to what the county staff want most of you will have your properties (on the lake/canal/community beaches) seriously impacted. 2) Pier, Dock, Float or ramp grating (Issue #7 in coalition letter) we want the option to exclude expensive grating for lakes that do not contain salmon. 3) Pier and Dock pilling spacing (Issue #8 - in coalition letter) we want the option to reduce spacing to 8 feet. 4) Pier and Dock Width (Issue #9 - in coalition letter) we want the option to be able to make our piers/docks 8 feet wide or more if applicant can demonstrate need. 5) Shoreline Environmental Designations (SEDs) (Issue #12 in coalition letter) we want the changes we were able to make for residents of Lake Lawrence adopted by the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners. Thank you for your consideration.	Lake Lawrence
172	10/15/21	Parminder	Bedi	Thank you for all the hard work in getting the proposed SMP changes to this point. I have been following the requests submitted by the Thurston County Shoreline Stakeholders Coalition and support their issue paper. Thank you for listening to the public and taking their views into account in the draft proposal. We are homeowners on Lake Lawrence and will be directly impacted by the proposed updates to the county plan. And as such will like to request the following: 1. Buffer widths (Ch 19.400.100) for lakes to remain as they were in the 1990 SMP. 2. Pier, Dock, Float, or ramp grating (Ch 19.600.160.C.1r., Ch 19.600.160.C.4.f, and Ch 19.600.160.C.5) we would appreciate the option to exclude expensive grating for lakes that do not contain salmon. 3. Pier and Dock pilling spacing (Ch 19.600.160.C.3.b) we would like the option to reduce spacing to 8 feet. 4. Pier and Dock Width (Ch 19.600.160.C.3.b) we would like the option to be able to make our piers/docks 8 feet wide or more if an applicant can demonstrate need. 5. Shoreline Environmental Designations (SEDs) we want the changes we were able to make for residents of Lake Lawrence adopted by the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners. Thank you for your consideration,	Lake Lawrence
173	10/15/21	Zina	Losey	Hi, I am concerned about the number of aquaculture boats going through Totten Inlet. They are large, go fast sometimes without lights. Since the increase in the aquaculture business there is also an increase in garbage that I collect on the beach. One of my main concerns is that there be a coordination between Thurston and Mason Counties regarding how many aquaculture businesses there are being allowed. This is including the privately leased out land to companies that harvest geoducks. All this damages the shoreline. Thank you for listening/reading.	Totten Inlet

Thurston County Shoreline Master Program Open House and 10/20/21 PC Public Hearing Comments

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment	Affiliation / Geo. Area
174	10/15/21	Kathi	McKay	Thank you for your very thorough update. I appreciate all the information and all the avenues you are checking. At this time, I want to be sure that Thurston County staff and the Planning Commission realize that we have not had any flooding on our 15+/- acres since my family has owned the property (1962). Three other specific points to consider are: 1. The crawl space of the house has never had water from excess rain or flooding. 2. When the Chehalis backed up in 2009 and flooded north towards our property, covering Anderson Road, a neighbor to our west said he was unable to drive to his residence due to the flooding on Anderson Road but he was able to walk across our property. He said our property did not receive any drainage or flooding from the Chehalis River. 3. If the Black River was ever to go over a bank, it would flow over the south bank which is lower than our bank. 4. I believe part of the flooding from the Chehalis in 2007 & 2009 was due to a problem downstream of the Chehalis that has been mitigated. Has anyone looked at the LIDAR information for our parcel?	Black River
175	10/15/21	David	Clark	I have property with a bulkhead on a steep bank. Will there be any problem with raising the bulkhead as the sea level rises?	
176	10/15/21	David	Fisher	I recognize that the COVID pandemic has limited your options for public engagement, but this appears to be a potentially major change that could affect thousands of property owners and tens of millions (or more) of property value, with a limited ability for people to have their questions answered. Unfortunately, for anyone other than a land use lawyer or environmental engineer, the material is extremely hard -- bordering on impossible -- to understand. For instance, I find it impossible to discern the practical difference between 1990's "rural" designation and the proposed 2021 "rural conservancy" designation. Defining a "substantial development" as any change costing more than \$7,047 seems extremely restrictive considering today's construction costs for material and labor. Even a minor project would often exceed that threshold. There doesn't appear to be any other criteria for "substantial," such as increases in impervious surfaces or structure volume of more than X%. Ideally, you would suspend the implementation of these new rules until public health conditions normalize and there can be real and effective interaction between staff and the people the new rules will impact. Failing that, the very least you could do is put together some plain English descriptions of the regulations before and after the proposed change. Things like "Setbacks in these areas are currently XXX feet, but they would be ZZZ feet if the changes are adopted." Or "The following uses/structures would no longer be allowed in (description) areas." Make it abundantly clear how the change in rules impacts people and their property.	
177	10/15/21	Thomas	Rowland	Thanks for the post card notification that our property is proposed to include SMP designation (Rural Conservancy) along the Johnson Creek tributary. The attempt to simplify the permitting process is certainly appreciated but I am not sure that I understand what is/isn't allowed with/without permitting. For example, is agricultural use on land designated for tax purposes as open spaces/agricultural permitted? How is this related to the 250 ft. buffer in the Rural Conservancy? How can weed growth be controlled in an area where thistle is abundant on neighbors' fields? Similarly how is fire protection by haying dealt with in the permitting process. I have found your online presentation very valuable and I will continue reading it.	
178	10/16/21	Edwin	Howell	Andrew, the purpose of this email is to state my overwhelming support for the Thurston County Shoreline Stakeholders Coalition. I, and my wife support all 19 recommendations as put forth by the Coalition. At a bare minimum the following items need to be addressed and changed to be in line with the Coalition guidelines. 1. Buffer widths (Issue #2 in coalition letter) for lakes to remain as they were in the 1990 SMP . If this particular issue is changed to what the county staff want most of you will have your properties (on the lake/canal/community beaches) seriously impacted. 2. Pier, Dock, Float or ramp grating (Issue #7 in coalition letter) we want the option to exclude expensive grating for lakes that do not contain salmon. 3. Pier and Dock piling spacing (Issue #8 - in coalition letter) we want the option to reduce spacing to 8 feet. 4. Pier and Dock Width (Issue #9 - in coalition letter) we want the option to be able to make our piers/docks 8 feet wide or more if applicant can demonstrate need. 5. Shoreline Environmental Designations (SEDs) (Issue #12 in coalition letter) we want the changes we were able to make for residents of Lake Lawrence adopted by the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners. Thank you for your support of the Lake Lawrence residential community.	Lake Lawrence
179	10/16/21	Andrew	Bentley	I am writing this email to show that I have concerns with the upcoming potential changes to the Shoreline Master Program (SMP). Specifically, I (and many others on the lake) support the following: 1. Buffer widths (Issue #2 in coalition letter) for lakes to remain as they were in the 1990 SMP . If this particular issue is changed to what the county staff want most of you will have your properties (on the lake/canal/community beaches) seriously impacted. 2. Pier, Dock, Float or ramp grating (Issue #7 in coalition letter) we want the option to exclude expensive grating for lakes that do not contain salmon. 3. Pier and Dock piling spacing (Issue #8 - in coalition letter) we want the option to reduce spacing to 8 feet. 4. Pier and Dock Width (Issue #9 - in coalition letter) we want the option to be able to make our piers/docks 8 feet wide or more if applicant can demonstrate need. 5. Shoreline Environmental Designations (SEDs) (Issue #12 in coalition letter) we want the changes we were able to make for residents of Lake Lawrence adopted by the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners. Please consider this when making any decisions on future changes.	Lake Lawrence
180	10/16/21	Patti and Daniel	Moffett	We have lived on Lake Lawrence since 1990 and would like to have the following implemented/ kept in place. 1. Buffer widths (Issue #2 in coalition letter) for lakes to remain as they were in the 1990 SMP . 2. Pier, Dock, Float or ramp grating (Issue #7 in coalition letter) we want the option to exclude expensive grating for lakes that do not contain salmon. 3. Pier and Dock piling spacing (Issue #8 - in coalition letter) we want the option to reduce spacing to 8 feet. 4. Pier and Dock Width (Issue #9 - in coalition letter) we want the option to be able to make our piers/docks 8 feet wide or more if applicant can demonstrate need. 5. Shoreline Environmental Designations (SEDs) (Issue #12 in coalition letter) we want the changes we were able to make for residents of Lake Lawrence adopted by the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners. We appreciate your attention to these matters.	Lake Lawrence
181	10/16/21	Rick	Bacon	Please do not reduce buffers, in fact increase them. Lots of talk about the value of wetlands but little action to beef up their protection. Also please eliminate all mitigations. If a wetland is destroyed the damage to the environment will never be 'mitigated' by a developer creating an artificial wetland of no value somewhere else. It would be nice if restrictions about destruction of natural habitats were clearer i.e. natural habitat such as cattails, etc. must not be altered in any way within a 50 (for example) feet buffer from a shoreline. Appreciate the opportunity to comment.	

Thurston County Shoreline Master Program Open House and 10/20/21 PC Public Hearing Comments

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment	Affiliation / Geo. Area
182	10/17/21	Paula	Lowe	<p>I have attended several SMP hearings in the past few years. I am dismayed that this process has taken YEARS. I am a 35-year resident of Pattison Lake, and president of the Pattison Lake Association. Our lake residents are in the process of starting a Lake Management District for Pattison Lake. My comments:</p> <p>1. Many county residents are not aware of these rules. I have seen docks built, shoreline trees removed, boathouses built, and more — all along the shoreline — and without permits. There isn't enough staff at the county to monitor, assess, nor fine these residents. Then when properties are sold, new owners remove trees without permits. I know someone who turned in several residents to the county and only a letter was sent to the offending party — there was no surveillance, nor a fine. The county needs to hire more staff to monitor and fine these offenses. It's vital that this information is shared with those who need it: shoreline property owners, as well as builders, developers, arborists, landscape companies, and other professionals who do these services. Additionally, shoreline property owners need to receive this document upon purchasing their home, and it needs to go to existing home owners.</p> <p>2. Pollution sources must be identified to help keep waters clean.</p> <p>a. Faulty or inappropriately located septic systems</p> <p>b. Use of inappropriate lawn and/or garden fertilizers, and/or</p> <p>c. Stormwater runoff directly into the county's marine waters, lakes and rivers should not be allowed. Our waterbodies are being polluted when we can fix the stormwater system.</p> <p>Additionally, I talked to people who work in the septic system department at the county and they said there is no monitoring nor testing of septic systems — again, there isn't the budget nor staffing to do this. This service is vital to keep our waterways clean. Monitor the septic systems, educate property owners with septic systems. Fine those who don't take care of their septic systems. It directly impacts our fish, wildlife, and humans who use the lake.</p> <p>3. Ch. 19.400.100. The labeling of all existing legally built homes and/or accessory structures already located within the buffer should be “conforming” not “legally non-conforming” State law recognizes these structures as “conforming”. Thurston County should as well.</p> <p>4. Ch. 19.400.120. Buffer widths should stay as presented in the July 28, 2021, draft SMP. Shoreline Residential buffer widths should be 50-feet for both marine and lake properties . . . as they have been since 1990 SMP, and longer.</p> <p>5. Ch. 19.400.120.D.1.b. and Appendix B, Section B.2.c. Decks and Viewing Platforms properly constructed to be pervious should not be required to be “. . . adjacent to residential structures . . . ” There should be no limit on size or location and there should be no requirement for a shoreline variance to build such a deck.</p>	Pattison Lake
183	10/17/21	Aaron and Melinda	Weller	<p>My wife and I own a lakeside property on Lake Lawrence in Thurston County. Our house was built very close to the lake back in the 60's and we have struggled to get through the current permitting process. The proposed changes to the Shoreline Management Plan will add increased burden for property owners like us who are invested in the lake being protected and managed appropriately. I have heard anecdotally that the large majority of lakeshore changes are unpermitted due to the complexity of the existing rules. The proposed SMP will only serve to make this worse in several aspects. Areas that I have specific concerns regarding, given my experience over the last couple of years:</p> <p>Ch 19.400.100. Part of our property are considered “legally non-conforming” vs “conforming”. As state law recognizes structures with similar characteristics conforming, so should the SMP.</p> <p>Ch 19.400.120 Extending buffers from 50 to 250 feet could significantly impact changes within the 50-250 feet range from the waterline — a large part of the usable area of my property.</p> <p>Ch 19.400.120.d.1.b The requirement for a shoreline variation to build (or in our case rebuild) a deck is costly and seems excessive.</p> <p>I know that there has been a lot of community feedback around some of these issues. As I said, given my experience with the complexity of the existing process — the SMP in some areas appears to be going in the wrong direction to balance the ability of property owners to maintain their properties with the clear need to manage and restrict development that could have an impact on the lake. I will unfortunately be travelling on the 20th and unable to attend the meeting, but wanted to convey my concerns to the county prior to then.</p>	Lake Lawrence
184	10/17/21	Jim and Mary	Pizl	<p>I was informed by Barry our lake president that you are planning to change the shoreline regulations. I agree with Barry on the following items:</p> <p>1. Buffer widths (Issue #2 in coalition letter) for lakes to remain as they were in the 1990 SMP . If this particular issue is changed to what the county staff want most of you will have your properties (on the lake/canal/community beaches) seriously impacted.</p> <p>2. Pier, Dock, Float or ramp grating (Issue #7 in coalition letter) we want the option to exclude expensive grating for lakes that do not contain salmon.</p> <p>3. Pier and Dock pilling spacing (Issue #8 - in coalition letter) we want the option to reduce spacing to 8 feet.</p> <p>4. Pier and Dock Width (Issue #9 - in coalition letter) we want the option to be able to make our piers/docks 8 feet wide or more if applicant can demonstrate need.</p> <p>5. Shoreline Environmental Designations (SEDs) (Issue #12 in coalition letter) we want the changes we were able to make for residents of Lake Lawrence adopted by the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners.</p> <p>6. My wife and I own 3 separate pieces of land that your changes will impact so please don't do them and leave them the same or above</p>	Lake Lawrence
185	10/17/21	Aaron and Emma	Holley	<p>This is comment about Summit Lake. We see that it is proposed to change it from rural to shoreline residential. We are concerned about this change because this has always been a private lake for the most part (except one boat launch) and the residents require the lake water as their primary and ONLY source of drinking water. It is also spring fed. Our family has lived there for over 50 years and we have seen and had a lot of problems with oversized vacation rentals and toxic algae outbreaks. Even though they are in violation of section 20 general and special uses there has still been little interference or regulation from the county because they told us they have no resources. Please take into consideration that allowing this area to become more public may potentially contaminate our only drinking water. The residents for the most part know the importance of protecting our water and not introducing waste into our life source. Large groups, especially bringing boats that were in other bodies of water do not consider their impact and opening up summit lake for more construction and public use is a big disservice to the people that live there.</p>	Summit Lake
186	10/17/21	Richard	Davis	<p>Your new plan achieves the required environmental protections without undue burdens to property owners. The county appears to be moving in the right direction, with meaningful and necessary rules while eliminating unduly burdensome ordinances. That makes sense. Keep up the good work.</p>	
187	10/18/21	Anne	Van Sweringen	<p>Dear Commissioner Edwards,</p> <p>Please accept the attached comment regarding the Thurston County Draft Shoreline Master Program Update: Thurston Environmental Community Stakeholders Black Hills Audubon Society, Sierra Club South Sound, Thurston League of Women Voters, Thurston Climate Action Team, and Thurston Environmental Voters</p> <p>As representative of the five Thurston County nonprofit organizations listed above, I would like to send the following comment to you for the upcoming Board of County Commissioners review of the Shoreline Master Plan Update: Marine Resources Committee — Consider establishing a Thurston County Marine Resources Committee. Josh Cummings, CPED, suggested I contact you. The committee would act as a citizens advisory group that would work closely with state and local officials, while promoting public outreach and education. Clallam, Jefferson, San Juan, Snohomish, Grays, and Island counties all have established MRCs. The mission of the MRC would be to address, using sound science, the needs of Thurston County's marine ecosystem. The MRC's focus would be to make recommendations on restoring and protecting county marine ecosystems, their ecological functions, and natural resources. The MRC's job would be to coordinate efforts to implement restoration and conservation projects, and to educate the public. With climate change, sea level rise, and increased population growth in the forefront of many county shoreline issues, we believe the time is right for a Marine Resources Committee.</p>	Thurston Environmental Community Stakeholders
188	10/18/21	CJ	Russo	<p>Hi Andrew, Please contact me asap about the shoreline designation change at 401 Summit Lake Shore Rd NW. It appears that of the 350+ properties on the lake, only my property and my neighbor's property will have a more restrictive designation. This is not reasonable. Please inform me about how I can keep this from occurring.</p>	Summit Lake
189	10/18/21	Jan	Tveten	<p>What is the basis for the shoreline set-back. Through out the state it varies, why? Just because you can, or is it something scientific about it?</p>	
190	10/18/21	Phyllis	Farrell	<p>Thank you for all the hard work you are doing on updating the SMP. I have seen several references to the Cumulative Impacts Analysis and No Net Loss Report...can those be made available? Some time ago, I asked (and I know you were busy) if we had data on the number of exemptions and variances over the past few years. Also, do you have the number of permit compliance visits, violations and penalties? I know the County is short staffed and monitoring and compliance are issues...I would like some documentation to advocate for more funding for these activities. Also, I noticed in the draft SMP on line ...in the section on buffers there is an option to advocate for the 1990 buffer widths, but I see only Option A and B in the documents for the Open House.</p>	

Thurston County Shoreline Master Program Open House and 10/20/21 PC Public Hearing Comments

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment	Affiliation / Geo. Area
191	10/18/21	Barbara	Chambers	I spoke with you about the SMP a couple of weeks ago, and you encouraged me to submit my comments directly to you if I was not able to attend the public hearing. While I believe that SMP is well thought out and has potential, what I do not like is that the SMP appears to illegally seize private property by changing rural shoreline properties to RURAL CONSERVANCY land. This new Conservancy land has been "created" by expanding our buffer zone of 50' to 150'-250'. Property owners will be prohibited and/or regulated to death for any property improvements in this proposal. The County already revalues our properties upwards on an annual basis significantly increasing our property taxes. Now this? If this is pushed through, than the County should remove the property tax that we are paying on any land that is "seized" under the guise of waterway protections. I for one am very meticulous on how my "shoreline" land is used primarily because I own high bank waterfront, and am very concerned with natural occurring sloughing and slides. Please come up with regulations that are citizen friendly, and do not keep increasing our expenditures. If you all have identified some rotten eggs that are misusing shoreline property, than focus on those folks. Thank you for your consideration. I do appreciate the opportunity to comment and your dedication to your job.	
192	10/18/21	Anne	Van Sweringen	Dear Commissioner Menser, Please accept the attached comment regarding the Thurston County Draft Shoreline Master Program Update: Thurston Environmental Community Stakeholders Black Hills Audubon Society, Sierra Club South Sound, Thurston League of Women Voters, Thurston Climate Action Team, and Thurston Environmental Voters As representative of the five Thurston County nonprofit organizations listed above, I would like to send the following comment to you for the upcoming Board of County Commissioners review of the Shoreline Master Plan Update: Marine Resources Committee – Consider establishing a Thurston County Marine Resources Committee. Josh Cummings, CPED, suggested I contact you. The committee would act as a citizens advisory group that would work closely with state and local officials, while promoting public outreach and education. Clallam, Jefferson, San Juan, Snohomish, Grays, and Island counties all have established MRCs. The mission of the MRC would be to address, using sound science, the needs of Thurston County's marine ecosystem. The MRC's focus would be to make recommendations on restoring and protecting county marine ecosystems, their ecological functions, and natural resources. The MRC's job would be to coordinate efforts to implement restoration and conservation projects, and to educate the public. With climate change, sea level rise, and increased population growth in the forefront of many county shoreline issues, we believe the time is right for a Marine Resources Committee.	Thurston Environmental Community Stakeholders
193	10/18/21	Phyllis	Farrell	FYI I noticed in the draft Shoreline Master Program this section that I liked: p.39 19.300.115 Water Quality and Quantity p.40 G. Policy SH-21.7 Stormwater outfalls into the rivers, streams, lakes and marine environment should be eliminated and diverted into settling ponds to reduce organics, harmful chemicals and waste from entering these water bodies and degrading water quality and contributing to algae growth.	
194	10/18/21	Kevin		It has been, and always most likely be the same with this update. Anytime the government changes an existing plan, they screw it up and add all these additional fees so the government employees in these positions can get pay raises, add staff to get promotions, and harass property owners. My vote is to LEAVE IT ALONE. The environmentalist just want to build or add to their resume and then pack their agency with more people to put more \$\$\$\$\$ in their pockets. I'm for the days that counties and governments actually help people with their projects---team up even with the costs. To spend our tax dollars fining, enforcing, harassing, property owners it is counterproductive, does nothing for the environment, and no wonder people have to back door issues--which, had they teamed up, the final results would be a safer environment for all. Your list of changes is all FLUFF to mislead people...no walk the talk. You all should be ashamed of yourselves and the biggest question of all: HOW CAN YOU ALL SLEEP AT NIGHT WITH YOUR LYING AGENDA?	
195	10/18/21	Glenn	Schorno	The 1990 SMP states specific language as agriculture being a preferred use in flood planes on page 37. Could this language be used in the update? Using geodata Parcel 22728420000 shows part of the parcel out of the SMP? Why is it included in the new SMP? The area not in the current SMP was the property that didn't flood in the 1996 flood. When I click on 1996 flood using geodata it now shows as been flooded. Please explain.	
196	10/18/21	Diane	Oberquell	I have been reading the material provided and trying to understand why there is a proposal for an area of Nisqually Reach being re-designated from "rural to "rural conservancy". It appears from the criteria that I have seen that the area is more represented by "shoreline residential" as it is more developed. I can see no justification for changing the buffers or set-backs. As I stated the shoreline is developed and there are a number of other programs that have placed rules and regulations regarding set-backs, rebuilding requirements and a number of other regulations. The area we are talking about abuts the aquaculture area where there is commercial oyster and geoduck harvesting, which is also very much regulated by the County and the State Dept of Ecology. It appears that this area is well protected already...Thank you for your consideration.	
197	10/18/21	Frank and Heidi	Hudik	Below comments are numbered to facilitate communication by reference. 1. Appendix A is not included in the document. Therefore, for the purpose of commenting below it is assumed 16246 Pleasant Beach Drive SE Lawrence Lake, Yelm, WA "is designated in the SEP and Appendix A maps as "Residential Shoreline". There are no comments about this designation, merely confirming. 2. We support and hereby endorse comments to the DRAFT SMP document from the Thurston County Shoreline Stakeholders Coalition (Ltr from John H Woodford, Chairman dated 23 September 2021), and comments regarding "Conforming vs. Non-Conforming" dated 31 August 2020. (RCW 90.58.620) Accordingly, please include our name as signatories to these referenced comments. 3. 19.100.110 Purpose and Intent /// and /// 19.100.120 Applicability All comments included below assume the following stated intent of the DRAFT SMP including its imbedded references such as those listed in 19.400.125: "...the purpose of the Master Program is to guide the future development of the shorelines in Thurston County in a manner consistent with the Shoreline Management Act of 1971, hereinafter the "Act." AND "Proposes any new use..." Citizen input: An important perception of these statements is "future development" and "new use" as opposed to previous development and current state. All comments provided herein assume this intent and relevant enforcement policy, as opposed to retroactively adding new restrictions (resulting in "non-conformance"). When a site-plan, construction permits, inspections, variances etc. were already approved by Thurston County, (SEPA/JARPA/HPA/Variance), often at great expense by the homeowner, why are they now "non-conforming"? This designation conveys the stigma of illegality or potential future actions invoked by the next document version/amendment? This is particularly worrisome for home Sellers. 4. 19.150.600 Normal Repair, The provisions of this paragraph should apply to the repair of dock/surfaces that have deteriorated with time, often to the point of an unsafe condition including splintering wood surfaces. Dock repairs should be encouraged for safety and aesthetic reasons, not discouraged. 5. 19.300.105 and .110 Ecological Provisions, Conservation, Consistent with the intent and stated mandates of this section (SH-3e, SH-16., etc), Lake Management Districts (LMD) should be explicitly acknowledged in this Plan, strongly encouraged, and fiscally supported by WA State and Thurston County via general fund (tax-funded) accounts. Our lakes are County resources! Our lakes are State resources! Our lakes are deteriorating! Fees collected by LMD constituents should be used strictly to fund direct boots-on-the-ground efforts such as invasive weed removal. Other uses of LMD funds (e.g., County Administrative costs) should be explicitly forbidden by this SMP, as it has the weight of law. Bottom line: administrative costs to operate the LMDs should be totally borne by Thurston County (General Fund) as the same LMD fee payers who directly support lake stewardship are also taxpayers. This Plan specifies treatment of government entities as equal participants in its impact so let's levy quid-pro-quo fiscal responsibility for administering LMDs on the government (taxpayer), not the LMD fee payers. 6. 19.400.120B Buffer Widths, We vehemently disagree with Residential Buffer changes proposed, struck-through, and repropoed as an option to the existing 50ft. There appears to be no science presented to change the 50ft buffer rule. Such expansion is particularly restrictive to small lakefront lots that pay a premium in taxes owing to "lakefront" tax-assessment designation. Per the SMP, the buffer expansion implies relegation to "non-conforming" status. The existing 50ft buffer caused us considerable home redesign and construction delay (\$\$) to ensure compliance!!! Now it's going to be 75? Why not an even 100, 200... What is the science? 7. 19.500.100B. 2 Permits, We agree with the statement that SDPs should not require public hearing. 8. 19.600.160B Moorings and C Standards, Again, we agree that Public Hearing should not be required per the note. Also, buoys obstruct water-skiing navigation, effectively making the lake smaller for turning high speed boats. Buoys for mooring should not be encouraged for lakes. The moored boat is an issue, as is the buoy itself. If located in 16ft of water (minimum), the buoy and moored boat will be significantly located in the high-speed-turn path of ski boats.	Lake Lawrence

Thurston County Shoreline Master Program Open House and 10/20/21 PC Public Hearing Comments

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment	Affiliation / Geo. Area
198	10/18/21	John	Morgan	school land rd. separates my home and most of my land from the black river. So why cant the buffer end there, after all there is no run off from my my main land to river.	Black River
199	10/18/21	Frank	Hudik	For the record, an e-mail was sent to Mr Andrew Deffobis on 18 October 2021, with our comments included as an attachment to the e-mail. We wish to thank the persistent efforts of John Woodford, Barry Halverson and Doug Karman. We hereby endorse comments to the SMP by the Thurston County Shoreline Coalition, as formally submitted in a letter from John Woodford dated 23 September 2021. Comments from the Lawrence Lake Citizen Advisory Committee to previous DRAFTs of this SMP were submitted to Ms Cindy Wilson and then-Commissioner Sandra Romero dating back to 8 May 2011. These comments were never acknowledged, and some of the same issues remain in this DRAFT. We request a decision/response to each of the comments provided to Mr Deffobis in our 18 October 2021 e-mail. Lake Management Districts (LMD) remain a viable resource to address lake stewardship and water quality issues. The cooperative efforts of citizen and government in LMD formation and maintenance should be addressed in this document, with due encouragement to support the LMDs. In addition, the SMP should codify the allowable legal use of LMD fees for direct lake stewardship activities only. Fees should not be used for administering the LMDs. It is our hope the SMP will provide legal clout to this precept and stop the persistent raiding of scarce LMD funds (fees) for County administration purposes.	Lake Lawrence
200	10/19/21	Glenn	Schorno	In order to preserve value of parcels negatively impacted by the proposed SMP, I recommend allowing owners with neighboring parcels under the same ownership, the ability to move their affected parcels out of the SMP to unaffected areas while retaining their current underlying zoning. The parcels could be moved through a special type of boundary line adjustment or other by other means. The total number of parcels would be unchanged. This will help preserve our family farm for the future financially and ecologically. Farmers have been negatively impacted for decades through rezones without being fully compensated. Please help us.	

Thurston County Shoreline Master Program Open House and 10/20/21 PC Public Hearing Comments

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment	Affiliation / Geo. Area
201	10/19/21	Brian and Nancy	Muirhead	<p>Attached is a complete set of inputs to the SMP from my wife Nancy and I as residents on Pattison Lake as of Oct. 2020. The first section contains inputs to the SMP that include our previous inputs on the buffer dimensions. The second section is a more detailed treatment of the issue we have with the proposed SED. There is also an additional input on the SED associated with the railroad property passing between the north and south parts of the lake. Thank you for your hard work on this important document and working with the community to get it right.</p> <p><i>See original comment for referenced images and for full version of comment (too long to copy below)</i></p> <p>Inputs to the SMP: General comment: There are a significant number of references to the powers and authorities of the Department of Ecology (DoE) in the SMP but we don't find any reference(s) to where to find the applicable information on the criteria DoE uses for their decisions and how they're defined and managed. For example, per 19.500.100.D.4 DoE must approve all shoreline CUPs. While there is a reference to a WAC requiring the review, there is no reference to any document that provides the basis for approval/disapproval. We think that some statement(s) should be added to the beginning of SMP that highlights the roles of DoE with respect to the quality of the water in the lakes and elsewhere and provide some appropriate references to DoE documents and policies that give some insight to evaluation criteria use by DoE.</p> <p>Specific paragraph inputs:</p> <p>19.400.100. The labeling of all existing legally built homes and/or accessory structures already located within the buffer should be labeled "conforming" not "legal nonconforming" as currently recognized by state law.</p> <p>19.400.120.B.1. Based on what we know at this time about the ecological benefits of the buffer size for fresh water lakes we support the smallest sized buffer zones for each designation: Shoreline Residential: 50 ft; Urban Conservancy: 100 ft; Rural Conservancy: 125 ft and Natural: 200 ft.</p> <p>19.400.120.D.1.e. We agree that water oriented storage structures should be for residential use only.</p> <p>19.400.120.D.2 We agree with the addition "herbicide"</p> <p>19.500.075 and 19.500.100.B.2. We agree that SDP, CUP and Variances should be processed administratively to avoid the additional time and complexity of public hearings.</p> <p>19.500.100.B.5 states all SDP's are to be submitted to DoE "upon a final decision by local government." What does this mean in practice? Does DoE have the power to approve/reject an approved SDP? If not, it should be made clear why the SDP is provided to DoE.</p> <p>19.600.160.C.1.r. We agree on striking a requirement for grating percent for docks on lakes without salmon. 19.600.160.C.3.b. and C.4.a. We agree with conducting a public hearing on shorter distances for spacing of residential dock pilings in lakes. Given the interest in keeping docks to demonstrated need size the piling locations and spacing should be based on the structural design and safety not seemingly arbitrary dimensions.</p> <p>Inputs on the proposed SED for our properties: The following is from previous email to you sent 9/30, which you responded to on 10/5/21: With respect to the proposed SED changes - we need to challenge what looks like a redrawing of the boundary lines along parcel boundaries and redesignation of our parcel 11702140600 (-600) as "natural." Our residence is on the adjacent parcel 11702420100 (-100). We understand and accept that part of our parcel, -600, is under a Department of Fish and Wildlife bald eagle management plan (due to a nest that was active in 1998) agreed to by the original owner of this property in 1998. However, the previous owners and now ourselves are using parts of parcel -600 as active living area, for access to the lake and for the septic drainage system. We need to know how to properly update the SED map to show shoreline residential and rural conservancy designations as it is and has been being used and maintained, and finding agreement on a natural designation where appropriate. The following are new inputs in response to your questions. Below is a figure that is a very rough edit of the GeoData map of the -600 parcel and part of the -100 parcel. The red polygons are pathways from -100 to the shoreline through -600, and the most eastward (to the right) is the septic drainfield (with a curvy line from the tanks at the back of the house). The next drawing shows where the current shoreline designations are. It seems to me that the geodata map is not accurate with respect to the actual shoreline and the 2018 and 2019 aerial views are not clear with respect to the existing backyard down to the shoreline. I'm preparing a more accurate sketch (based on the 3rd</p>	Pattison Lake
202	10/19/21	Jeff	Krueger	<p>Thank you for asking for input. I grew up on Puget sound & have lived on Lk St Clair for over 40 years. These proposals are sometimes written in a way that require clarity, for example Buffers. A buffer gets described as 50' in width. I'm guessing it is written incorrectly and is intended to read 50' from the high water mark and then 50' onto the property. My lot for example is apx 160' wide at the lake, so the way it's been written I have 110' that would not be addressed. The do's & don'ts of the buffer section need to be way better defined. Limb thinning for example is way too intrusive. In the county's effort to adopt regs that make sense, it is important to remember not to overreach. Docks and Piers: Shallower lakes like Long Lake probably use more piers (docks on pilings) and have their own requirements, but deep lakes like Lk St Clair use floating docks. With the exception of shoreline trees, properly constructed docks are probably the best contributor of shade and help with cooler habitat. Docks should be allowed in the SED and should be an inexpensive and unpainful permit. Up until now, a dock permit has been so expensive and time consuming that many have been built without permits. The ability to educate homeowners to the proper products for floatation, correct types of treated for joisting and decking and environmentally friendly sealers. It would be nice to see the County educate lake owners and have a program to update old docks with styrofoam float logs or old oil drums. Proposed SMP, Expanding a Structure: Is it the County's intent that a structure may be expanded up to 500 Sq Ft? It has been for years that providing your plans meet the pervious vs impervious ratio an addition of any size is allowable. I can't imagine the intent is to limit any addition to a 500 Sq Ft maximum. If this is the case, it is way too overreaching. Lake St Clair has an inflow but no outflow. With that in mind, insuring good water quality and addressing those items that create pollution are important. There is a county road culvert on Glory Dr that might need to be looked at. Lake residents have always been concerned about how many septic systems are a problem especially when the water gets high. A program for assistance might be considered. Another nasty pollution contributor is old bulkheads made of railroad ties. Railroad ties have no place around water and continue to leach during hot days for years. These should be identified, homeowners should be notified, and leniency should be offered for replacement. Again, thank you for asking for public input. I am currently out of town but would be happy to be involved going forward.</p>	Lake St. Clair
203	10/19/21	Glenn	Schorno	<p>The 1990 SMP states agriculture as a preferred use on flood planes. (page 37) On farmers' behalf, please keep this language in the updated SMP. Also, if a shoreline shrinks or a restored, well established, mediated buffer dies due to a natural event or a "fix" of a man made problem being addressed and remedied, will the SMP boundaries be adjusted? Will wetlands be reclassified? e.g. The Centralia power canal has leaked for decades causing wetland along large portions of the neighboring properties. The city has started to line the bottom of the canal to address the problem.</p>	
204	10/19/21	Meredith and Donovan	Rafferty	<p>Our property's saltwater shoreline lies in a dense development that is now identified as a half-mile-long "reach", MBU-16. The draft SMP embraces totally new criteria for designating shoreline categories that are not directly based on the ecological intactness of the shoreline. One of the broadest is the all-encompassing "environmental limitations" criteria for the Rural Conservancy designation (pg. 29). Now counted is the presence of "steep slopes" and/or "flood-prone" areas with no definitions, just a broad pass. The issue is the breadth of the characteristics and the variability in the interpretation. We note that there are definitions in the Critical Areas act which already regulates us. The act provides a publicly established process for specifying such characteristics and there are standards for regulating them. In this increasingly regulated world, we question creating a new layer of regulation for an undefined purpose. Currently, the Rural Conservancy's "environmental limitations" broadly includes "steep banks, feeder bluffs, or flood plains or other flood-prone areas" (pg. 29). We note that "flood-prone" is similarly undefined in this document. We have no idea what the designation purpose is for so broadly including "steep banks" and "other floodprone areas". We do know that this phrase can result in our property being characterized as hazardous. It also results in increased restrictions under the SMP. We are deeply concerned.</p>	Boston Harbor
205	10/19/21	Meredith and Donovan	Rafferty	<p>We are submitting the attached comment to the SMP Public Hearing. RE: Over-regulating daily activities in using our properties For shoreline property owners, daily use of their properties is comprehensively regulated by the Substantial Shoreline Permit. This expensive and complex process involving a hearing examiner is triggered by any disturbance of the property at an astonishingly low threshold of \$7,047 in project value. Yet the draft SMP intends to cover 100% of any activity, regardless of value. Even when a Substantial Development Permit is not required, any disturbance must be reported in advance to, in essence, "get a permit to not get a permit". We object. Clearly state in this SMP document that activities valued less than the substantial development permit threshold do not require any action, no daily reporting and no validating.</p>	Boston Harbor

Thurston County Shoreline Master Program Open House and 10/20/21 PC Public Hearing Comments

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment	Affiliation / Geo. Area
206	10/19/21	Dan	Moffett	<p>We have been at Lawrence Lake for more than 30 years. I support these changes for the next Thurston SMP:</p> <p>1) Ch 19.400.120. Buffer widths should stay as presented in this July 28, 2021, draft SMP. Shoreline Residential buffer widths should be 50-feet for both marine and lake properties...as they have been since the 1990 SMP, and longer.</p> <p>2) Ch 19.600.160.C.1.r., Ch 19.600.160.C.4.f. and Ch 19.600.160.C.5. I agree with each of these Options. Strike the requirement for pier, dock, float or ramp grating on lakes that do not contain salmon.</p> <p>3) Ch 19.600.160.C.3.b. I agree with this Public Hearing Option, "Consider a shorter distance (than the specified 20-foot spacing) for spacing of residential pilings (supporting piers and/or docks) in lakes..." 8-foot spacing is a move in the right direction; I would prefer to see 6-foot.</p> <p>4) Ch 19.600.160.C.4.a. I agree with this Public Hearing Option...and more. The maximum width of single-use and joint-use piers should be 8-feet, and more if the applicant can demonstrate the need.</p> <p>5) The Shoreline Environmental Designation (de facto, the zoning) of any property should not be changed to a more restrictive classification or added to the SMP jurisdiction without due process. I request that the changes that were made for residents of Lake Lawrence been adopted by the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners and extended to all properties in Thurston County. Some 2,700 properties are facing this new designation or redesignation. This issue must be resolved for each one of these properties before the SMP moves forward. Open House Fact Sheets #3 and #10 present some SED information, but nothing about how to determine your SED or to appeal a new designation.</p> <p>6) Ch 19.400.100. The labeling of all existing legally built homes and/or accessory structures already located within the buffer should be "conforming," not "legally non-conforming." State law recognizes these structures as "conforming." So should Thurston County. This is another critical issue.</p> <p>7) Ch 19.400.120.D.1.b. and Appendix B, Section B.2.c. Decks and Viewing Platforms properly constructed to be pervious should not be required to be "...adjacent to residential structures..." There should be no limit on size or location and there should be no requirement for a shoreline variance to build such a deck.</p> <p>8) Ch 19.400.120.D.1.e. I agree with the Option. Limit water-oriented accessory storage structures to residential uses only.</p> <p>9) Ch 19.500.075 and 19.500.100.B.2. I agree with the Options: Substantial Developments Permits, Conditional Use Permits and Variances should be processed administratively rather than having to undergo a public hearing before the Hearing Examiner.</p> <p>10) Ch 19.600.150. I support the option to prohibit industrial development in Shoreline Residential Environmental Designations.</p> <p>11) Nothing in the Thurston County SMP should be more restrictive than State requirements.</p> <p>12) A companion pamphlet must be completed simultaneously with the SMP to guide the public through the SMP requirements, including development restrictions, acceptable native plants for the buffer (with specific examples), and permitting requirements. Without the guidelines that the pamphlet can provide, property owners will be at a loss to understand the regulations, requirements and restrictions buried deep within the full-blown SMP document.</p> <p>13) Staff has begun to acknowledge that different environmental conditions exist for a) marine waters, b) streams/rivers and c) lakes in the County...and amending the SMP to address those differences. Yet, even more is required. Establish fresh water (lake) requirements for decks, docks, piers, floats and bulkheads and address the unique habitat characteristics associated with shoreline residential use. Maximum dimensions must be increased for single use piers, and floats (both mooring and recreational) in Shoreline Residential SEDs; docks with their piers, ramps and floats on lakes are places of water access for swimming, fishing and other water-oriented family play and enjoyment.</p>	Lake Lawrence
207	10/19/21	Shad	Pruitt	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the draft Shoreline Master Plan (SMP).</p> <p>Specifically, I am concerned with the proposed increase of the shoreline buffer for lake properties to 75 feet. I strongly believe the shoreline buffer should remain at 50 feet for the following reasons.</p> <p>1. Changing the buffer from 50 to 75 feet will have a negative impact on any new construction or remodeling projects for both existing and new lake property owners as compared to their neighboring properties. Such a change would result in unequal treatment of neighboring property owners based solely on the date of their (a) property acquisition or (b) receipt of approval for construction projects related to home improvement, remodeling or re-building.</p> <p>2. As you are aware, lake properties are mostly built out. And, as a result, these areas have relatively less ecological function than more intact areas. Since lake properties are essentially built out, changing the buffer will have virtually NO impact to shorelines for several generations to come. These properties have very low turnover and significant construction projects are few and far between.</p> <p>3. And, finally, I am also unaware of any scientific data that suggests increasing the shoreline buffer from 50 to 75 feet will results in profound change. Instead of increasing the buffer for lake properties, please consider pursuing alternative lake shoreline strategies, within the existing 50 foot buffer requirements, to mitigate risks that will actually have a meaningful ecological impact in the near term.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of my comments.</p>	Lake Lawrence
208	10/19/21	Ken	Bruce	<p>I'm sending this in support of the Lake Thurston SMP team.</p> <p>1. Buffer widths (Issue #2 in coalition letter) for lakes to remain as they were in the 1990 SMP . If this particular issue is changed to what the county staff want most of you will have your properties (on the lake/canal/community beaches) seriously impacted.</p> <p>2. Pier, Dock, Float or ramp grating (Issue #7 in coalition letter) we want the option to exclude expensive grating for lakes that do not contain salmon.</p> <p>3. Pier and Dock pilling spacing (Issue #8 - in coalition letter) we want the option to reduce spacing to 8 feet.</p> <p>4. Pier and Dock Width (Issue #9 - in coalition letter) we want the option to be able to make our piers/docks 8 feet wide or more if applicant can demonstrate need.</p> <p>5. Shoreline Environmental Designations (SEDs) (Issue #12 in coalition letter) we want the changes we were able to make for residents of Lake Lawrence adopted by the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners.</p>	
209	10/19/21	Barry	Krueger	<p>What is the environmental zone? When I was trying to build on lk st Clair 23 yrs ago I found out the setback was 100 '. No one at county could tell my why since the rest of the lk was 50'. Took me over a year for shoreline variance to get it reduced to 73'. At the last meeting you said you have never heard of it. My house had to be much smaller because of this. Now is the time to reverse this. All the lakes should have the same setbacks. I'm on ramblewood In which is 100' setback also known as goat lake section of the lake. Time to change this since nobody at the county has been able to tell me why it was ever deemed 100'.</p>	Lake St. Clair
210	10/19/21	No Name Given		<p>I believe that all shellfish farming should be eliminated. It is destroying the beaches, visually and ecologically. We have picked up 1,000's of pieces of shellfish farming debris on only a couple hundred feet of shoreline on Eld Inlet. We used to have smelt, sand dollars, and many other forms of marine life that have disappeared. The County seems to be preoccupied with septic systems while ignoring the negative effects of shellfish farming. I believe it is critically important to focus on controlling septic effluent to prevent damaging water quality, but ignoring negative environmental effects of intensive shellfish farming is a dereliction of responsibility on the part of the County. Shellfish farming is turning residential areas into commercial zones with disturbances going on all hours day and night. Most industries have limitations as to the hours they work and the noise they cause when adjacent to residential property. The commercial shell fish operators appear to have none of these restrictions. It seems the County also wishes to restrict housing structures proximity to the water and maintain vegetative buffers between the structures and the water in order to enhance the views from the water, while ignoring the extremely negative visual impact of geoduck PVC tubes, nets, and floating structures loaded with PVC tubes and other equipment. Some of these structures (docks and boats) sit in front of your property for weeks or longer and are even lighted at night.</p>	Eld Inlet

Thurston County Shoreline Master Program Open House and 10/20/21 PC Public Hearing Comments

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment	Affiliation / Geo. Area
211	10/19/21	No Name Given		PLEASE STOP SHELLFISH FARMING. It results in the following: A decline in wildlife and marine life that depend on undisturbed beaches. Human waste from shellfish workers and their litter. Petroleum pollution in the water and air from boats and generators. Poisons poured into the water that shellfish farmers use to eliminate competing marine life. The wholesale shooting of birds, even during their migration. Noise pollution and search lights flashing at our homes as late as midnight. Beaches littered with thousands of rubber bands, plastic ties, plastic nets (some so enormous that seabirds and eagles get trapped in them and are drowned), and PVC pipes that are being inserted into the sand by the hundreds of thousands. Global Warming as proven in the following studies: "Oyster Flatulence Worries Climate Scientists" in EURACTIVE and "Methane Fluxes from Coastal Sediments Are Enhanced by Macrofauna" in SCIENTIFIC REPORTS Shellfish farming decreases the value of our homes and the enjoyment of our property, and yet we, who do not gain one cent from this enterprise. pay high taxes on our waterfront homes. In spite of the commercial activity, we pay residential taxes, not commercial or farming rates. Visitors to Thurston County are shocked by the sight of all this destruction to a formerly unique and scenic part of the Pacific Northwest.	
212	10/19/21	Cooper Point Family		There are many families like ours who've lived in the same spot for generations and have helped build and contribute to our community. We're happy that changes are being made to protect the beautiful waterfront environment in which we live, work, and play. Over the years, we've welcomed many new neighbors that have replaced the original cabins on our street with property-line brushing dream homes. With these new structures come added expenses for all of us. We're concerned about the aging families who live in modest homes on a fixed income. For many of us, this is our primary residence and we'd like to stay here in spite of high property taxes and other increasing costs. We sincerely hope that during this update, changes to codes, permitting, etc, will not price aging families out of making updates to their property should they arise. Will there be any benefits available to people whose primary residence is in this area, who have vintage homes, or who are on restricted income? Let's find a balance where we can protect our environment for future generations and also keep our elders in the home they worked so hard to get.	Cooper Point
213	10/19/21			No, it gives you a chance to misuse your power	
214	10/19/21	David	Clark	Greetings. I have noticed the farming practices on the tideland lots to both the east and west of my property at 7424 Sandy Point Rd. NE, Olympia WA 98516. Before the Geoducks are planted in the plastic tubes, the tidelands are "clear cut" All living things are removed from the beach where the Geoducks will be planted. There are natural sand dollar beds in the area, including on my property. The sand dollars are removed, put into piles and left to die. Practically, every other living thing is removed as well. Does the Thurston SMP address the damage that can be done to the ecosystem by total removal of all living things other than Geoducks in the tideland beds they are planted in?	
215	10/20/21	Brian	Taylor	I am in the process of finalizing my plans to construct on the lake. Any changes to water rights would be a major issue for me and my investment in this project thus far. It was very challenging to make any progress during covid as no one was available in the office. Now I am making progress and changes could derail and cost me hundreds of thousands of dollars.	
216	10/20/21	Kirk	Van Landeghen	Thanks for making yourself available at the Thurston County Stakeholders Coalition. I agree with the need to break out different code sections for streams, lakes, and marine waters. I believe that every single home in the Residential Zone should be allowed a moorage structure. The language of the requirements poses a roadblock to those ends: 19.600.160, B - Application Requirements: All of these items should be deleted except for items 2, 3, and 4. What is located on my neighbors property shouldn't impact mine. As I understand, the length of my dock can be 15% of the distance measured across the lake(according to 19.600.160,C.4.b). We also shouldn't be required to dock at a public facility; this is an unfair "taxation" since that would be a cost a neighbor with a moorage structure doesn't have to pay, but I would. Anything that costs one landowner money and not the other should be considered infeasible. Therefore, those rules shouldn't exist. Agree with deleting number eight. And delete number nine. Who makes the determination of critical freshwater habitat? This should not be a gray area open to interpretation by a public individual. The habitat survey noted in 19.700.145 doesn't give a clear idea what happens to the plan for a moorage structure if it is found to be in a critical habitat. A dock, with the constraints noted in sections 3 & 4 for Pilings and Piers, does not significantly impact the lake shoreline. Overall, the residential use of the shoreline needs to be strengthened. These rules weaken the ability for those whom own lakefront to fully enjoy without a moorage structure. The rules for docks also run contradictory to the vegetation restrictions within the shoreline buffer. If trees are needed to remain to provide shade and keep the temperature of the lake cool, what do you think docks are doing? The size of docks should also be increased to provide more cooling to the lake and areas for the fish to hideout. Grated decking should be prohibited. Let's not make docks the bogeyman of the lakes by making Application and Development standards as roadblocks to the process.	
217	10/20/21	Don	Ireland	I am writing concerning the Shoreline Management Act proposal. I support the actions presented by the Coalition. I would ask that the planning commission take special notice of the following recommendations: 1. Buffer widths (Issue #2 in coalition letter) for lakes to remain as they were in the 1990 SMP . If this particular issue is changed to what the county staff want most of you will have your properties (on the lake/canal/community beaches) seriously impacted. 2. Pier, Dock, Float or ramp grating (Issue #7 in coalition letter) we want the option to exclude expensive grating for lakes that do not contain salmon. 3. Pier and Dock pilling spacing (Issue #8 - in coalition letter) we want the option to reduce spacing to 8 feet. 4. Pier and Dock Width (Issue #9 - in coalition letter) we want the option to be able to make our piers/docks 8 feet wide or more if applicant can demonstrate need. 5. Shoreline Environmental Designations (SEDs) (Issue #12 in coalition letter) we want the changes we were able to make for residents of Lake Lawrence adopted by the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners. I would like to point out as has been pointed out many times in the past, the Cumulative Impacts Analysis of Thurston County's Shoreline Master Plan states that Shoreline ResidentialSED properties accounts for only 3.5% OF TOTAL COUNTY SHORELINE ACREAGE. Rural Conservancy accounts for 65%, Natural 31.9%and urban Conservancy 1.1%. Further, the vast majority of parcels located in the Shoreline SEDs are already built out: there are very few vacant parcels available for new development. Our existing shoreline residential properties should not bear the brunt of these proposed very restrictive regulations. I believe the county has over 96% to conserve and be concerned about. The remaining 3.5% have, in their best interest, maintaining their waterfront property in a reasonable manner, for both themselves and the lake/waterfront without onerous restrictions placed on them by the county.Thank you for allowing us to comment.	
218	10/20/21	Rob	Kirkwood	Thurston County Planning Commission - Shoreline Hearing – October 20, 2021 We have owned our property at 4424 65th Ave NE since 1989. During our 1989 short platting process, the Shoreline set back was established at 200' from OHW. At the time, we thought that was overly restrictive, but accepted it as part of the new environmental awareness. We have left the property much as we found it, other than a trail to the beach that is legally shared with the two upland properties and informally by other neighbors. We have sold our home on the upland parcel, 4426 65th Ave NE, and would now like to build a cabin closer to the beach. During the initial development investigation, we found that the shoreline set back had been increased to 250'. This renders about 2/3's of the property useless and sets our building site back far enough to substantially block any water or western view. During a short shoreline boat cruise last fall we noted how many of our neighboring properties have bulkheads and continue to clear cut trees and brush right down to the OHW. We realize that the shoreline structures were built prior to awareness of the environmental damage caused by building so close to the water. We are not asking to build on the beach. Our bank has been little changed since we purchased the property so a bulkhead is not necessary. We would prefer the setback to be 150' with limbing up of major trees allowed while leaving the brush in place. We realize that the previous set back adjustments were made as an almost emergency reaction to the increasing development and environmental awareness. We hope that now with wisdom gathered over the last 30 years that the setbacks can be reduced to allow us to enjoy our property in a manner more similar to our neighbors.	
219	10/20/21	Susan	Lund	RE: Troubling overreach and proposed over-regulation of use of private property for repairs or small improvements. My name is Susan Lund. I'm sorry I can't be there in person to read this testimony. I am Vice President of the Boston Harbor Homeowners Association, and we have been watching the progress of this Commission. For this hearing, I'm coming to you as an individual property owner/stakeholder directly affected by the changes you propose. For the sake of brevity, I am aware of the correspondence to you from John Woodford (copied below). I completely agree with the points he makes which are many and several. I especially agree with this letter (copied below) that you received from the Rafferty family (copied below). There are many more people in Boston Harbor aware of what you are proposing than you may realize. I urge you to take seriously the requests for modifications from those who have been in contact with you from Boston Harbor. While it may seem that the voices from our neighborhood are a few, my primary message is to assure you that there are many more of us paying attention who have not previously engaged with you. The sentiment seems to be watchful in expectation that our neighbors will be heard. I truly thank you for your service. These are difficult times, and you are undertaking a difficult project. Att. 1: Coalition Letter, contained herein as Comment #64 Att. 2: Email Comment contained herein as Comment #205	Boston Harbor

Thurston County Shoreline Master Program Open House and 10/20/21 PC Public Hearing Comments

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment	Affiliation / Geo. Area
220	10/20/21	Brian	Muirhead	Thanks for the response. I still have a question about how our issue with the SED will be resolved. What can you tell us about that? I'm planning on being at tonight's meeting and that will be one of the questions I ask.	Pattison Lake
221	10/20/21	Marvin	Stewart	I write you this morning in support of the following 5 changes to the proposed Shoreline Management Plan. I could give a scathing rebuke of each of these, but with respect I won't. I implore you to recognize that many of the proposed changes will place undue hardship on Homeowners. In particular, the proposed dock, pier, and float proposals are extreme. It is absolutely baffling why an already expensive and cumbersome set of already established requirements would be increased on non-salmon bearing freshwater lakes. Homeowners are already faced with exorbitant fees with the permitting process. The SMP, as proposed, is untenable. I am a moderate Indp that does support protecting wildlife, but it seems that the powers that be are not taking into account that property owner's already heavily restricted process. Please make the following 5 changes. 1. Buffer widths (Issue #2 in coalition letter) for lakes to remain as they were in the 1990 SMP . If this particular issue is changed to what the county staff want most of you will have your properties (on the lake/canal/community beaches) seriously impacted. 2. Pier, Dock, Float or ramp grating (Issue #7 in coalition letter) we want the option to exclude expensive grating for lakes that do not contain salmon. 3. Pier and Dock pilling spacing (Issue #8 - in coalition letter) we want the option to reduce spacing to 8 feet. 4. Pier and Dock Width (Issue #9 - in coalition letter) we want the option to be able to make our piers/docks 8 feet wide or more if applicant can demonstrate need. 5. Shoreline Environmental Designations (SEDs) (Issue #12 in coalition letter) we want the changes we were able to make for residents of Lake Lawrence adopted by the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners.	Lake Lawrence
222	10/20/21	Glenn	Schorno	Adding to an earlier comment, changing parcel boundaries to essentially move parcels out of the SMP and the costs and fees associated should be funded by the beneficiaries of the SMP changes, the public. I recommend creating grants and waive fees for affected land holders to help restore landholder value.	
223	10/20/21	David	Keen	Re: Proposed Shoreline Master Program being considered for change. My wife and I are owners of a seasonal lake cabin on Lawrence Lake and are considering this property to be a long term investment and possible a future full time residence. Lake Lawrence has benefited greatly from the Lake coalition group and its cooperation and attentiveness to the water quality and related environmental concerns that has helped to maintain this lake as a consistent good recreational lake for property owners and visitors year around. I think the upgrade items within the shoreline master program being considered by the county are extreme and reflect an attempt to shape all freshwater lakes within the county as equal areas of concerns. Each Lake within the County is different and some lakes benefit from stream fed sources and some may have more or less ecological merit to consider some mitigation within the already adopted management guidelines. This new proposal seems to add another layer of burden onto the already staffing of the planning department and will , in my opinion, give more authority to people out of the county planning department to consultants, attorneys, and special interest groups that have little vested interest of the communities that have thrived on these lakes for many years. Lake Lawrence has a healthy blend of waterfoul, fish, and other wildlife that depends on the health of the lake but also depends on the health of the surrounding properties. I think the existing building codes, and environmental requirements that are established give allowances for properties on individual needs instead of providing a pool of additional regulation that will only slow down legitimate small development or the need to maintain an existing property to make sure it is not creating a safety problem and will insure future generations that they may have a quality recreational lake to enjoy. The County has completed a new boat launch restoration and facility on Pleasant Beach Dr which is a great improvement. I am not sure how the surface run off is being addressed for the vehicular traffic and newly paved lots and ramp area but most commercial development would need to insure that this runoff is pretreated or somehow contained within the property. The small amount of residential development on this lake leaves a lot of wild and natural habitat un touched on the shoreline and I do not think some of the proposed changes will do anything to enhance what is already working. I think the involvement of a lake management district and the members attention to County concerns is paramount and should not be in conflict so the life on the lake can continue with a good joint effort and concerns get addressed as they arise on an individual nature. With aging properties blending with newly developed properties existing on the lake I believe it is necessary to allow for reasonable maintenance of homes, docks, and other features that will allow for changing family needs, as well as making the aging properties a historical reminder of the lake's history. I think the many freshwater lakes within the County's jurisdiction have a lot to offer all county residents and should be maintained and considered by a forward thinking county planning staff that can continue to provide and interpret existing guidelines and implement specific concerns only when necessary by means that already exist. The proposed program provides some language that is moving the freshwater lakes into a category of saltwater development which is not the same and not have similar guidelines. The proposed language for docks, swimming platforms and the like are extreme and expensive upgrades to impose on owners. It is the responsibility of the homeowner to see that his property and structures such as docks and decks are safe and provide good access for the private enjoyment of that property owner and their visitors. Buffer widths are already established and with administrative staff variances they should be maintained "as is" to allow for individual considerations based on merits of the need. I would encourage the planning staff and commissioners making the decisions on this proposed new master program take the necessary time to visit some of the lakes that will be affected by this program and look at the shorelines, wildlife, and historic structures that tell the story of those individual lakes and the communities they serve. I would hate to see some these freshwater lakes become master planned and lose their identity as so many properties in the county have made room for high or medium density development and take away some of the personality that Thurston County has to offer. I appreciate the opportunity to voice and opinion and hope that all of the staff, consultants and related persons give a fair review of the facts, the needs, the existing program, and what will be the result of "over planning" a resource that is always changing along with the community it is serving.	Lake Lawrence
224	10/20/21	Gale	Holmes	I have received two postcards soliciting comment and input from me about proposed changes that will impact my property located at 8807 113th Ave SE, Olympia, WA 98501, Parcel # 12735120100. In 1990 the County changed the Southeast corner of my property to Rural Conservancy. Now a designation change from Rural Conservancy to Natural is being proposed which, I believe, will further devalue my property by restricting current or future use of the land. I am opposed to this new change and would like the designation to revert back to 1990 or remain as Rural Conservancy. Considering the fact that my property tax valuation was just increased by almost 48% it seems highly unfair and makes no logical sense to devalue the property while at the same time substantially increasing the property tax valuation and subsequent tax burden. The Southeast corner of my property is actually a fair distance from the Pittman Lake shoreline. It should only take a few minutes to update your map to exclude my property. I'm asking that you please do not change the designation to Natural.	Pittman Lake
225	10/20/21	Lois Ward	Ward	Greetings County Commissioners and County Planning Committee: As you work to develop guideline for the Shoreline management plan, I would like to share some thoughts. As a longtime resident of Thurston County (50 years) and a native of WA State I have watched as Puget Sound has deteriorated over the years. I do appreciate the efforts that have gone into saving salmon, Orcas, and preventing pollution in our beautiful waterways, but we have fallen short and need now to work diligently toward gaining back some of the properties that once were. While I applaud your efforts to create no net loses to our environment and shoreline, I am a firm believer that there are places and times that net gain is possible and it should be sought. Please do not reduce the buffers. They are at a minimum now and reducing buffers only means more potential damage to the shoreline which is critically endangered. I have watched the damage to our shoreline and tide flats over the years as well. While aquaculture has come a long way in 50 years it continues to destroy the natural tide flats with barge loads of gravel to make fields of oysters accessible by large trucks and harvesting equipment. There is also excessive use of plastic in the form of netting, net bags and tubes for geoduck. Research has shown that plastic does degrade into small minute pieces that are often found in fish and other seafood. Finally, the hydraulic equipment used to harvest geoduck is devastating to the substrate. I do not advocate for ending aquaculture but it must be done responsibly and without practices that damage and destroy the delicate balance of our shorelines. I also do not advocate for an end to growth and development but an abundance of caution must be exercised if we are to have salmon in our rivers, fish in our lakes and if Puget Sound is to recover from much of the damage that has been done to it over the past hundred years. We can change things and that is what I believe we need to do. Please let's not move backward in this effort. Thank you.	

Thurston County Shoreline Master Program Open House and 10/20/21 PC Public Hearing Comments

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment	Affiliation / Geo. Area
226	10/20/21	Phyllis	Farrell	<p><i>See Original Comment for Full Text (Too long to copy below)</i></p> <p>Greetings. As a resident of unincorporated Thurston County, I have been following the development of the draft SMP for several years. My priorities are environmental protection, conservation and restoration. I believe the draft SMP is an improvement in protection of our shorelines. I especially like the following goals mentioned in the following material: Thurston_SMP_Planning_Commission_Public_Hearing_Draft_(with_edits).pdf (thurstoncountywa.gov)</p> <p>p.35 19.300.100 Shorelines of Statewide Significance p.36 Policy SH-4 Protect the resources and ecology of the shoreline 1.a. Projects should shall consider incremental and cumulative impacts while ensuring no net loss of shoreline ecosystem processes and functions. 2.b. In order to ensure the long-term protection of ecological resources of statewide importance, activities impacting anadromous fish habitats, forage fish spawning and rearing areas, shellfish beds and other unique environments should be severely limited p.37 Policy SH-5 Increase public access to publicly owned areas of the shorelines 2.b. Enabling trail access to public shorelines is a priority of this Program. Partner with other agencies and entities to prioritize developing unpaved, pervious paths and trails to shoreline areas and linear access along the shorelines, where appropriate. p.39 19.300.115 Water Quality and Quantity p.40 G. Policy SH-21.7 Stormwater outfalls into the rivers, streams, lakes and marine environment should be eliminated and diverted into settling ponds to reduce organics, harmful chemicals and waste from entering these water bodies and degrading water quality and contributing to algae growth p.42-43 19.300.135 Public Access and Recreation, F. Policy SH-44 Encourage linkage of shoreline parks, upland recreation opportunities and wateroriented opportunities G. Policy SH-45 Encourage the acquisition of public shoreline recreational lands through a variety of means including fee purchase, acquisition of easements, options, development rights, and Conservation Futures. H. Policy SH-46 Encourage coordination between public agencies, land owners, non-profit organizations, land trusts, private developers, and others in their plans and activities to provide a wide variety of recreational opportunities on public shorelines I do have some comments, suggestions and questions indicated by *** p.37 19.300.105 Critical Areas and Ecological Protection p.37 D. Policy SH-10 Permitted uses and developments should be designed and conducted in a manner that protects the current ecological condition, and prevents or mitigates adverse impacts. In order to reduce the amount of plastic debris entering water bodies in Thurston County, permitted uses and developments are encouraged to limit the use of plastics.....***please replace the underlined word with required. The amounts of plastics used in the aquaculture industry warrants phasing out the use of PVC pipes, plastic bags and plastic netting. While the SMP cannot ban aquaculture, it can regulate its practices. p. 40 19.300.120 Economic Development p. 40 B. Policy SH-23 Water-oriented economic development, such as those aquaculture activities encouraged under the Washington Shellfish Initiative, should be encouraged and shall be carried out in such a way as to minimize adverse effects and mitigate unavoidable adverse impacts to achieve no net loss of shoreline ecological functions. ***Please replace the underlined word with limited due to inordinate concentrations of</p>	
227	10/20/21	Claudia		<p>I don't want to be on screen. I just want to hear questions & answers. I went through whole 194 pages & I still have NO idea what changes you want to make. Is there a list of proposed changes? I am an individual private home owner on Eld Inlet. I just want to know what will affect my property. I also own a small shellfish company. I still pay all licenses but haven't dug since my husband became ill& passed away. I am trying to figure out what changes affect homes built long ago. Also have small old boathouse on the ravine lot I have next door to home. Both lots are separate parcel numbers. What changes are you planning for long time existing homes. Built last home in 1990 on property purchased in 1968. Just need to know what changes you are making. I am a widow on Social Security. Am I able to watch & not talk?</p>	Eld Inlet
228	10/20/21	Darcy	Eggeman	<p>Please find my comments below, B. Existing Structures: 1.c. For structures located partially within the shoreline buffer or setback, alterations shall be limited to the addition of height up to 35 feet above finished grade and landward expansion into areas outside the shoreline setback. My comment: Already, the increased buffers from a few years ago were prohibitive, causing many properties to be deemed nonconforming. Now you are adding additional restrictions. Are you willing to lower property taxes for waterfront properties that are affected by the ever-increasing restrictions? Use affects marketability. Is this saying a property owner will be restricted both vertically and horizontally away from the water by 35 feet? Why? What does this matter? Again, the constant increase of restrictions, are an affront to the rights of property owners with little or no justification? d. For structures located entirely within the shoreline buffer or setbacks, alterations shall be allowed for the addition of height up to 35 feet above finished grade or landward expansion, up to 500 square feet (1,000 square feet total if adding second floor up to 35 feet high), on the upland side of the structure, or both. Mitigation shall be required for any such expansions within the buffer. The square footage limitation on expansions only applies to portions of the property within the shoreline buffer or setback. Structures may be expanded outside the shoreline buffer or setback, subject to other applicable provisions of Thurston County Code. My comment: As mentioned before – the previous increase in Buffer already reduces use and value of properties. How do you plan to mitigate the reduced value of my property especially since the assessed value continues to climb? There is no doubt that new buyers may not have full knowledge of how their property has been affected by the additional restrictions. 19.400.105 Proposed development: 2. New development, including alterations to existing structures, shall be located and designed to avoid the need for future shoreline stabilization for the life of the structure. Likewise, any new development which would require shoreline stabilization which causes significant impacts to adjacent or down-current properties shall not be allowed. My Comment: These make no sense to not allow shoreline stabilization – aka bulkheads. This should be allowed to protect the land. I do not understand your why on this? Is it Thurston county's plan to force people to live only in crowded cities? Olympia is very restrictive on building there as well. So why are you making enjoyment of one's property so limited? I do not believe most of your plan does anything ACTIVE to help the environment.</p>	
229	10/20/21	Jonathon	Cody	<p>Chapter 19.400.100 A(4) would negatively impact military landowners who have legally nonconforming uses. These landowners often must move away from their homes for periods greater than 24 months and may be unable to ensure the use is maintained during that time. There should be a procedure for those military personnel, and others similarly situated, to inform the county that they will not be present for the required period of time to maintain the use and ensure that future use is not denied. 19.400.120 D1(a) and (b): The limitation on trails being four feet wide and viewing platforms being four feet wide and platforms being less than 100 square feet seems arbitrary. Additionally, these may interfere with disabled persons ability to access areas or enjoy uses. For example, ADA requires a minimum of 36" for ramp width and intermittent landings of at least 60." Recommend that the proposed plan allows for trails greater than 48"wide if required for access and that viewing platforms may exceed 100 square feet, where necessary to meet disability requirements. 19.400.120(D)(1): These standards make no allowance for emergency hazard tree removal or trimming. When a tree is ready to fall on property or presents a danger, high winds can easily cause that fall to accelerate. Quick trimming can provide necessary time for more efficient and safer removal. There should be an allowance for emergency trimming. Additionally, the proposal does not account for how adjacent property owners would petition for such removal and who would be required to pay for the required mitigation costs.</p>	

Thurston County Shoreline Master Program Open House and 10/20/21 PC Public Hearing Comments

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment	Affiliation / Geo. Area
230	10/20/21	Anne	Van Sweringen	<i>See Original Comment for Attached Letter (Too Long To Copy Below)</i> 2021 10-20 Testimony, Planning Commission Public Hearing, SMP Update, Anne Van Sweringen, NE Olympia, representing 5 Thurston environmental nonprofits (Black Hills Audubon Society, Sierra Club, League of Women Voters, Thurston Climate Action Team, Thurston Environmental Voters). Please read the comments I have submitted. I want to thank Commissioners and County staff for your good work on the current draft of the SMP Update. I have a few last points: We support management designed to achieve no net loss of shoreline ecological functions, that follows the SMP guidelines (WAC 173-26). The update should require more of an evaluation of no net loss. To achieve no net loss using mitigation, the county must: Stand firm on avoiding and minimizing impacts, and ensure developers provide full compensatory mitigation. The success of the SMP will depend on how the county improves mitigation in the permitting process to achieve no net loss. How will cumulative impacts be determined using descriptive methods? A more quantitative assessment method of baseline conditions, more robust monitoring, and adaptive management is necessary. Buffer widths must be maximized to account for climate change, sea level rise, and flooding. A net gain in buffer width means a net gain in ecological functions for water quality and quantity, habitat, and amelioration of climate change. We would like to see the county develop regulations that severely limit or restrict the expansion of industrial geoduck aquaculture. Geoduck farms reduce foraging and feeding opportunities for birds during breeding and migration. Create development standards for all shellfish aquaculture; and include: 1) avoiding plastics and micro-plastics, which cause starvation in birds and marine life; 2) minimizing predator control netting to reduce the risk of birds being trapped; and 3) avoiding estuaries until aquaculture as a disturbance can be understood in the estuarine landscape. Lastly, the SMP Guidelines state the county has an obligation to assure that no net loss of ecological functions is achieved within the SMP. Thank you.	Thurston Environmental Community Stakeholders
231	10/20/21	Barry	Halverson	<i>See Original Comment for Attached Letter (Submitted in Image Format)</i> Andrew, please find attached my testimony for tonight's meeting. Just wanted you to have a written copy. I will be making comments from this document.	Lake Lawrence
232	10/20/21	Mary	Downey	2445 Summit Shore Road NW. What constitutes a bulkhead? Our neighbors, the Hargraves, have cement blocks placed along the shore. I believe the previous owners did this and I doubt they had a permit. I would like you to check into this "bulkhead" and see if it is legal. We don't have a bulkhead and instead have a "lawn" which is soggy virtually all year long. But we do have a border for small animals! I remember when there were many salamanders and even otters at the lake who would gather clams and eat them on our dock. Those days are gone with all the lovely green lawns and mcmansions erected by people who have discovered Summit Lake. It's a shame.	Summit Lake
233	10/20/21	John & Melody	Cosley	We own two waterfront properties on the Eld Inlet. In reviewing the SMP proposed revisions, we strongly endorse Option A for the Marine Buffer designations. The current 250' Rural Conservancy buffer seems excessive. Most homes along the shoreline are within a 50' buffer, as they were developed under the county's shoreline residential zone. The proposed SMP indicates that nearly all of the shoreline along the Eld Inlet would now be designated as Rural Conservancy. We believe that Option A's 150' buffer is a much more reasonable protective zone for any remaining undeveloped parcels along the Eld.	Eld Inlet
234	10/20/21	Valerie		We purchased 5 acres on Henderson Inlet 1987. zoned one house one acre. There was no setback when we purchased it. We short platted to three lots prior to the 1990 ordinance changed it to one house 5 acres with a 200 foot setback. The setback has since been increased to 250 feet we adjusted, with the cost of time and money to be grand fathered in. Seemed ok to pay/invest to protect land/water. We have always been good stewards, verdants, conservators of the land...no trees cut unless they were dangerously falling, waterfront remains healthy, with minimal erosion. Working since age11 and planning/investing in retirement, now we have involuntarily donate 2/3 of our property to protect the public interest. Why not charge those who want our good intentions and investments to pay for our incalculable losses? Compensation should at least include back taxes and relocation expenses. We would prefer the set back be adjusted to 150'.	Henderson Inlet
235	10/20/21	Kirstin	Segale	<i>See Original Comment for Attached Letter (Submitted in Image Format)</i> Attached please find Segale's comment letter to be included in tonight's public hearing for the Shoreline Mater Program.	Segale
236	10/20/21	Tim	Trohimovich	<i>See Original Comment for Attached Letter (Too Long To Copy Below)</i> Enclosed please find Futurewise's Comments on the Shoreline Master Program (SMP) for the March 20, 2021, Planning Commission Public Hearing. Please contact me if you require anything else. Annotated Version Below: Provisions Futurewise Particularly Supports: The SMP update has many good provisions. We want to highlight some of the best provisions: <div> <div> The vegetation conservation goal and policies in proposed 19.300.110. Retaining native vegetation in shorelines jurisdiction is important to maintaining no net loss of shoreline ecological functions.4 </div> <div> Calling for carrying out the Alliance for a Healthy South Sound's (AHSS) South Sound Strategy through the shoreline master program and its implementation. This will better protect water quality and water quantity. </div> <div> Proposed 19.400.130B.'s requirement that sites with known or potential archaeological resources require a site inspection by a professional archaeologist. This will significantly improve protections for archaeological resources and save permit applicants time and money because the risk of having their project stopped for archaeological work will be reduced.5 </div> <div> Proposed 19.500.105K.'s monitoring provisions. These provisions are needed to determine if the Shoreline Master Program is achieving no net loss. These provisions are required the Shoreline Master Program Guidelines.6 </div> </div> Summary of Key Recommendations <div> <div>Please correct the descriptions of critical areas and their status under the Shoreline Management Act in proposed 19.100.110. Please see page 3 of this letter for the detailed recommendation.</div> <div>Please clarify shoreline master program jurisdiction to include shorelands, floodways, flood plains adjacent to floodways, lakes 20 acres in size, and streams with a mean annual flow of 20 cubic feet per second consistent with the Shoreline Management Act (SMA). Please see pages 4, 5, and 7 of this letter for the detailed recommendation.</div> <div>Please clarify the definition of no net loss in proposed 19.150.590 so it is consistent with the Shoreline Master Program (SMP) Guidelines. Please see page 4 of this letter for the detailed recommendation.</div> <div>Modify Policy SH-18 to maintain water quality as the SMP Guidelines require. Please see page 7 of this letter for the detailed recommendation.</div> <div>Adopt improved landslide hazard requirements to better protect people and property. Please see page 8 of this letter for the detailed recommendation.</div> <div>Include vegetation conservation requirements consistent with the SMA and SMP Guidelines. Please see page 11 of this letter for the detailed recommendation.</div> <div>Please adopt aquatic buffers in proposed 19.400.120 consistent with Management Recommendations for Washington's Priority Habitats. The Option B buffers are closest to this recommendation provided they are measured from the edge of the flood plain or channel migration zone for stream buffers. These buffer widths are necessary to achieve no net loss of shoreline resources. Please see page 11 of this letter for the detailed recommendation.</div> <div>Require wider setbacks between development and critical areas and critical areas buffers in areas subject to wildfire danger. Please see page 14 of this letter for the detailed recommendation.</div> <div>Please adopt a ten percent impervious surface limit for the Rural Conservancy shoreline environment consistent with the SMP Guidelines to protect shoreline ecological functions. Please see page 14 of this letter for the detailed recommendation.</div> <div>Protect people, property, and habitat from sea level rise and increased coastal erosion. Please see page 15 of this letter for the detailed recommendation.</div> </div>	Futurewise

Thurston County Shoreline Master Program Open House and 10/20/21 PC Public Hearing Comments

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment	Affiliation / Geo. Area
237	10/20/21	Kim & J	Nelson	<p>My name is Kim Nelson and my husband, J, and I live on Lawrence Lake with our teenage boys at 18130 Lisa Lane SE, Yelm, WA. We have a vested interest in ensuring the health of the lake for those of us who live on the lake as well for those who recreate on it. To further my point, we also volunteer our time with the LMD and use our boat for weed surveys to help make sure we stay ahead of any issues. Thank you for the opportunity to opine at the SMP Planning Commission Public hearing. My comments are as follows:</p> <p>I agree with the Thurston County Shoreline Stakeholders Coalition opinion on the 9 key issues represented by John Woodford. Most important to me and my husband are the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Buffer widths (Issue #2 in coalition letter). I agree that the buffer widths should be 50-feet for both marine and lake properties and do not understand the reasoning for changing them. This seems arbitrary. 2. Pier, Dock, Float or ramp grating (Issue #7 in coalition letter) we want the option to exclude expensive grating for lakes that do not contain salmon. Lake Lawrence does not contain salmon, therefore should not be included in this. 3. Pier and Dock piling spacing (Issue #8 - in coalition letter) we want the option to reduce spacing to 6-8 feet. 4. Pier and Dock Width (Issue #9 - in coalition letter) we want the option to be able to make our piers/docks 8 feet wide or more if the need exists. 5. Shoreline Environmental Designations (SEDs) (Issue #12 in coalition letter) we want the changes we were able to make for residents of Lake Lawrence adopted by the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners. 6. Full dock surface replacement should not require a permit. Getting a permit for this will deter our residents from maintaining the very structures that keep our families and guests safe while in use. 7. Lake Management Funds should be used to manage and keep our lake clean so that we are able to use it as a resource (swimming, fishing, boating, water sports as well as the ability to take in its beauty). Administrative cost should be at a minimum so as to ensure that the LMD funds can be used towards removing the weeds and keeping our water area clean. Thank you for your attention to this. 	Lake Lawrence
238	10/20/21	Debbie & Darren	Smith	<p>As residents of Holmes Island for nearly 30 years we want to thank the Thurston County Shoreline Stakeholders Coalition, and specifically John Woodford, for all the work they've done to keep us shoreline residents informed about the SMP and encourage our participation in this process. I am concerned about and fully support the key issues outlined by the coalition below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sh 19.400.100. The labeling of all existing legally built homes and/or accessory structures already located within the buffer should be “conforming,” not “legally non-conforming.” State law recognizes these structures as “conforming.” So should Thurston County. 2. Sh 19.400.120. Buffer widths should stay as presented in this July 28, 2021, draft SMP. Shoreline Residential buffer widths should be 50-feet for both marine and lake properties...as they have been since the 1990 SMP, and longer. 3. Sh 19.400.120.D.1.b. and Appendix B, Section B.2.c. Decks and Viewing Platforms properly constructed to be pervious should not be required to be “...adjacent to residential structures...” There should be no limit on size or location and there should be no requirement for a shoreline variance to build such a deck. 4. Nothing in the Thurston County SMP should be more restrictive than State requirements. 5. The Shoreline Environmental Designation (de facto, the zoning) of any property should not be changed to a more restrictive classification or added to the SMP jurisdiction without due process. Some 2,700 properties are facing this new designation or re-designation. This issue must be resolved for each one of these properties before the SMP moves forward. Open House Fact Sheets #3 and #10 present some SED information, but nothing about how to determine your SED or to appeal a new designation. 6. Staff has begun to acknowledge that different environmental conditions exist for a) marine waters, b) streams/rivers and c) lakes in the County...and amending the SMP to address those differences. Yet, even more is required. Establish fresh water (lake) requirements for decks, docks, piers, floats and bulkheads and address the unique habitat characteristics associated with shoreline residential use. Maximum dimensions must be increased for single use piers, and floats (both mooring and recreational) in Shoreline Residential SEDs; docks with their piers, ramps and floats on lakes are places of water access for swimming, fishing and other water-oriented family play and enjoyment. The Cumulative Impacts Analysis of Thurston County's Shoreline Master Program states that Shoreline Residential SED properties accounts for only 3.5% of the total County shoreline acreage. Rural Conservancy accounts for 63.5%, Natural – 31.9% and Urban Conservancy – 1.1%. Further, the vast majority of parcels located in Shoreline Residential SEDs are already built out; there are very few vacant parcels available for new development. Our existing shoreline residential properties should not bear the brunt of these very restrictive regulations. 	
239	10/20/21	Howard	Glastetter	<p>Attached are the oral comments I intended to give at the Planning Commission - Shoreline Master Plan meeting. I updated my wife's iPad with the latest Zoom software a few days ago. I was able to get signed in to the meeting, but could not get any sound. I gave up after more than an hour. If appropriate, please add the attached to the SMP public comments. Your prior email said you would be accepting public comment until the 22nd. All online comments to the SMP are in order by date. My written comments are dated October 11th. I live in lower Nisqually Valley in the “channel migration zone” near the beginning of the Nisqually Delta. I have lived in the lower valley for over 50 years. My written comments covered Mining, Channel Migration Zone and replacement of I-5 Nisqually Bridges. I will discuss Channel Migration (the biggest threat) in my three minutes.</p> <p>Channel Migration Zone: There is much discussion of the Nisqually channel migration zone. There is no mention of Alder Dam, the largest manmade impact in the valley, nor of the is a FEMA study that is changing the zone levels to conform to the February 1996 Nisqually flood. The 1996 flood was the result of predicted 3-day multi state severe storm. Alder Lake Dam was 17’ below capacity when the storm hit. Tacoma Power Utility (TPU) simply allowed the reservoir to top off on the first day of the storm and were forced to dump. This caused \$20,000,000 damage to property below the dam, as well as a like amount to the TPU La Grande generators attached to the dam. TPU's FERC license has no fall / winter flood control responsibilities. They should have and the Shoreline Master Plan should call attention to this. The 1996 flood was not unique. The recent February 2020 Nisqually flood was the result of TPU purposely allowing the raising the reservoir level to almost 2’ from capacity in late January during the 2nd rainiest winter recorded in Western Washington. TPU exacerbated both the above floods and several others over the years. The plan should include comments that say Thurston County will attempt to have FERC build some safety into the license or work with TPU to have a more conservative flood mitigation strategy during dangerous times of the year. FEMA has said they will be setting the zones as if the reservoir will always be full. If they do that, the county should appeal the FEMA decision. To set the flood migration zones at the 1996 flood levels is to reward TPU for their unsafe management in 1996 and keeps the door open for more of the same. TPU is the elephant in the Nisqually Valley room and needs to be reined in. Again my name is Howard Glastetter and all written comments are in order by date. My written comments about Nisqually Valley were submitted on October 11th and can be found among other comments submitted on October 11th. Thank you.</p>	Nisqually Valley

Thurston County Shoreline Master Program Open House and 10/20/21 PC Public Hearing Comments

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment	Affiliation / Geo. Area
240	10/20/21	CJ	Russo	<p>Please include the statement below as part of the public comment. Also, do you think this argument is strong enough to receive proper consideration? To Whom it Concerns, Comment / Request for Thurston County Shoreline Master Program Regarding 401 Summit Lake Shore Rd NW (parcel number 14813140203) and 409 Summit Lake Shore Rd (parcel number 14813140200) I oppose the change of designation from Rural to Rural Conservancy.</p> <p>There are approximately 522 lots within the Summit Lake shoreline jurisdiction. Of those, only 2 properties, 401 and 409 Summit Lake Shore Rd are slated to be changed to a more restrictive designation. Of the 522 lots, there are two properties currently designated as Conservancy. These two are proposed to be Rural Conservancy. This makes sense and is reasonable. There are 520 lots currently designated Rural including 401 and 409 Summit Lake Shore Rd. Of these, 518 are proposed to be Shoreline Residential. Here is the Designation Criteria for Rural Conservancy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outside incorporated municipalities and outside urban growth areas, AND at least one of the following: • Currently supporting low-intensity resource based uses such as agriculture, forestry, or recreation. • Currently accommodating residential uses • Supporting human uses but subject to environmental limitations, such as properties that include or are adjacent to steep banks, feeder bluffs, wetlands, flood plains or other flood prone areas • Can support low-intensity water-dependent uses without significant adverse impacts to shoreline functions or processes • Private and/or publically owned lands (upland areas landward of OHWM) of high recreational value or with valuable historic or cultural resources or potential for public access. • Does not meet the designation criteria for the Natural environment. <p>Yes, both 401 and 409 Summit Lake Shore Rd meet the primary and at least one of the secondary criteria for this designation. Also, the other 518 lots meet the primary and at least one of the secondary criteria. Based on these facts, they too should be designated as Rural Conservancy.</p> <p>Here is the Designation Criteria for Shoreline Residential.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not meet the criteria for the Natural or Rural Conservancy Environments. • Predominantly single-family or multifamily residential development or are planned and platted for residential development. • Majority of the lot area is within the shoreline jurisdiction. • Ecological functions have been impacted by more intense modification and use. <p>This is the proposed designation for 518 lots and they meet these criteria. 401 and 409 Summit Lake Shore Rd meet these criteria. Therefore, similar to the other 518 lots, 401 and 409 Summit Lake Shore Rd should be designated as Shoreline Residential. Please change the proposed designation of 401 and 409 Summit Lake Shore Rd to Shoreline Residential.</p>	Summit Lake
241	10/20/21	Mike	Beehler	<p>In regards to the proposed SMP Update my comments are below. I write them as not only a resident of the County, with shoreline on Pattison Lake, but also as a former member and chair of the Lacey Planning Commission. In my experience the best planning is based on objective and thoughtful consideration of the science involved, but also on the human impact of the decisions made by governmental agencies.</p> <p>My recommendations are as follows:</p> <p>1) Chapter 19.400.100 , A. 1. Existing Development needs to use language that does not infer any "less than" status for existing development prior to the adoption of the new Updated SMP, once in place. Language like "non-conforming", "legally non-conforming", etc. are not appropriate to this status. It is retroactively establishing a violation, if not legally, at least politically, in development that would no longer meet the new criteria in the updated SMP. We should not use language that places legal development in any status other than legal.</p> <p>2) Chapter 19.400.100 A. 4 The arbitrary time limit of 24 months without any recognition of special circumstance is too limiting and does not allow for unique circumstances for a property owner to establish their status as a conforming development. I suggest that some language be included that recognizes the possibility of governmental or other legal processes that may preclude an owner from meeting the 24 month rule. One example is the total loss of a structure due to fire or some other disaster which is then impacted by governmental or other legal restraint upon the ability of the property owner to meet the 24 month criteria. My wife and I had a total loss by fire of our residence in 2001, and the resulting legal action took more then 24 months to become resolved in our favor. In our case the structure was rebuilt within a year but we had to sue the Insurance company after they denied our loss claim. We were lucky that this suit did not occur until after the home was rebuilt, not before the rebuilding. Other property owners may not be so fortunate, and find themselves without a residence and the ability to rebuild if the current language in the SMP draft remains.</p> <p>3) Chapter 19.400.120 B, 1 Buffer Widths , Standard Buffer, In the proposed Shoreline Residential I understand one option is to keep the existing buffer of 50 feet for Freshwater Lakes. I agree with that. In our case we have a "Natural Shoreline", exceeding the 50 foot buffer and intend to keep it, even though we are a Shoreline Residential designated property. In any event allowing for consideration of the typography, lot configuration, and access to the property should also be considered in establishing buffer widths for a particular property. The width should not be based on some general figure, without the ability of an owner to mitigate, if possible, the buffer distance.</p>	Pattison Lake
242	10/20/21	Karen	Parker	Are there any future plans to dredge Scatter Creek? It would be nice if the water stayed in and around the actual creek channel. We used to have salmon but they can't get to their spawning areas now.	Scatter Creek

Thurston County Shoreline Master Program Open House and 10/20/21 PC Public Hearing Comments

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment	Affiliation / Geo. Area
243	10/20/21	Tina	Werden	<p>See Original Comment for Full Text (Too long to copy below)</p> <p>1) Ch 19.400.100. The labeling of all existing legally built homes and/or accessory structures already located within the buffer should be “conforming,” not “legally non-conforming.” State law recognizes these structures as “conforming.” So should Thurston County. This is a hot button issue with lots of people.</p> <p>2) Ch 19.400.120. Buffer widths should stay as presented in this July 28, 2021, draft SMP. Shoreline Residential buffer widths should be 50-feet for both marine and lake properties...as they have been since the 1990 SMP, and longer.</p> <p>3) Ch 19.400.120.D.1.b. and Appendix B, Section B.2.c. Decks and Viewing Platforms properly constructed to be pervious should not be required to be “...adjacent to residential structures...” There should be no limit on size or location and there should be no requirement for a shoreline variance to build such a deck.</p> <p>4) Ch 19.400.120.D.1.e. I agree with the Option. Limit water-oriented accessory storage structures to residential uses only.</p> <p>5) Ch 19.500.075 and 19.500.100.B.2. I agree with the Options: Substantial Developments Permits, Conditional Use Permits and Variances should be processed administratively rather than having to undergo a public hearing before the Hearing Examiner.</p> <p>6) Ch 19.600.150. The Coalition supports the option to prohibit industrial development in Shoreline Residential Environmental Designations.</p> <p>7) Ch 19.600.160.C.1.r., Ch 19.600.160.C.4.f. and Ch 19.600.160.C.5. I agree with each of these Options. Strike the requirement for pier, dock, float or ramp grating on lakes that do not contain salmon.</p> <p>8) Ch 19.600.160.C.3.b. I agree with this Public Hearing Option, “Consider a shorter distance (than the specified 20-foot spacing) for spacing of residential pilings (supporting piers and/or docks) in lakes...” 8-foot spacing is a move in the right direction.</p> <p>9) Ch 19.600.160.C.4.a. I agree with this Public Hearing Option...and more. The maximum width of single-use and joint-use piers should be 8-feet, and more if the applicant can demonstrate the need.</p> <p>Additional Coalition Key Issues, not necessarily listed here in any order of priority, that also require resolution at the Planning Commission Public Hearing include:</p> <p>10) Nothing in the Thurston County SMP should be more restrictive than State requirements.</p> <p>11) A companion pamphlet must be completed simultaneously with the SMP to guide the public through the SMP requirements, including development restrictions, acceptable native plants for the buffer (with specific examples), and permitting requirements. Without the guidelines that the pamphlet can provide, property owners will be at a loss to understand the regulations, requirements and restrictions buried deep within the full-blown SMP document.</p> <p>12) The Shoreline Environmental Designation (de facto, the zoning) of any property should not be changed to a more restrictive classification or added to the SMP jurisdiction without due process. Some 2,700 properties are facing this new designation or re-designation. This issue must be resolved for each one of these properties before the SMP moves forward. Open House Fact Sheets #3 and #10 present some SED information, but nothing about how to determine your SED or to appeal a new designation.</p> <p>13) Staff has begun to acknowledge that different environmental conditions exist for a) marine waters, b) streams/rivers and c) lakes in the County...and amending the SMP to address those differences. Yet, even more is required. Establish fresh water (lake) requirements for decks, docks, piers, floats and bulkheads and address the unique habitat characteristics associated with shoreline residential use. Maximum dimensions must be increased for single use piers, and floats (both mooring and recreational) in Shoreline Residential SEDs; docks with their piers, ramps and floats on lakes are places of water access for swimming, fishing and other water-oriented family play and enjoyment.</p> <p>14) In the SMP, Buffer is defined as "a non-clearing area established to protect the integrity functions and values of the affected critical area or shoreline.." What if your waterfront yard is a lawn? Is it a buffer? A</p>	Long Lake
244	10/20/21	Rick		<p>There is a lot of information to be considered and I have spent considerable time trying to read through it and understand what it all means. As for my wife and I specifically, we are quite concerned. We have a building that is currently not at all impacted. It is close to the current "Rural" designation as seen in the "Current Designations" map, but outside of the boundaries. However, when clicking the proposed designations on the map, our building is almost fully involved in the "Rural Conservancy" area. Unfortunately, I am not really finding anything at all that fully describes what this might mean to us and this particular building. So, what would be the impacts to us? The building is currently used as a multipurpose workshop, but formerly used as a barn. Others in the area have homes that will be involved in the "Rural Conservancy" area. What would be the impacts to my wife and myself with our multipurpose workshop building? This is very concerning and we would certainly reject proposals that would impact how we (or our neighbors) might use our existing property and buildings. Clarification would certainly be appreciated prior to making any changes in The shoreline designations!</p>	
245	10/20/21	Joseph	Wolfe	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I support the comments submitted by the Thurston County Shoreline Stakeholders Coalition. Specifically, I would like to add my comments on 19.400.100 and 120. Ch 19.400.100. The labeling of all existing legally built homes and/or accessory structures already located within the buffer should be “conforming,” not “legally non-conforming.” This terminology appears to be in conflict with the intent of RCW 90.58.620(1)(a), which allows "Residential structures and appurtenant structures that were legally established and are used for a conforming use, but that do not meet standards for the following to be considered a conforming structure: Setbacks, buffers, or yards; area; bulk; height; or density"</p> <p>Ch 19.400.120. Buffer widths should stay as presented in this July 28, 2021, draft SMP. Shoreline Residential buffer widths should be 50-feet for both marine and lake properties...as they have been historically, as documented in the 1990 SMP.</p> <p>Nitrate load reduction: Excess nitrogen in urban runoff contributes excess nutrients to waterbodies, creating algal blooms and overabundant aquatic plant growth (eutrophication). The breakdown of decomposing aquatic plants can create an oxygen deficit that negatively affects the health and productivity of aquatic animal species. Toxic and non-toxic algae blooms in our freshwater lakes have been getting progressively worse over the last decade due to the introduction of excess nitrate in our freshwater lakes. These algae blooms have inhibited citizens ability to access and utilize the lakes, caused Thurston County property owners to incur the cost of treatment, and has in some cases led to negative health consequences for Thurston County residents recreating on the lakes.</p> <p>Ch 19.600.500. Aquaculture Application Requirements stipulate a schedule for water quality monitoring "where required", indicating the ability of the County to include water quality monitoring requirements for specific activities at or near the shoreline. I note that water quality monitoring schedules are not required for stormwater outflows, a major source of nitrates in our lakes. I would encourage the County to include a requirement for water quality monitoring at all stormwater outflows discharging into our freshwater lakes and streams, as mapped under the current Western Washington Phase II Municipal Stormwater Permit. A requirement such as this would go a long way towards ensuring compliance with Chapter 90.48 RCW and the Clean Water Act. More importantly, a requirement such as this would provide us with the information necessary to begin to reduce and address the contamination being introduced into our waters.</p>	
246	10/21/21	Glenn	Schorno	<p>I strongly urge agriculture be exempt from the two year "use it or lose it rule" The 1990 (current) SMP stated agriculture as a preferred use in flood planes. What happened? There are many reasons a farm or parts of it may sit idle besides being left fallow. A family hardship, death, bankruptcy, major equipment failure, drought, a dispute between owners, or simply low commodity prices are some of the examples. If the 100 year flood plane is included in the SMP, this puts approximately 200 acres of our family farm at risk, although potentially not being able to farm this acreage puts the entire farm at risk of failure. We would lose everything. Is this what you want? Agriculture should be exempt of the use rule.</p>	

Thurston County Shoreline Master Program Open House and 10/20/21 PC Public Hearing Comments

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment	Affiliation / Geo. Area
247	10/21/21	Pete	Hackett	I do appreciate the effort that has gone into updating the County Shoreline Code. We are very concerned about the health of the lake and wildlife in and around it. We own 2 lots in the Summit Lake area; one lakefront and one upland. We have enjoyed Summit Lake for 25 years with our family and friends. We would like to retire on the lake and have our kids continue to visit. Summit Lake was divided into hundreds of 50' lakefront lots and larger upland lots at in 1954. This probably represents a very large residential development in Thurston County. And probably the largest without community water and sewer. Because of the terrain of the Summit Lake basin many siding access roads also developed, essentially giving up developable land for the convenience of the community. Some lots are only 60' deep and have access roads traversing them, giving them less than 40' to the High water mark. Our lot is 115' deep with a siding road at about 85' from the HWM. You could try and build on these access roads, but then you would be sued by all your neighbors...sounds like a blast. So, obviously 100' building setbacks would never work and a Variance would always be needed to build. The septic issue is, for the same reason, a bigger issue. This is why we waited and waited and finally invested in an upland lot to located our eventual septic system. I know families with summer homes on the lake that use port-a-potties in the summer. Our lakefront lot still has a boathouse and old fashion outhouse. And there are still many like this on the lake. I also know of septic drainfields on hillsides within 25' of the lake. Because to the deterioration of these drainfields and the many homes on the lake that have lawns and gardens being fertilized, we feel the lake will have more and more algea blooms like the one in 2019. Because of this I have also gotten a bid of \$24,000 to drill a well on the upland lot. Because our lot (and most every other) is only 100' wide and the clearance required around a well is a 100' circumference, that blocks the rest of the lot from access and from running septic lines thru that wellhead area. Because we own one of the few undeveloped lakefront lots in the area, we have been contacted by many upland neighbors seeking an easement to access and utilize their lake water rights. The cost to drill a well on a Turkey Road lot would be astronomical because of the elevation and where the predicted water table is. So now that I have rambled on about trying to build and live on Summit Lake I am very thankful that it may be reclassified as Shoreline Residential. We would also hope that the County would take the next step and start planning water and sewer systems to the lake. These will preserve Summit Lake for our kids and theirs.	Summit Lake
248	10/21/21	Carol and Larry	Hargreaves and Schneider	<i>See Original Comment for Attached Letter (Too Long To Copy Below)</i> First, thank you to Thurston County Planning Commission and its staff for the years of work they have put into developing the updated Shoreline Master Program. It is a complex and time-consuming job. Please stick with it, keep listening to stakeholders and be sure to incorporate feedback and answer questions before proceeding to finalize the plan. Following are answers to the Planning Commission Options as were highlighted in yellow in the draft SMP. These answers are from me and my husband, Larry Schneider, who reside at 2526 Carpenter Road SE, Olympia, WA, on Long Lake. 19.400.100 Existing Development - Please do not use the phrase “legally nonconforming.” It has a negative connotation. Instead, we prefer, in the following order: (1) "legally existing," (2) “conforming," or (3) "existing structure” 19.400.120 Vegetation Conservation Buffers B. Buffer Widths - Leave the Freshwater Lakes Buffer at the existing 50 feet. D. Other Uses and Modifications in Buffers - Yes, we agree the default options should be decks and viewing platforms larger than 100 square feet and closer than 25. A shoreline variance should be required. We do not understand the text of the SMP section B.2 on Mitigation Standards or the sample figures provided in Appendix B, however we concur a statement should be included that decks will be considered pervious if designed to allow water to infiltrate the ground below and the ground below the deck is not compacted or otherwise made impervious. 5. Yes, we agree that water-oriented storage structures should be limited to residential uses only. 19.500.100 Permit Application Review and Permits B. Substantial Development Permit - Remove the requirement for Substantial Development Permits to undergo public hearing. This action is expected to simplify and speed up the permitting process and save many people’s time. 19.600.115 Aquaculture 3. Additional Standards for Net Pens. Fish net pens and rafts shall meet the following criteria... - We concur with all of these criteria but would add to the second to last bullet a specific timeframe/deadline associated with “Respond promptly to complaints and take measures to comply.” For example, “...respond to the complaint within 10 business days...” 19.600.150 Industrial Development A. Environment Designations Permit Requirements - Speaking only about Long Lake, we prefer that industrial development be prohibited in all areas - Shoreline Residential, Urban and Rural Conservancy. 19.600.160 Mooring Structures and Activities A. Environment Designations Permit Requirements - Speaking about Long Lake only, do not allow docks in any Natural environment of the lake’s shoreline. B. Application Requirements - We concur that the requirement to consider alternative moorage prior to allowing piers and docks (#8) should be stricken. In addition, we recommend striking #6 regarding demonstration that existing facilities are not adequate or feasible. C. Development Standards - 1. General Development Standards - No comment regarding striking the requirement to consider alternative moorage; pertains to marine environment only. No comment regarding whether covered moorage should be permitted; relates to commercial and industrial uses. We agree that the requirement for grating on lakes that do not contain salmon should be stricken from the SMP.	Long Lake
249	10/21/21		Kimball	We are opposed to this revision. The wetlands, bodies of water are a vital use for farmers and ranchers. Livestock, grass growth, food harvests and property owners’ access to these bodies of water is essential for most land owners. People purposely purchase lands with wetlands or bodies of water for these reasons. People don’t buy land for these uses to have it continually change with setbacks and regulations. These lands are more valuably used by ranchers and farmers than any other use I can see proposed here as to why revisions need to be made. If you want to keep future farming and agriculture alive in our county. Making it difficult for such future purchasers and users is not advantageous.	
250	10/21/21	Matthew	Brown	I OBJECT to this shoreline update.	
251	10/21/21	Chris	Bixby	This seems to be a most short-sighted proposal. This pandemic has shown us the value of local production. The ridiculously short period of time contemplated shows a desire to kill local farmland. Two years doesn’t even give enough time for an ownership change. And farming should be encouraged and have no barriers to entry.	
252	10/21/21	No Name Given		I highly oppose this stealing of our farm land. For what legitimate reasoning could you possibly have? Do you stop receiving property taxes on this land? If not you are overstepping your boundaries, when did the government start thinking they control the activities on purchased land? Please stop this ridiculous power grab!	
253	10/22/21	Jake	Yancey	These type on restrictions would directly effect the conservation, habitat creation, work we are currently doing with prescribed grazing on the Black River. Through collaborative efforts with WSDFW, Center For Natural Land Management, USFW, and Center for Ecological Studies we have brought cattle grazing back to abandoned farm ground (out of production for well over 10 years) and are currently grazing livestock on seasonally flooded ground. The documented, monitored, and Commercially Beneficial program has increased Oregon Spot Frog Habitat, created increased ovapositioning sites, led to increased beaver activity, left to increased observed waterfowl and birds, and most recently, and following three years of grazing, has led to the discovery of Pacific Lamprey. Some if this ground may have been "historically farmed" but some has not and rather is pioneered ground with interests in increasing wildlife habitat. Should restrictive proposed buffers be written in, with grazing not listed as a management tool, this County loses a great, clearly demonstrated, tool for not only producing commercially viable agriculture (grazing), which I'm our case is sold right here in the County, but also loses a viable, feasible, practical, demonstrated, and efficient way to CREATE habitat. Please consider not including restrictive buffers as there is a difference between "stockpiling" possible habitat and "managing" habitat. To see this type of Prescribed Grazing in action feel free to call for a tour (360)352-7707.	Black River / Tracking Y Ranch

Thurston County Shoreline Master Program Open House and 10/20/21 PC Public Hearing Comments

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment	Affiliation / Geo. Area
254	10/22/21	Dave	Brastow	Things I'm concerned about: 1) The lack of any real teeth for enforcement of regulations. I recently reported activity on a neighbor's property, conducted by the tenant. They were stacking pallets for pathways over about one half of the near shore cattail beds on the north shore of Trosper Lake, as well as clearing vegetation almost to the lake.. This was prime nesting area for a variety of species of birds, and was observed being used for many, many years. What could be done and was done by the county? Almost nothing. The compliance officer who came in response to the report was in agreement that this was all illegal. But they couldn't enter the property without permission, and could only view and video the damage from our property. The only recourse was writing a letter to the owner. The pallets are still there. The birds aren't. Please add people and money for the enforcement of the regulations. The police claim that they don't have jurisdiction in such matters, since they are civil crimes. 2) I would love to enhance the riparian habitat for the benefit of the wildlife. The lack of forest management is a big issue nation wide, but property owners are not allowed to cut dangerous branches, trim overgrown thickets, or remove or restrict weedy species that choke out everything else (leaving an unhealthy ecosystem). The other neighbors can't cut a dead tree that is likely to fall on our house, can't even shorten it so it will not reach the house, without a permit and a great deal of time and expense. (By the way, a large number of trees all along the lake edge died because a beaver raised the lake level about 10", which drowned the trees roots during the nearly a year it took some agency to figure out what to do about the beaver.) Please allow for a way for property owners to submit management plans for there own property, without costly permits and other prohibitive expenses. And why are people allowed to clear vegetation for the purpose of maintaining a view, but not for habitat management? 3) Find a better way to determine the boundaries of the various zones. Even in the new proposed system it is impossible to tell what is the extent of the Shoreline Protection Area . In one place it's listed as 125 feet, on one map it's about 80 feet and on another its about 300 feet (beyond the property line, so that everything we own is included.) In reality, at about 75 feet, the property becomes upland forest type. And along one side of the property, at about 100 feet, it becomes a housing development. The blanket assignment of a distance is irresponsible in my opinion, and very costly for most individual home owners to have corrected. Thanks, enough for now, though not nearly all,	Trosper Lake
255	10/22/21	Adam Christopher	Hagedstedt	1) Ch 19.400.100. The labeling of all existing legally built homes and/or accessory structures already located within the buffer should be “conforming,” not “legally non-conforming.” State law recognizes these structures as “conforming.” So should Thurston County. This is an important issue to me given the buffer zone and my house is within 75 ft of the lake. 2) Ch 19.400.120. Buffer widths should stay as presented in this July 28, 2021, draft SMP. Shoreline Residential buffer widths should be 50-feet for both marine and lake properties...as they have been since the 1990 SMP, and longer. Not the 75-feet under consideration since this impacts as I said if my house is in or outside the buffer zone. 3) Ch 19.400.120.D.1.b. and Appendix B, Section B.2.c. Decks and Viewing Platforms properly constructed to be pervious should not be required to be “...adjacent to residential structures...” There should be no limit on size or location and there should be no requirement for a shoreline variance to build such a deck. 5) Ch 19.500.075 and 19.500.100.B.2. I strongly agree with the Options: Substantial Developments Permits, Conditional Use Permits and Variances should be processed administratively rather than having to undergo a public hearing before the Hearing Examiner. 6) Ch 19.600.160.C.1.r., Ch 19.600.160.C.4.f. and Ch 19.600.160.C.5. I agree with each of these Options. Strike the requirement for pier, dock, float or ramp grating on lakes that do not contain salmon. 7) Ch 19.600.160.C.3.b. We agree with this Public Hearing Option, “Consider a shorter distance (than the specified 20-foot spacing) for spacing of residential pilings (supporting piers and/or docks) in lakes...” 8-foot spacing is a move in the right direction; we would like to see 6-foot.	Long Lake
256	10/22/21	Grant	Middleton	We need to maintain the use of our local agricultural lands without more limiting factors. The current COVID environment we have experienced and continue to experience is probably the best example of why this needs to happen, although there are many more reasons. The major shipping/receiving delays at the ports is another example . We need to maintain what local agricultural resources we have available to provide support to our local communities with local produce and organic supplies in general. Having usable agricultural land for farming activities is essential! Taking away usable agricultural land from farms whether big or small is not in the Publics best interest.	
257	10/22/21	Loretta	Seppanen	Thank you for the opportunity to make these comments late in the SMP review process. These are comments about agricultural land in the SMP and potential inadvertent threat to farming. Many local farms are along the many creeks and rivers in the county. A large share of farms will change hands in the coming decades due to the aging population of the current farm producers. As that transition happens some farms will be owned by land trusts with a goal of keeping the land in farming by leasing it to the next generation of farmers. Some farms will transition to the next generation within the family or to other farm families. Also, due to the age of current farmers, family health or other tragedy could result in the land being out of farming for three, four or five years before the farmer is back on their feet and farming again. As farms transition to new owners who aim to continue farming the land the SMP should treat the farms the same as farms that exist at the time of adoption of the SMP. Similarly farms that return to production after more than a two year temporary suspension of farming should be seen as farms that exist at the time of adoption. Despite change of ownership or longer than two year suspension of farming, these agricultural activities should not need to apply for a permit. This would help to preclude loss farms because of the expense of new requirements on land that stays in production. A maximum a VSP could be required to assure that farming the land meets the goal of no net loss of ecological function.	
258	10/22/21	Richard	Lawrence	I am submitting a comment through a friend regarding my property on Woodland Creek. I am concerned as to the ability to use my property and build my retirement home on a site that already has both a water well and septic system. Increasing setbacks without established risk to the environment amounts to unreasonable limits to use property that has been in my family for nearly 80 years. Consideration of proximity to shoreline should also include aspects of total size of property subject to development. Thank you for consideration, Richard Lawrence by Jon Pettit	Woodland Creek

Thurston County Shoreline Master Program Open House and 10/20/21 PC Public Hearing Comments

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment	Affiliation / Geo. Area
259	10/22/21	Marty	Beagle	<p>First off, true appreciation to the county staff that have labored over this Plan. A long process but worth the effort to ensure future generations will still be able to appreciate the PNW environments. I live on the Steamboat Island part of the county- moved here in 1976. Page #'s refer to the draft reviewed on October 20,2021. My comments on the draft: 1. Section 19.400.100 , page 47 I like the use of the term " legally existing" compared to "nonconforming" . "Nonconforming " just sets things off on the wrong foot...</p> <p>2. 19.400.120, page 56 Buffers. 250' seems a little much to me (Urban Conservancy, Rural Conservancy, Natural) - a person in an existing house in a "Natural " area could not build a garden shed closer than 250' to Ordinary High Water . That said, a 50' reduced buffer for Shoreline Residential seems too close to water.</p> <p>Also, perhaps consider establishing different buffer criteria for Freshwater and Marine environments. They really are two different ecologies.</p> <p>3. 19.400.120.D.(1) (b) page 60,62 Decks: I can't recall seeing a waterfront home with a deck of 100 sq.ft. or smaller- no way is that the reality in the county. Also, the use of the term "adjacent " is vague - does the 100 sq. ft. deck need to be secured to the main domicile or just nearby ? Also, do not allow viewing platforms as close as 25' to OHWM- that is inviting pollution and littering.</p> <p>4. 19.400.120.D.(3)(c) Review of thinning trees in a shoreline designated as Natural will be accomplished by County staff. What appeal process will provide relief for an applicant ?</p> <p>5. Sec 19.400.120.D.1.(e) (viii) prohibits storage sheds in the Natural environment. They should be allowed but with an appropriate cap on size.</p> <p>6. 19.500.075 and 19.500.100.C.(3) and 4 (a)As far as Development types, a Substantial Development Permit should be a Type 1 or 2 with Thurston County staff making the decision. Exemption letter should be affordable to the applicant.</p> <p>7. 19.600.115 , page 98 A number of the information items required on the application don't make sense to me,(examples B.3.(j) B.4.(f)) - Biological Demand and loading of the sediment by biosolids from whatever critters are being grown- but how can an applicant provide any data when nothing can be cultivated (and thus measured/sampled) until a permit is issued...same thing with B.4(c) - Department of Health certification is required - why is that necessary when the applicant won't have a crop ready for harvest until 18 months after planting (at the earliest; add a few years for Manila clams or 5 years for geoducks...) - the Health Department will charge a grower in the ballpark (depending on classification) of \$700 annually. Consider the "Mom-n-Pop" growers and the tightness of their budget...</p> <p>At a recent meeting of the Board of Commissioners testimony was submitted stating aquaculture practices in the County were releasing vast amounts of microplastics into our inlets. I concur that there is indeed a problem with plastic pollution in our world, but asserting plastic equipment used in geoduck/shellfish farming is a main culprit in this matter belies the facts. Recent studies of a heavily farmed area in British Columbia (Baynes Sound) found the vast majority of microplastic pollution is from microbeads (used in cosmetics, not geoduck farming) and microfibers, not from the anti-predator PVC tubes utilized in geoduck cultivation. (See Davidson, K and Dudas, Sarah E., Microplastic Ingestion by Wild and Cultured Manila Clams in Baynes Sound, British Columbia in Archives of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology, 71, pages147–156(2016), and Martinelli, J.C., Low Incidence of Microplastic contaminants in Pacific Oysters From the Salish Sea, in Science of the Total Environment, 715 (2020) 136826. Expert testimony given and upheld at hearings of the Washington State Shorelines Hearing Board (SHB) has opined that PVC anti-predator tubes do not significantly degrade; due to the fact that because they are underwater the vast majority of the time they experience little exposure to UV radiation (SHB No. 11-019Finding of Fact (FF)9), SHB No. 13-006 (FF41-42 and Conclusions Of Law (COL); 16); SHB No. 14-024 (FF 44-47 and COL 13,20)</p> <p>8. page 103 - mussel rafts - these dozen or so bullet points don't belong in this document. It is more appropriate to list such specific conditions in the Substantial Development Permit or the Conditional Use Permit when it/they are issued.</p> <p>9. Section 19.600.115 C.1.(b) I strongly support ensuring no deleterious effects on Puget Sound by development on the Uplands. Thanks again for the efforts,</p>	Steamboat Island
260	10/22/21	Laura and Sam	Schrager	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide input. We have not been following the crafting of the current Draft Shoreline Master Plan, but we watched the public hearing on October 21,2021 and have reviewed the draft plan. We offer these comments with the caveat that since we have not been tracking the Plan's development, our comments may miss the mark. Our property at 4122 Gravelly Beach Loop NW is located near Frye Cove Park in an area with a proposed designation of "Natural." There are three points in the plan that are of concern to us.:</p> <p>1.Buffer widths -- 19.400.120, Section B (p. 53 of Oct 21,2021 draft) We strongly support the new proposed limits of 200' and 150' for the Standard and Reduced Standard Buffer respectively in the Natural Area rather than the earlier proposed limits of 250' and 200'. Our house was built in 1994/5 and we have a 180 foot set-back. At that time approval was required for any structure closer than 200' from mean high tide. We received approval to place our house on a bench at 180'. I doubt that our 4-acre lot would be buildable if a building could not have been placed closer than 200 feet from mean high tide. Marine waterfront lots often have slopes and benches such that house placement may be ecologically more desirable on a closer in bench. With proper review, we would support that the Reduced Standard buffer for the Natural Area be even less than 150', perhaps as low as the 110' proposed for Rural Conservancy Area.</p> <p>2, Decks -- 19.400.120 Section D: 1, b This section contains the following language: "Decks and viewing platforms adjacent to residential structures may be permitted, but shall be limited to one-hundred square-feet in size." As a naive reader of the plan the use of the word "adjacent" is ambiguous as to whether or not decks attached to homes are limited to 100 sqft. Such a limitation would make no sense for waterfront homes.</p> <p>3. Stairs -- 19.400.120 Section D: 1, c This section indicates that beach stairs are allowed with proper review and permitting. The chart on p.89, however, prohibits beach stairs in Natural Areas. We obtained a permit for our beach stairs many years ago, and we strongly believe that the use of those stairs, rather than cutting a trail down to the water, was ecologically preferable. We urge you to allow stairs, with permitting, in the Natural Area. In terms of protecting our marine environment, we feel that failing septic systems play a huge role in degradation of water quality and were disappointed to see little attention to that issue in the Plan. We would encourage progress on that issue. Thank-you for the chance to comment. We can be reached by email or phone (360-866-9343) if you have any comments or questions.</p>	Frye Cove

Thurston County Shoreline Master Program Open House and 10/20/21 PC Public Hearing Comments

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment	Affiliation / Geo. Area
261	10/22/21	Cynthia	Wilson	<p><i>See Original Comment for Attached Letter (Too Long To Copy Below)</i></p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft SMP. I have several comments that I will try to relate below. Generally, I think there are some good items in the draft. I do have serious concerns with the proposals to reduce the current buffers for Freshwater and Marine Riparian areas, also known as Shorelines in this document. The science does not support reducing buffers from their current distance. Additionally, there are numerous activities proposed to be allowed within the buffers, storage structures, platforms, etc. It appears that the Planning Commission is relying on the implementation of mitigation to reduce impacts. Mitigation sequencing is required when impacting an environmentally sensitive area and the number one priority is avoidance. Relying on mitigation is false confidence since very few private property mitigation projects are successful. This is due not usually to purposefully removing plants or maintaining buffers, but due to lack of attention, changing property owners, and the County's inability to monitor and force a property owner to complete and maintain the mitigation area. It is a problem and results in permanent loss and function of ecological functions. It also puts the County in the untenable position of regulating by enforcement and trying to do it consistently and for every project. Avoidance of impacts should be the priority, then clear criteria for those properties that cannot be used without some alteration of buffer functions. Mitigation can then be required and applied for those limited projects. I encourage you not to reduce the current buffers and not to allow non-essential buffer reductions with unachievable mitigation requirements. Reducing current buffers and relying on mitigation will not lead to the no net loss requirement. TCC 19.400 Buffers should remain the same as the current buffers for the Fresh and Marine Riparian Areas within Critical Areas Ordinance, Option B. The CAO Riparian (Shoreline) buffers were identified as critical during the CAO and are based on the Best Available Science at the time. Current science indicates that even larger buffers may be required to preserve fish and wildlife habitat as well as water quality. You need only to look at the Governor's "State of the Sound" to see that we are not doing enough to protect our valuable natural resources including salmon and Orca. stateofthesound.wa.gov. Reduction of Reductions, loss of vegetation and structures within a Riparian buffer are not supported by WDFW Management Recommendations for Washington's Priority Habitats: Riparian Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife, Land Use Planning for Salmon, Steelhead and Trout: A land use planner's guide to salmonid habitat protection and recovery Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife Page 57. It's unclear which type of Shoreline B.2. is referring as the proposed reduction are quite drastic compared with the standard buffers. Are you proposing to reduce a 250-foot buffer on a Natural Shoreline to 150 feet by just submitting a restoration plan? Why? I encourage you not to allow for reducing buffers based on difficult to enforce mitigation unless a property does not have a buildable area and avoidance cannot be met. Although mentioned here, mitigation sequencing requires avoidance, minimization and mitigation. It is contrary to the law and science to jump to mitigation, especially since mitigation is rarely successful for individual private properties. It is difficult for staff to review mitigation plans. They can face pressure from property owners, internal staff and political influence. Independent studies and the County records indicate that nearly all requested variances are approved regardless of quality of report. Even though many require mitigation, even under the best of circumstances, mitigation fails due to lack of maintenance, changing owners, and even purposeful removal after County staff has completed their review and the project is approved. The County has neither adequate staffing for permit reviews nor for compliance. Using the CAO as guidance, a property that is too small for use can use an administrative process to develop in an appropriate area (as defined in square feet) on the property with appropriate mitigation. Fewer mitigation projects would be easier to monitor. No variances should be allowed in the code for property that simply wants a smaller buffer but does not need it to use their property. Private property mitigation is rarely successful and the smaller buffer is contrary to the science on environmental protect, both for water and habitat. You will not achieve no net loss and the County will continue to degrade the shorelines. The current buffers within the CAO offer an administrative process to minimally reduce a buffer. It also sets out the standards. Using the current Riparian area buffers with this administrative process can achieve environmental protection, provide clear criteria for a reduction and streamline the process if those criteria are met. Please don't place the burden of approving permits through administrative processes on staff. Having an independent Hearing Examiner or the Department of Ecology, will provide consistent and non-biased review. People seemed determined to impact their lake property but their actions do affect others, and those others are counting on you to do the right thing. For all shorelines, there was some testimony and the public hearing that stated that waterfront property owners care about the lakes and know what is needed to protect them. I don't doubt their sincerely but the science you have before you, does not support what has been happening on our lakes. Lack of shoreline vegetation, armoring, bulkhead,</p>	
262	10/22/21	Bob	Lanouette	<p>Comments for SMP Public Hearing. I want recognize Andrew Deffobis for the effort on the Plan. He has shown a willingness to help homeowners and property owners. I especially appreciate that he attended and led the SMP discussion with a room full of lake property owners hosted by the Long Lake Management District. While I have already submitted input during the online open house, I want to comment during the Public Hearing.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I have commented numerous times at Planning Commission Meetings of a need for a User Friendly Pamphlet to accompany the SMP. I find the plan in its current form difficult to read and understand. This product has a better use for regulators and planners than for the average county citizen. An sister document geared toward the citizen user would greatly benefit the shoreline management program. 2. The SMP should not label property nonconforming! This label is divisive and in my opinion serves no useful purpose. I recommend this concept be stricken. 3. Buffers from the OHWM for shoreline residential should remain at 50 feet. 4. A deck or viewing platform should not be restricted to 100 square feet. This is to small of an area to be useful. 5. A deck should be considered pervious because water does flow through the spaces between boards. 6. The requirement to use grating on docks, piers and floats in the lake environment should be deleted. 7. The county engineering staff should be consulted on the spacing of residential pilings on piers and docks. I believe 20 feet is too far and a length of 6 or 8 feet a more reasonable width. 8. Figure 19.600.160(1) should be used as an example with the measurements removed. The average length of a lake boat is in excess of 18 feet. A 15 foot float is too short to safely moor a boat. 	Long Lake
263	10/21/21	Bob	Whisler	<p>Interesting meeting last night. In reviewing the interactive SED map and my property (1523 Delphi Rd SW) I find it difficult to understand the designation of my property vs the parcels adjacent to me. Why is my property which is high and dry for the most part and significantly further away from the stream bed or high water mark compared to the neighboring parcels to the east of me almost entirely designated natural conservancy with the balance under consideration whereas those properties designated rural? The parcel directly and adjacent to me to the west is designated much differently with that parcels property literally adjoining the tide flats not designated at all? Regarding my comments about grazing horses on my property and that being the likely use for my property in the future along with a small horse facility, you responded back to me that because that activity hadn't taken place for the past two years it may be subject to special request/approval. I want to know more about this as the SMP process proceeds as any rule restricting me from using that property in the manner I described will be an issue and in my opinion, contrary to the overall concept of grand fathering prior use or structures.</p>	
264	10/21/21	John	Woodford	<p><i>See Original Comment for Referenced Images</i></p> <p>While I've opposed all of the SED re-designations that have come to light so far, there is one missed site that I must bring to the attention of the Planning staff and the Planning Commission. It is Tax Parcel # 11826240100 on the east shoreline of Long Lake, known locally as Carpenter's Park. It was once owned by the Carpenter's Local #470, of Tacoma, and was used as a weekend retreat for the members. Carpenter's Park from the WDFW boat launch across the lake. The approximate north and south property lines are indicated yellow. Carpenter's Park, on the east shoreline of Long Lake, from above...approximately at the midpoint of reach LLO-4 to LLO-5, Parcel # 11826240100, is the 11.60 acres, from the shoreline, up the bluff, to the former campsite. Parcel # 11826130100 is the 4.65 acre, narrow rectangle that connects the larger parcel to Walthew St SE, which run north/south on the right hand side of this image. This smaller parcel falls outside the SMP jurisdiction. The existing SED of the larger Parcel # 11826240100 is Rural; the proposed is Shoreline Residential. You've got this one wrong. The SED should be, if not Natural, at least Rural Conservancy. Please give serious consideration to this SED re-designation. The small circled island is Kirby Island, reach LLO-16, and it has an existing SED of Rural and proposed of Natural. You've got this one right; do the same for Carpenter's Park.</p>	Chair, Thurston County Shoreline Stakeholders Coalition

Thurston County Shoreline Master Program Open House and 10/20/21 PC Public Hearing Comments

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment	Affiliation / Geo. Area
265	10/21/21	Iris	Newman	<p>I thank you so very much for your kind phone call. I appreciate the information you shared with me. I wish to add a few items for consideration for Shorelines Management review.</p> <p>1. The issues of septic systems for rural folks is a good one. I know that not everyone can budget an engineered septic system. But, I hope you will consider allowing those in this review of rules. If the engineered septic system is done well, it will allow the ofal to be potable water, and that is a bonus for our environment. These are so very possible, and I think there should be an option when a landowner wants to move a septic system or put in a new one, within your current rules. Think of it this way, A well-engineered system will take away any need for concern of contamination of the waterways that are being considered. Yes, not everyone can afford them. But, if a landowner does budget for this lovely option, that landowner should be given consideration, and you should allow the use of these systems. I personally have FDA and other credits to my name regarding marine systems for processing seafood, both at sea and on land. This is done all the time in that industry. Piece of cake.</p> <p>2. Another idea that I wish to ask for your consideration is the use of "gray water" from a home. Grey water must be contained in systems in parts of CA when building new homes. Again, this has marine applications. Grey water can be looped and treated quite easily. By using gray-water in a contained system, the landowner is helping conserve water. The landowner is keeping that water out of the septic system or the sewer system. WA might be still called the Evergreen State, but we are facing climate changes. Any and all recycled water, like a good gray-water system, is saving runoff to the shorelines and rivers and bays, and it also saves our water table. And it puts much less water into the septic fields and sewers. And making potable water in this method is cost-effective and good for the environment.</p> <p>3. While I do not, do not, do not, recommend these for new rules; I do hope that these may be included as modern, environmental options that will allow landowners to use. I hope these will be included in your exceptions, on a case by case basis. Thank you very much for including these comments in your Shoreline Management Review.</p>	
266	10/21/21	Henry	de Give	I hope that you are getting a lot of feedback on the issue of Carpenter’s Park. This parcel is one of the last undeveloped stretches of natural shoreline left on Long Lake. It includes a section of marshland that together with it’s upland woods has long been maintained in pristine condition as a day park for the members of the local Carpenter’s Union. It provides habitat for a large population of waterfowl and shore birds as well as wood birds and other woodland creatures. I have seen eagles, osprey, various species of heron, river otters and and all manner of indigenous birds along the shoreline. In the winter, it serves as protection for a large population of wintertime residents. It provides habitat for fish and is across the lake from a State Fish and Wildlife boat launch and public access area. As such, it is seen and enjoyed by many state residents. It provides a buffer for some of the massive amount of pollutants in local runoff waters. (Much of which is piped directly into the lake from storm drains all around the area.)	Long Lake
267	10/21/21	Walter	Anderson	I understand you are advocating for a redesignation of Carpenters Park. As a resident of Long Lake for over ten years, I wish to express my shared desire to see Carpenter Park’s re-designated to Rural Conservancy or Natural. This re-designation would be a key action to ensure continued use of Long Lake by the community while preserving its natural beauty and wildlife.	Long Lake
268	10/21/21	Abigail	Ruskey	<p>I understand that comments received by Friday, October 22, 2021 are considered part of the public hearing about the Shoreline Master Plan proposed revisions. Since 2004, I have been the homeowner and steward of the property at 7630 Earling Street, NE, Olympia. This property is in inner Zangle Cove and is among a small group of other homes in the SMP, reach MBU16WA, that is under consideration for a proposed change from “shoreline residential” to “rural conservancy”. I am writing in opposition to this proposed change. While I do not have technical expertise related to shoreline plan management or near shore ecology, I am an environmental and climate learning and policy specialist and regard ownership along Zangle Cove a privilege and responsibility. It provides food and habitat for numerous species, and I am glad that my bank, even though overgrown with invasive Himalayan blackberry, is also a source of nutrients and protection for the food web that thrives in the cove, which I cherish. I want to see Zangle Cove remain in this natural state and continue to sustain wildlife, recreation, and the human spirit. That said, in evaluating the change proposed, I do not believe it will appreciably result in this protection. The existing 50-foot buffer is more than sufficient for sustaining land supports to near shore habitat for wildlife in Zangle Cove and would be interested in scientific evidence that would argue otherwise. I’m grateful that my neighbors, the Townsend family, are voluntarily removing the bulkhead they inherited when they purchased their property. Imposing a 150 buffer seems odd and unnecessary given that we are all well-developed properties that are hooked up to the Boston water and sewer system. We are a seamless part of the shoreline community of Boston Harbor and Zangle Cove. Thus, the proposal appears to single out a small handful of responsible property owners in an area with a strong land/water/environment ethic. I understand that your job is to establish guidelines that will protect the environment given the decision of future owners as well, but I would suggest that incentive programs to remove existing bulkheads and dams, bolstering shorelines with native plants, along with the monitoring of shore habitat, water quality and mitigation of sources of toxic run-off and algae growth would go a lot further towards water quality and the protection of habitat, wildlife and the “sense of place” all who live and visit here enjoy. Additionally, tightening the enforcement reigns and ensuring that the county (and or other responsible agencies) effectively enforces the existing zoning height and set-back limits for this area would also be proactive and helpful. In sum, it seems to me that the proposed change along Zangle Cove in the SMP is unnecessary and request that the current designation be retained. Also, I would like to take this opportunity to provide a friendly suggestion that in the future, county planning staff initiate a site visit and meeting with those who would be impacted by proposed changes such as this. I would not have known about the implications of the passage of the SMP here in my neighborhood and to my property if a neighbor hadn’t reached out. Finally, it’s occurred to me that a covenant among neighbors for stewardship of Zangle Cove in perpetuity, and the coordination and cooperation among neighbors to improve the health of the cove, would strengthen our social and natural systems here in our amazing “back yard”. Any resources the county may have for supporting this type of initiative would be most appreciated. I hope this letter will find its way to those who are thoughtfully weighing, and have the power to determine the science as well as cultural and financial sensibility of the proposed change to reach MBU16WA in addition to the overall SMP. With thanks to those who have worked so diligently on this plan,</p>	Boston Harbor
269	10/21/21	Liz	Bettine	The site on Long lake formally known as Carpenters Park on the east shoreline of Long Lake must be brought to the attention of Planning staff and Planning Commission. They should visit this designation again. It was once a weekend retreat for members of a Local Carpenters Union and I remember watching the wonderful weekends these families got to enjoy. I grew up on Long Lake as my parents took the bold step to move to the "country" in 1961 and raise their family here. I am thankful that I was and am still able to live here most my life. It was a magical place. I have seen many changes to the lake over all these years and have many memories before it became so populated. In meetings I recall statements that most of the lakes are currently developed so they will be residential as there are not many parcels left for development. Look again - this parcel on Long Lake is. At the least it should be natural or rural conservancy. Kirby island for example-neighboring parcel. Long Lake struggles with the population and we have been assessed with extra taxes to maintain it. The Long Lake committee does a WONDERFUL job of maintaining it with their relentless hours of work. We can't watch and wait to see what next big development comes our way to create more maintenance on this last bit of piece of heaven we still try to enjoy as Long Lake. Please encourage them to review this one more time.	Long Lake

Thurston County Shoreline Master Program Open House and 10/20/21 PC Public Hearing Comments

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment	Affiliation / Geo. Area
270	10/22/21	Brian and Nancy	Muirhead	<p>The attached document contains a complete new input on the SMP SED map issue we've been working with you. This document is more complete and supersedes the information be already provided. Please let me know you received and understand the new inputs. As stated in this document, we have contracted for a survey of the -600 parcel, which along with the survey we have of the -100 parcel will provide the data to update the GeoData maps and support our owner proposed boundary line change. Thank you for your time and effort on this important work. We look forward to working with you and the Planning Commission to implement a mutually agreeable SED for our property.</p> <p>Attached Letter (See Original for Referenced Images and full text)</p> <p>The following is an update to the material we submitted with respect to our issues with the proposed Shoreline Environment Designations (SED) for our parcel 11702140600 (-600). This information supersedes the info we provided previously and should replace what we've already given you (if you can remove what I sent you before from the public record that would be best but if not, this is the material you should be working with. Our updated material is a site map (Figure 1) for our residential parcel, 11702420100 (-100), from a survey, plus approximate boundaries and existing features in parcel -600, including an approximate OHWM profile, existing paths (~10 wide), existing cement block stairs (4ft wide), existing hillside landscaping, and existing dock. We have contracted for a survey of parcel -600 in order to provide a fully accurate site map of both parcels which we will provide you when it's complete. The current SED LPA-8 reach boundary (as best I can understand from the SED map, Figure 2) between shoreline and conservancy appears to be a slanted line into -600 parcel starting near the intersection of the eastern property line of -100 with the southern property line of -600. Our estimate of the line is shown in Figure 1. It should be noted that the parcel boundaries as shown on the map appear to be in error as they are not consistent with the legal definition as shown by survey of the -100 parcel and will be verified by survey for parcel -600. Per 19.200.145.B (pg 33) of the SMP Planning Commission Review document, we will provide our survey information so that the Thurston County GeoData information can be updated. The proposed SED LPA-8 reach would be along the -600 parcel boundary which, as shown on Figure 3. Per our assessment below it is not consistent with the Natural designation per Table 2 of the Thurston County Shoreline Master Program Update, Shoreline Environment Designations Report date June 30, 2013:</p> <p>1) EEcologically intact and therefore currently performing an important, irreplaceable function or ecosystem-wide process that would be damaged by human activity. NO</p> <p>2) Considered to represent ecosystems and geologic types that are of particular scientific and educational interest. NO</p> <p>3) Unable to support new development or uses without significant adverse impacts to ecological functions or risk to human safety. NO</p> <p>4) Includes largely undisturbed portions of shoreline areas such as wetlands, estuaries, unstable bluffs, coastal dunes, spits, and ecologically intact shoreline habitats. NO</p> <p>5) Retain the majority of their natural shoreline functions, as evidenced by shoreline configuration and the presence of native vegetation. NO</p> <p>6) Generally free of structural shoreline modifications, structures, and intensive human uses. NO</p> <p>For reference, with respect to the proposed Rural Conservancy definition, the proposed SED LPA-8 does not meet most of the criteria below:</p> <p>1) Outside incorporated municipalities and outside urban growth areas, AND at least one of the following: YES</p> <p>2) Currently supporting low-intensity resource- based uses such as agriculture, forestry, or recreation. NO</p> <p>3) Currently accommodating residential uses YES</p> <p>4) Supporting human uses but subject to environmental limitations, such as properties that include or are adjacent to steep banks, feeder bluffs, wetlands, flood plains or other flood prone areas NO</p> <p>5) Can support low-intensity water-dependent uses without significant adverse impacts to shoreline functions or processes NOT SURE</p> <p>6) Private and/or publically owned lands (upland areas landward of OHWM) of high recreational value or with valuable historic or cultural resources or potential for public access. NO</p>	Pattison Lake
271	10/22/21	Susan	Gills	Please take into consideration my comments as a long time resident on Long Lake. The proposed changes to Carpenter Park and the work already begun have impacted the habitats already. Eagles used to soar. Nests were being built and newborns learned to fly right in front of our home. Lately, we see very few. Housing and associated travel and all that comes with them can only add to pollution, noise and negative impacts on the natural habitats. Shoreline maintenance is of utmost importance to creation. Please designate Natural or Rural Conservancy.	Long Lake
272	10/22/21	Gary	Larson	I'm requesting properties I own at the south end of Long Lake (recently approved under BLA 2011628OTC lots ABC) site addresses 4242, 4244 and 4248 Kyro Road SE, portions to be classified as "shoreline residential". I appreciate your consideration in this request.	Long Lake
273	10/22/21	Gary and Karen	Nylund	<p>We would like the commissioners to know we would like the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Buffer widths (issue number two in correlation letter) for lakes to remain as they were in the 1990 SMP. 2. Pier, dock, float or ramp grating (issue seven in coalition letter) we want the option to exclude expensive grading for lakes that do not contain salmon. 3. Pier and dock pilling spacing (issue eight in coalition letter) we want the option to reduce spacing to 8 feet. 4. Pier and dock width (issue nine in the coalition letter) we want the option to be able to make piers/ docks 8 feet wide or more if applicant can demonstrate need. 5. Shoreline Environmental Designations (issue twelve in coalition letter) we want the changes we were able to make for residents of Lake Lawrence adopted by the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners. Thank you for taking time to read this and please know we do care about our lake. 	Lake Lawrence
274	10/22/21	Carol and Larry	Hargreaves and Schneider	Repeat of Comment #248	Long Lake
275	10/22/21	Alan	Bennett	I want to express my concern regarding the designation of "legally non conforming" status given to those residences that would fall into "non compliance" with the updated buffer standard proposed. Like the large number of other home owners here on Long Lake, I too would like this changed to either "Conforming" or perhaps a new designation, "Conforming to standard at time of construction". Words do have meaning. Future lawyers and banking representatives may take issue with the proposed double speak. I also want to request that SED for the parcel 11826240100 located on Long Lake known as Carpenter Park be considered for a designated as "Natural" rather than residential.	Long Lake
276	10/22/21	Meredith	Magee	Carpenter's Park as a "Residential Development" stands to impact the lake ecology of Long Lake and the lake community as a whole, for years and perhaps generations to come, if we don't get it right. As a former resident of Holmes Island proper, directly across from the designated location, and having raised my small children on the island, I feel strongly about how a large number of residential properties might affect the lake itself and the ecology of the area. The home that we lived in is my in-laws house and it is still a part of our family; we live across town now and visit regularly. Swimming in the summer is a major draw for my girls that grew up and learned to swim on Long Lake. At times, even now there are occasions when the lake is "too crowded" to go out and enjoy it on the boat or even swimming, when the waves are coming at us so quickly and all the boats are churning up lake weed and debris. We receive the brunt of that lake debris, (and trash) by the way, as a home directly on the point of the island. My fear is that adding a large number of residential properties, directly across from the island and the boat launch and park, will greatly affect the lake itself, our ability to enjoy it, the amount of debris and trash ending up in our swimming area, etc. Not to mention the fact that the increased usage will affect the ecology of the lake itself. Climate change is a real concern and Long Lake has not gone unaffected by its impacts. We need to protect the natural state of the lake, as it remains, as best we can, and can do so by limiting large scale developments such as Carpenters Park. I ask that you think about this re-designation thoroughly and consider the ultimate impact as it won't be minimal, given the size of the planned development. Please re-designate the area of Carpenter Park as Rural or Natural and protect this remaining portion of the lake that is not developed.	Long Lake
277	10/22/21	Terralyn	Barfield	I agree with the letter below (<i>referencing Comment #264 from John Woodford</i>) . The Carpenter Park area must be preserved. Just recently, during the Carpenter Road construction, we on Long Lake Dr. Noted a period of days when a doe and her fawns were running back and through our yards looking for safety, but apparently unable to find any. Our area is no longer the haven is used to be. What green spaces we still have must be guarded or we will loose something very precious. What wildlife we are still able to enjoy in the Long Lake area will no longer have a home is this parcel becomes just more privately owned residential housing. The quality of life of the residents, humans included as well as the property values of the current residents around Long Lake will forever be diminished with the loss of this wild space. Please save this as a conservation act immediately. Thank you.	Long Lake

Thurston County Shoreline Master Program Open House and 10/20/21 PC Public Hearing Comments

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment	Affiliation / Geo. Area
278	10/22/21	Bob	Zych	Please change the Shoreline Environmental Designation (SED) for Carpenter’s Park on Long Lake from Shoreline Residential to either Rural Conservancy or Natural. I've lived across the channel directly west of Carpenters Park for more than 33 years. Each day we watch eagles nest and rest in the trees along the mature, natural shoreline. The SMP designation change allows the parcel to remain as "natural" as it has been for years. The change is consistent with the net zero environmental impact goal of the SMP. The parcel is one of the largest remaining natural shorelines on Long Lake. As such, the relative impact of the parcel designation is very significant. Act now to protect this valuable and unique natural shoreline parcel from residential development. Thank you for memorializing my comments in the SMP Public Hearing. <i>See Original Comment for Referenced Image</i> Please include the winter picture below of the Carpenters Park parcel with my comments. Thank you.	Long Lake
279	10/22/21	Jane	O'Brien	I am a resident on Long Lake and am hoping that the SED for Carpenter Park will be changed from Shoreline Residential to either Rural Conservancy or Natural. For the sake of all who enjoy this park throughout each year, the change seems to be best to protect the park for the citizens of our county, state and visitors from outside our area. Thank you for your consideration and for the thoughtful and thorough time and effort given to the Shoreline Master Program. The decisions made are very important to all of us.	Long Lake
280	10/22/21	Adam Christopher	Hagedstedt	I live on Long Lake and wanted to cast my input on a few points and ask you a question on permitting: I live at 8027 Lakeridge Dr SE, Olympia, WA 98503, I am looking at putting in boat launch rails and a boat house given the increasing variation in the lake height that makes a boat lift not a viable option. I want to understand if this will be easier/harder/possible with the SMP new updates. Looking forward to your insights! Below are the input points I wanted to send you: 1) Ch 19.400.100. The labeling of all existing legally built homes and/or accessory structures already located within the buffer should be “conforming,” not “legally non-conforming.” State law recognizes these structures as “conforming.” So should Thurston County. This is an important issue to me given the buffer zone and my house is within 75 ft of the lake. 2) Ch 19.400.120. Buffer widths should stay as presented in this July 28, 2021, draft SMP. Shoreline Residential buffer widths should be 50-feet for both marine and lake properties...as they have been since the 1990 SMP, and longer. Not the 75-feet under consideration since this impacts as I said if my house is in or outside the buffer zone. 3) Ch 19.400.120.D.1.b. and Appendix B, Section B.2.c. Decks and Viewing Platforms properly constructed to be pervious should not be required to be “...adjacent to residential structures...” There should be no limit on size or location and there should be no requirement for a shoreline variance to build such a deck. 5) Ch 19.500.075 and 19.500.100.B.2. I strongly agree with the Options: Substantial Developments Permits, Conditional Use Permits and Variances should be processed administratively rather than having to undergo a public hearing before the Hearing Examiner. 6) Ch 19.600.160.C.1.r., Ch 19.600.160.C.4.f. and Ch 19.600.160.C.5. I agree with each of these Options. Strike the requirement for pier, dock, float or ramp grating on lakes that do not contain salmon. 7) Ch 19.600.160.C.3.b. We agree with this Public Hearing Option, “Consider a shorter distance (than the specified 20-foot spacing) for spacing of residential pilings (supporting piers and/or docks) in lakes...” 8-foot spacing is a move in the right direction; we would like to see 6-foot.	Long Lake
281	10/22/21	Bill	Martin	When I moved to Lacey and bought my property at 3209 Long Lake DR SE over 20 years ago, a major attraction for my purchase was a natural beauty and rural feeling for this area. My property was commonly used as a resting spot by single deer and small herds of deer as they passed back and forth to the lake. Listening to the nesting pairs of eagles, and owls has been common over the years. Sadly, as the local area has increasingly developed, these experiences have significantly diminished. Please consider revising and changing the Shoreline Environmental Designation (SED) for Carpenter’s Park on Long Lake from Shoreline Residential to either Rural Conservancy or Natural. This change is small, but has outsized impact on the quality of life for both residents and our animal occupants. As has been pointed out by others, the SMP designation change allows the parcel to remain as "natural" as it has been for years. The change is consistent with the net zero environmental impact goal of the SMP. The parcel is one of the largest remaining natural shorelines on Long Lake, and it deserves the preservation and protection to help retain the natural beauty in our immediate area. I am a military veteran, and I have traveled all over the world. There are few places where the natural world remains relatively undisturbed. I stand in awe of the natural wonders preserved for us by forward thinkers such as Gifford Pinchot. John Muir, and Teddy Roosevelt. Tho' this is a small thing, it is an important local thing that we can do to help preserve our past and our environment. Thank You for your consideration.	Long Lake
282	10/22/21	Henry	de Give	<i>Repeat of Comment #266</i>	Long Lake
283	10/22/21	Burton	Guttman	Forwarded message: Long Lake neighbors, I’ve just sent this email to Andy Deffobis asking that the Shoreline Environmental Designation (SED) for Carpenter’s Park be changed from Shoreline Residential to either Rural Conservancy or Natural. I know that it’s a real long shot, but if you agree in principal, please get an email off to Andy ASAP. Don’t just say, “I agree with John.” Be a little creative and say something about how important a “natural” Carpenter’s Park is to the lake as a whole. Andy has said that any comments received by midnight tomorrow will be included in his package of SMP Public Hearing comments. Andy’s email address is at the beginning of the attachment below...and send an email with any last comments you have on other matters. This is our last chance! Midnight tomorrow is the deadline for all public communication on the SMP!	Long Lake
284	10/22/21	Carole	Mathews	In Chapter 19.400, General Regulations, 19.400.100, B. Existing Structures c. change height restriction to up to 25 feet. This change might allow for residences behind existing structures when "remodeled" to have at least a limited view instead of the view of a three story building.	
285	10/22/21	Burton	Guttman	Mr. Deffobis, I'm sorry you only received a part of what I wanted to send you--I don't know how to operate these e-mail systems very well. The main point I want to make is about the importance of the multifaceted beauty of such areas as Carpenter's Park in our living space, and the spaces of all the residents around this lake. In principle, I suppose the people, like you, who oversee our living spaces could have every tree and bush torn down and could force more construction, so we are crowded into tiny spaces. And we could our lives pounding on computers and watching stupid TV programs, no longer enjoying the natural world that we love. And then when we got tired of trying to live like some kinds of heartless robots we could kill ourselves and let someone else move into our houses. A lot of people, I'm sure, would benefit financially. But my wife and I (a retired public-school teacher and a retired professor) have a more realistic and perhaps old-fashioned view of what life is all about, and if the beauty of the natural world that surrounds on us on this lake were somehow taken from us, I think we would find life no longer worth living. But this is what has been done in a much smaller way when the people of Carpenter's Park have been allowed to destroy their natural area, motivated by nothing but greed and stupidity. We--and I'm sure many other residents of this area--beg you impose proper restrictions on building and the destruction of this area's natural beauty.	Long Lake
286	10/22/21	Tom	Solberg	For over four years now, I’ve been trying to follow and keep abreast of the proposed updates to the Thurston County Shorelines Management Plan. While many of the features of the plan don’t affect me, there are still a number of things that tend to give me heartburn. After many meetings which were attended by me and other interested stakeholders – the lakeside property owners – too many of these issues keep rearing their ugly heads as if they had never been addressed at all by those of us who have the greatest interest in its impact. Probably the biggest issue has to do with shoreline setbacks. My house, which is still on the original Holmes Family homestead on Long Lake and originally built by Albin Holmes son Edwin with a lot of help – I am told-- from Billy Frank Jr. will suddenly find itself “legally non-conforming”. The setback will be changed from 50 ft to 75 ft. At the very helpful meeting with Long Lake Management District property owners and Andrew Deffobis of the county planning staff, the question was asked why this is necessary. The old answer “follow the science” was pretty well discredited when there was no available “science” offered. It would seem that this a requirement that can apparently be attributed to pure inertia. At any rate, it seems to make no ecological sense. At the very least, the existing homes should not have their designation changed to anything but “conforming” and there is no need to increase the buffer to the lake by 50%. Another area which gives me heartburn has to do with docks. As nearly as I can figure by reading the preliminary document, virtually all future docks shall effectively be constructed like piers – This will make any construction so prohibitably expensive that those docks that are currently on the lakes will ultimately decay to the point that they will be dangerous, ugly, and essentially nonfunctional. Ultimately, only VERY well-to-do residents will be able to afford one. This I don’t believe is consistent with the idea that lakeside property will be protected for recreational use. While there are other issues that I’m not terribly happy about, I have attempted to summarize my two main concerns since I don’t want them to get lost in a whole bunch of “static”.	Long Lake

Thurston County Shoreline Master Program Open House and 10/20/21 PC Public Hearing Comments

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment	Affiliation / Geo. Area
287	10/22/21	Meredith and Donovan	Rafferty	I provided comment at the SMP Hearing on October 20, 2021. We wanted to clarify that the attached comments submitted earlier on October 19th by email are in support of my testimony. When providing my comments to the Planning Commission, please include the attached comments. I did find the Zoom format intimidating, facing only a looming view of a time counter ticking away in red and no view on the screen of the Planning Commission whom I was addressing. Attachment 1, Letter dated Oct. 19, 2021 re: Over-regulating daily activities in using our properties (Comment #205) Attachment 2, Letter dated Oct. 19, 2021 re: Standardize evaluations of "environmental limitations" a broad criteria for Rural Conservancy (Comment #204)	Boston Harbor
288	10/22/21	Carol	Porter	Maintain Carpenter Park on Long Lake designated as RUAL not residential. I have lived directly across from Carpenter Part for 32 years. I have witnessed the wildlife that live in and amongst the trees of this natural habitat. How can this gem be taken from the wildlife that lives there? Last year when the tree removal process began to clear the property at Carpenter Park, four Bald Eagles flew around the park and my home for weeks. It was clear the Eagles were in distress. How can the County consider extending a setback buffer on lake front property in the name of conservation yet allow Carpenter Park to be designated Residential and destroy an existing natural habitat? Do not re-designate Carpenter Park. It is up to you to protect the wildlife that live in Carpenter Park and maintain this natural habitat.	Long Lake
289	10/22/21	Esther	Kronenberg	Esther Kronenberg and Suzanne Kline for Citizens for a Clean Black Lake. When you go to your Grandmother's house and she offers you food, you say yes, thank you, not only because you want to eat, but because you know it will make your Grandmother happy. But if you went to her house and raided the refrigerator without asking, you would be acting badly and hurting your Grandmother too. You would be taking without giving anything back. That's what our policy of "no net loss" is doing to our common Grandmother who provides everything we need to sustain ourselves - our land, our water and its abundance. We take whatever we can get but we forget to give back. What has been the result? There are 500 species in danger in Washington State. In Budd Inlet, the shorebird population has been reduced by 95% of what it was just 20 years ago when you could see 100's of them. Now you see almost none. Chinook, coho and steelhead populations in Puget Sound have declined by up to 90% over the past 40 years. LOTT is finding dangerous cancer-causing chemicals and medications in ground and surface waters and even in its highly treated reclaimed water, including x-ray contrast agents, 1,4-dioxane, and flame retardants which persist after treatment. We can't get rid of them. Every day they're going into the water we and our children drink. The reclaimed water still has 63 chemicals in it, 22 residual chemicals left in surface waters and 16 in the groundwater. And though there are thousands of these chemicals in use, many of which are toxic in tiny amounts of parts per billion, we have only tested for 127, so we know there are many more dangerous chemicals getting into our water supply. The Black Lake Special District annually applies diquat, a chemical similar to paraquat that causes Parkinson's disease, and other herbicides into the strategic groundwater reservation for the State Capital and no one is testing for them. This is in addition to the low dissolved oxygen, high temperatures, high coliform bacteria and algae blooms that are becoming more and more the new normal in our natural water bodies. A whole section of southern Budd Inlet is already a dead zone where only jellyfish can survive. In response to this emergency, the Department of Ecology is in the midst of issuing a new permit to control excess nitrogen from stormwater runoff and wastewater treatment plants in the Sound that are causing algae blooms and low dissolved oxygen that kill off all marine life. Add to this shoreline erosion caused by the construction of bulkheads that decreases habitat, the increase of impervious surfaces, and the projected calamitous effects of climate change, and we are putting more of our marine, estuarine and nearshore ecosystems at risk. We are poisoning the bloodstream of our collective body. This is urgent. How much more proof do we need that No net loss is really a HUGE loss and that we can't continue to take without giving back? When will we stop acting on the made up belief that we can do whatever we want with land because we own it and face up to the fundamental reality of nature that clearly shows that if we fail to take care of and give back to the land, it won't be able to take care of us. I urge you to adopt Net Ecological Gain to replace no net loss and begin the healing we desperately need to preserve our common heritage and source of prosperity. Without clean water, what will your property be worth? Please consider the facts, and resolve to act with courage and conviction to stop the accelerating descent into this environmental degradation that is threatening the habitats and lives of all beings, including us. Thank you for your consideration.	Black Lake
290	10/22/21	Kelly	Putsker	Hi Andy. This is Kelly from Long Lake. I am interested in supporting all who would be interested in keeping carpenter Union Park a wildlife conservation and natural area as has been all along. There are eagles nest over there which are finally becoming a bit more bountiful.. The deer have lived there for all these years and have been chased out of everywhere else. IF it becomes residential. Not only would it be destroying the natural habitat for the turtles and the fish ducks nutria edt.. with the extra activity the beautiful and purposeful trees would be gone and the water quality will decline again. I hope my thoughts are considered.. thank you for your time.	Long Lake
291	10/22/21	Melanie	Bissey	As a long term resident of Long Lake, I ask that you please change the Shoreline Environmental Designation (SED) for Carpenter's Park on Long Lake from Shoreline Residential to either Rural Conservancy or Natural. I daily observe wildlife using the area for food, refuge and safety. I've seen Eagles and Osprey as well as other birds landing in the trees and hunting in the water along the channel. The shoreline with all the trees is an important location for small fish and other wildlife to have refuge. I've watched many hours of multiple different species of ducks, canadian geese and trumpeter swans hunt in the area. The forested area also supports a large number of deer as well as other wildlife. It would be a great loss to the wildlife in the Long Lake area if this valuable parcel of shoreline was cleared. As well as the value to the environment and the humans that use the lake. Please protect this valuable and one of the last natural shoreline parcels. Protect it by designating it a natural or rural conservancy. This is important for the future of the area. Thank you so much for memorialising my comments in the SMP Public Hearing,	Long Lake
292	10/22/21	Andre	Bisset	As I type this email, I have the good fortune to observe flocks of amazing waterbirds swimming, eating and raising their young in the area of Carpenter Park. I have lived across from this beautiful, natural area for many years. It is one of the last areas of undeveloped land on a lake full of man-made landscapes. I have seen so many varieties of wildlife activity from my windows, that I got a book to try and identify the sheer amount of diversity that depends on this natural, undeveloped section of land for their welfare and survival. This area is critical to maintaining these precious and irreplaceable flora and fauna. The trees lining the shoreline of carpenter park are a sanctuary for osprey, bald eagles and enumerable migratory birds. The area of natural grass land lining the shores of the park are a favourite area for fishermen. The fish congregate and thrive in the grass and untouched shoreline of the parkland. I've personally seen the big bass and trout that call this natural area..home. I'll admit that I am a dichotomy. I make my living in construction and land development. I have seen the effects that a bulldozer and excavator have on a pristine forest, waterline, and a natural area. As a person who has been on the "front line" of over-development and encroachment, who better to implore the committee to spend a few minutes reflecting on the human impact of allowing more development on this precious and limited natural area of land. I invite one and all to spend a few minutes to observe the natural environment around them and especially around the lakes of Lacey. Please protect this natural area by designating it as a natural or rural conservancy. Thank you for your time and consideration,	Long Lake
293	10/22/21	Carol Jo	Hargreaves	Andrew, yesterday I sent you feedback regarding the draft Thurston County SMP a long with several questions and comments. Subsequently, in continuing to look at the SED map, I discovered two more interesting things: 1. My brother's property at 2607 Mayes Road SE, Lacey (Long Lake) is currently designated Rural. The proposed designation is Shoreline Residential. He owns 1.05 acres and 80 feet of waterfront. Our house, located at 2526 Carpenter Road SE, Olympia (Long Lake) is currently designated Rural. The proposed designation is Aquatic and Shoreline Residential. We own 1.27 acres and 50 feet of waterfront. Please help me understand the difference in SED designations for basically similar properties on the same lake. 2. There is a large, wooded bluff area approximately midway on the east side of Long Lake known locally as "Carpenter Park" because it originally was owned by the Carpenters Union and used as a weekend recreation area for union members. It was (and still is) a heavily wooded area with a cleared campground at the top of the bluff, a small house for the caretaker, a small dock, beach and swimming area at the lake shore. The property (Tax Parcel ID # 11826240100) is currently designated Rural. Its proposed designation is Aquatic, Shoreline Residential. There is no need for a change in the SED designation. The property should continue as Rural (or possibly even be changed to Natural). The approximately 15-acre park area is the largest woodland area left on Long Lake and is home for eagles, osprey, deer, raccoon and many types of water fowl. (By the way, we enjoyed watching an eagle soar over the park's trees on Friday, October 15, while out on the lake in our boat.). No one has lived in the park area, except maybe the caretaker, since the property's purchase by the Carpenters Union in the early 1950s. Recreational use stopped entirely after the Carpenters Union went bankrupt and the park was closed. I am suspicious the new SED designation is a way to open the door to development of the property. I am concerned that increased human activity would put significant additional pressure on the lake and its shoreline, cause erosion of the bluff, disrupt the riparian and nesting areas, damage the vegetation and adversely impact the overall ecology of Long Lake. I appreciate your consideration of my input. I hope you and/or the Planning Commissioners will answer my questions and will reconsider keeping the SED designation of Tax Parcel ID # 11826240100 Rural (or change it to Natural).	Long Lake

Thurston County Shoreline Master Program Open House and 10/20/21 PC Public Hearing Comments

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment	Affiliation / Geo. Area
294	10/22/21	Kevin	Ingley	As a shoreline resident of Long Lake, I take great pride in maintaining my property and have great interest in how other properties on the lake are maintained for the beauty and enjoyment of us all. I also have a financial interest in maintaining and growing my property value, which is also impacted by how others maintain their property around the lake. I understand there is a proposed change of 11.6 acre Parcel #11826240100 to Shoreline Residential. With the recent changes/activity over there and all the recent community concerns about over-building around the lake, devastating algae blooms, and the potential for that much more adverse environmental impacts such as sewage, fertilizers, and other negative impacts on the lake, I suggest this property should be changed to Natural or Rural Conservancy. As much as there are differences of opinion on other SMP items, I'd imagine maintaining this large parcel of land as Natural or Rural Conservancy is something we all can agree to.	Long Lake
295	10/22/21	Henry	Kappert	<i>See Original Comment for Attached Images</i> My wife, Mary Lyn, and I have lived on Long Lake since 1976 and love our home and the waterfront environment of all of Washington, but, specifically, Thurston County. Mary Lyn worked a lot with Thurston County Development staff doing permitting work while we had our construction business, and we had good working relationships with many of the permitting staff. It was apparent, however, that there was far more confusion caused by the process than necessary and the ordinary citizen could not navigate the confusing requirements, and the processes were not always consistent from staff member to staff member. It is good to clarify and make the process more user friendly. It should not be a necessity for a property owner to hire a permit professional, at great expense to navigate the system, and the regulations should be clear to all staff so that the process is not as subjective. I have constructed piers and floats on lakes and marine environments for over 30 years. In reviewing Chapter 600 it is obvious that you did not work with individuals/stakeholders in my industry to develop reasonable standards. Following are my general comments: 1. A 4 ft float/pier (dock) is unsafe. The minimum width should be 6 ft with an allowance to go to 8 ft. However, it should be 8 ft with an option to go to 6 ft. You never know when a person with mobility issues would be present. 2. There is conflicting evidence on the need for grating on docks. Pick your expert and you will get an answer. Some say it is needed in the marine environment and some say it is not. At the minimum, It shouldn't be required on non-salmonoid lakes. 3. There are basic float/pier (dock) designs that could be incorporated into the SMP via the pamphlet you have promised to produce along side the SMP. Attached are drawings for those basic docks. By including these drawings in the pamphlet you could allow administrative approval if designed and build in accordance with these drawings. 4. Joint docks should not be a requirement or even mentioned in the SMP. I have constructed a number of joint docks and they cause nothing but problems between neighbors. 5. A provision needs to be made to allow for the depth of the water on lakes as it is in the Marine environment. In some of our eutrophic lakes, you may need to go out past the 50 ft limit to get a depth adequate for a boat to be moored. There should be a depth allowance in this chapter in relation to dock length. 6. In the draft SMP 19.500.100 Permit Application Review and Permits, Section C Exemptions from Substantial Development Permits #4 "...shall not require SDPs" subsection h. Construction of a dock...This exemption applies if..., ii. In fresh waters, the fair market value of the dock does not exceed: \$22,500 for docks that are constructed to replace existing docks, are of equal or lesser square footage than the existing dock being replaced; or (A) \$11,200 for all other docks constructed in fresh water." The question is, why should not all freshwater docks be exempt to the \$22,500 valuation to encourage construction using the highest quality materials and be judged by the size of the project and NOT the dollar value of the project. It is a given that materials increase in cost, hence the size of a project, not the dollar cost, should be the determining factor in the permit process. I could have provided additional expert input had the industry leaders been given the opportunity to participate in the development of the standards.	Long Lake
296	10/22/21	Mary Lyn	Kappert	In reviewing the issues related to Long Lake, I became alarmed when I learned of the SED of the former Carpenter Park, parcel #11826240100. It is presently designated as Rural, but proposed as Shoreline Residential. I disagree with the change and would think it should be Natural, as is proposed for the close-by Kirby Island. We have lived on Long Lake since 1976 and have watched the continuing development along the lake...the removal of trees following the big ice storm many years ago and the construction of huge homes on the shoreline. Carpenter Park is a reminder of the historic rural atmosphere of the area and the last natural environment for many animals and birds, as well as fish. I support the SED of Natural, or at minimum Rural Conservancy for that area. Thank you for all of your hard work in this process and I wish you all the best as you move forward with it. As was said the other night at the Hearing, we home owners and lake users love the lake the most and want to see it protected. In this case, from over development and destruction of the last true natural waterfront environment on Long Lake.	Long Lake
297	10/22/21	Karin	Strelhoff	<i>Repeat of Comment #A5</i>	Thurston Conservation District
298	10/22/21	Anne	Van Sweringen	<i>Repeat of Attachment from Comment #230</i>	Thurston Environmental Community Stakeholders
299	10/22/21	John	Woodford	<i>Repeat of Attachment from Comment #64</i>	Chair, Thurston County Shoreline Stakeholders Coalition
300	10/22/21	Bob	Jensen	<i>See original letter (Submitted in Image Format)</i> Summer 2013 Issue of Pipeline newsletter – Phosphorus and Onsite Wastewater Systems	
301	10/22/21	Joel	Waters	<i>Repeat of Comment #240 and #302</i>	Summit Lake
302	10/22/21	CJ	Russo	<i>Repeat of Comment #240</i>	Summit Lake
A1	10/18/21	Ryan	Andrews	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the update to Thurston County's Shoreline Master Program. This comment is being provided for the Thurston County Planning Commission public hearing on Wednesday, October 20th. City of Lacey Community and Economic Development staff supports the proposed buffer width of 50 feet along freshwater lakes within the Shoreline Residential environment (Page 57 of 427 buffer widths, 1.a.) in lieu of the 75-foot alternative. The 50-foot buffer requirements is consistent with the City of Lacey's buffer widths along freshwater lakes within the Shoreline Residential environment. Within the Lacey Urban Growth Area, this buffer regulation would apply to both Pattison and Long Lakes—both of which are regulated under the Lacey Master Program for those properties in the city limits as well as the Thurston County Master Program for properties in the unincorporated county. Having this consistency will ensure that adjacent properties that may be located in different jurisdictions will develop consistently. Additionally, having the same buffer regulations will improve consistency if unincorporated properties are annexed. Thank you again for the opportunity to comment. Please let me know if you have any questions.	City of Lacey Community and Economic Development

Thurston County Shoreline Master Program Open House and 10/20/21 PC Public Hearing Comments

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment	Affiliation / Geo. Area
A2	10/13/21	Noll	Steinweg	<p><i>See original letter and attachments for reference (Too long to copy below)</i></p> <p>The Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) has reviewed the provided project materials and offers the following comments at this time, other comments may be offered in the future. WDFW appreciates the SMP focus on habitat protection and public access to shoreline areas which support fish and wildlife recreational activities- values shared with our agency. After reviewing the SMP draft, WDFW staff noted several language suggestions, WAC citation suggestions, and miscellaneous notes. These 21 comments are included as embedded comments in the attached PDF. Thank you for the opportunity to review these materials and please let us know if we can be of further assistance.</p> <p>Summary of Embedded Comments: C1: For the definition of critical saltwater habitats, WDFW suggests additionally citing WAC 220-660-320 to address species and habitats not covered by 173-26-221 such as feeder bluffs and rockfish settlement areas. C2: For the definition of dock, WDFW Suggests that you borrow language from WAC 220-660-140(1) and WAC 220-660-380(1) to better define these structures and their intended uses. C3: For the definition of Ecologically intact, WDFW suggests that this is changed to "highly" instead of "totally" since some ecological function may remain even in extremely degraded sites/systems. C4: WDFW suggests that eelgrass is defined by the genus Zostera. C5: WDFW suggests defining kelp as macroalgae in the order Laminariales. C6: WDFW suggests adding "recreational use" to the definition list. C7: WDFW suggests using the larger buffer option to more closely align with recent best available science outlined in WDFW's 2020 "Riparian Ecosystems, Volume 2: Management Recommendations": https://wdfw.wa.gov/publications/01988 C8: WDFW suggests that if net pens and rafts are located close to shore (within 500 feet) they should be located to avoid kelp beds, eelgrass, etc. to avoid impacts from shade and nutrient fallout. C9: WDFW suggests that temporal losses in function are also addressed during reclamation. C10: WDFW suggests that dock restrictions remain on Natural shoreline designation to protect sensitive marine embayments, pocket estuaries, salt marsh, and lake fringe wetland habitats. C11: WDFW suggests that the requirement for considering alternative moorage remains. Buoys should be considered as an alternative to reduce nearshore and beach impacts. C12: WDFW suggests that language is used from WAC 220-660-140(3) and WAC 220-660-380 to address grating requirements. Applicants will need to meet one of these WACs for their HPA. Exceptions and alternatives to these WACs are assessed on a case by case basis and are best handled with early and often communication to WDFW concerning hydraulic permitting approvals. C13: WDFW suggests that the requirement for assessment remains, and that each project is assessed individually for impacts to fish life. WDFW suggests early and often communication to WDFW concerning state HPA application/hydraulic code requirements, in order to reduce the possibility of conflicts with local permitting requirements. C14: WDFW suggests that WAC 220-660-340 is referenced in Critical Salwater Habitats Standards which outlines the requirements of WDFW's forage fish spawning surveys. C15: WDFW suggests following the adjacency guidance outlined in the June 15, 2017 "NEW GUIDANCE REGARDING HYDRAULIC PROJECT APPROVAL (HPA) PROVISIONS FOR THE PROTECTION OF INTERTIDAL FORAGE FISH SPAWNING BEDS" guidance document which has no adjacency distances for documented surf smelt (after spawning beach segments were expanded around 2017) but does offer an adjacency definition for sand lance of 2080 feet from the midpoint of a documented sand lance spawning beach. Guidance attached. C16: WDFW suggests a maximum of 6' pier width per 220-660-380(4)(b)</p>	WDFW
A3	10/20/21	Jessica	Jackson	<p><i>See Original Comment for Full Text (Too long to copy below)</i></p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) appreciates the opportunity to participate in Thurston County's Shoreline Master Program update and Planning Commission Public Hearing. PSE provides both electrical and natural gas service to Thurston County. PSE does have utility infrastructure within the shoreline jurisdictions that include linear electrical and natural gas facilities (both aerial and below ground), as well as service lines to homes, businesses and other water-dependent uses. I have reviewed the proposed updates to the Shoreline Code and would like to submit the attached comments for your consideration. Please feel free to contact me to discuss anything further. Thurston County SMP Draft Update, PSE Comments:</p> <p>Section 19.150.765 Structure, The term "structure" as defined is broad enough to include utility poles, even though there is a definition for utilities under 19.150.795. In parts of the SMP, there is a proposed 35 foot height restriction for structures, therefore clarification is needed that utility poles are exempted from this height limit or that utility poles are not included in the Structure definition. More detailed comments are outlined below.</p> <p>Section 19.300.105 Critical Areas and Ecological Protection (D) This policy seeks to reduce the amount of plastic debris entering water bodies, and states that permitted uses are encouraged to limit the use of plastics. Please note that the standard material used for many types of utility conduit is plastic. Also many of the most frequently used erosion control BMPs contain plastics. However, the use of plastics for these purposes would not add substantially to the amount of debris entering water bodies.</p> <p>Section 19.300.145 (D) Transportation and Utilities, It is proposed that Policy SH-54 states that Transportation and utility projects should, instead of shall, incorporate public access. PSE supports this change since public access may not be compatible with utility corridors. In addition, utilities typically do not own the corridors in fee, so often do not have the right to authorize public access. PSE Suggests adding a qualifier to this section.</p> <p>Suggestion - "Transportation and utility projects should incorporate public access, where practicable and consistent with the utility's underlying property right."</p> <p>19.400.100 Existing Development, The county is soliciting public comments specifically on the approach for identifying nonconforming structures, lots and uses. PSE has facilities that frequently fall into this category, based on the age and nature of our system. Essential public utilities that pre-date the Shoreline Management Act should be allowed to remain within Shoreline jurisdiction, since they either serve water-dependent uses, are linear facilities that have no option but to cross Shoreline areas, or have no practicable alternative. Facilities such as substations (or the equivalent for other utilities such as natural gas, water, etc.) should be allowed to perform necessary repairs, maintenance and upgrades without the need for discretionary approvals (e.g. Variance) when such repair, maintenance or upgrade minimizes expansion of the development in the Standard Buffer to the extent practicable.</p> <p>19.400.100 (B) Existing Structures, In section 1.b it states that nonconforming structures may continue and may be remodeled, repaired or maintained in accordance with the Act. Based on the definition of "normal repair", replacement of structures (if utility poles are included in the definition of structures) would be included.</p> <p>Suggestion - Have this section refer to the defined term "normal repair" to clarify that replacement of non-conforming structures and utility infrastructure is allowed.</p> <p>Suggestion - In section 1.c and 1.d, the height limitations pose a severe restriction on PSE's ability to replace poles. Based on the stated height limitation of 35 feet, many of PSE's distribution and all of the transmission pole replacements would be prohibited. The listed height is not achievable under current National Electrical Safety Code. PSE distribution poles carry power from bulk transmission lines to neighborhoods and homes at a voltage below 55 kV. The general operating pole height for a distribution pole is 45 feet. Pole heights can vary based upon site specific circumstances; however 35 feet is not a standard or generally feasible operating height for PSE's distribution poles. Transmission poles carry bulk power and require taller clearances than distribution poles. Transmission pole heights generally range from 60 to 100</p>	PSE

Thurston County Shoreline Master Program Open House and 10/20/21 PC Public Hearing Comments

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment	Affiliation / Geo. Area
A4	10/22/21	Sarah	Moorehead	<p>BUFFER WIDTHS & USES: A site-specific management approach to conservation allows the ability to achieve multiple objectives simultaneously. Similar to the principles in Thurston County's Voluntary Stewardship Program, individualized, flexible and incentivized management plans that allow for dialogue with landowners/operators achieve more success in habitat restoration. Individual stewardship plans could be used for site-specific custom conservation in buffer lands.</p> <p>We have for some time recognized conservation grazing as a practice to help restore habitat. (https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/national/programs/?cid=nrcs144p2_027164) This is particularly true in areas of Oregon Spotted Frog (which have very different habitat requirements from salmonids). Customized management plans allow for targeting different needs to increase ESA listed species habitat.</p> <p>Incorporating a blended approach of natives and non-native perennial production species (fruit and nut trees and shrubs) to buffers allows for an economic offset of lost production ground for agricultural producers and increases local food production. Recommendation: Allow for flexible buffer widths, with established minimums. Develop site-specific management plans for agricultural lands with allowable uses that are relevant to the individual site conditions (such as flash grazing or agroforestry). Incentivize excellent stewardship - voluntary installation of bigger buffers receive compensation, tax benefits, etc.</p> <p>ABANDONMENT PERIOD: The abandonment period in the SMP is particularly problematic. Agriculture is a preferred land use type to others (industrial, residential, commercial) in our critical areas. Encouraging this land use, particularly in larger acreages is ideal for continuing effective management of critical areas. In addition, as Thurston County plans for its future in a changing climate, with an increasing population (and increased pressure on its natural resources), the luxury of planning with a single-issue focus is long gone. Integrated plans that achieve multiple benefits (increasing food security and access, preserving agricultural lands, strengthening the local economy, improving public health, restoring wildlife habitat, etc.) will not only empower the local community to steward their land wisely, but ensure a thriving community for generations to come. The likelihood that an abandonment period would result in a positive impact appear miniscule in comparison to the potential negative impacts, such as: loss of farmland, encouraging parcel subdivision and development - thereby decreasing habitat, reducing local food security, and hurting local family-owned businesses. Recommendation: Remove abandonment period entirely from SMP.</p> <p>'NEW' AGRICULTURE: Meeting no net loss of ecological functions of the shorelines – might not require that new agriculture is subject to immediate buffer provisions. New agriculture should be encouraged to increase the amount of food grown locally (increasing security and reducing climate impacts) and maintain open space and habitat. Agricultural land uses remain the preferred land use type to industrial, commercial and even residential - particularly in critical habitat areas. Recommendation: Codify 'new' agriculture under the same rules and regulations as existing agriculture. Do not increase regulations on 'new' or future agriculture through the SMP.</p>	Thurston Conservation District
A5	10/22/21	Karin	Strelloff	<p><i>See Original Comment for Attached Letter (Too Long To Copy Below)</i></p> <p>I really apologize for taking so long to review the SMP draft and share comments regarding the proposed update. Unfortunately time got away from me and I only realized that tonight is the deadline for comments (so of course now I am submitting via my personal email at home on Friday night. Apparently there's nothing like a pending deadline to mobilize me!) Again, apologies.</p> <p>A few thoughts on the below comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•If you would like to discuss any of this in person or via a phone call, just let me know. Please feel welcome to call my Thurston CD cell phone at 360-972-4565.•For document locations, I refer to the section and/or page numbers on the bottom of the document pages rather than to the pdf pages.•I will try to note comments in red. My observations tend to fall into these categories:<ul style="list-style-type: none">oClarification might be needed (This means I wasn't clear about something, but my confusion might be a result of the fact that I was speeding through this immense document on a Friday night and missed info. Or there might be a problem to consider with the wording)oPersonal Comment as Karin Strelloff, Thurston County ResidentoCD Comment (from perspective of Thurston Conservation District shoreline specialist)oCorrection: - if something needs to be changed or will be inaccurate/misleading <p>Okay, here we go:</p> <p>Definitions Section</p> <p>p 13 / 19.150.400 Hard Surface: An impervious surface, a permeable pavement, or a vegetated roof</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•Clarification - in my professional experience "hard surfaces" typically refer to impervious surfaces like roofs/pavement/asphalt etc. In contrast, permeable pavement or vegetated roofs are considered to be pervious or permeable surfaces - water can infiltrate through them. My point of reference is stormwater management. I would suggest checking this definition with stormwater experts in house to make sure you are defining it the way you want.•Clarification - the words "shoreline armor" and the word "armoring" are used at various points in the document. You might want to include a definition of shoreline "armor" in relation to shoreline modification - either under the definition of "bulkhead" or as an interchangeable term or as a stand alone word/phrase needing definition (Shoreline armoring = see bulkhead definition) . Or maybe it's there and I just missed it. <p>P 38, F. Policy SH-12 Shoreline processes, both freshwater and marine, that should be protected to support the above functions include, but are not limited to the delivery, loss and movement of sediment etc....</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•CD Comment ***wish this language was not struck. Shoreline processes such as sediment deposition in the marine environment are critical. It seems important to reflect the importance of coastal processes for ecological function in the marine nearshore, and to try to preserve these processes to the greatest extent possible. I would encourage this topic somehow. <p>P 39, B. Policy SH-16 Shoreline landowners are encouraged to preserve and enhance native woody vegetation and native groundcovers to stabilize soils and provide habitat. When shoreline uses or modifications require a planting plan, maintaining native plant communities, replacing noxious weeds and avoiding installation of ornamental plants are preferred. <i>Unless approved by the Director or their designee, nonnative vegetation is prohibited within critical areas, their buffers, and associated setbacks.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•CD Comment *** While I understand and agree with the intent of the last line in italics, I have some concern about a blanket prohibition regarding the use of non-native species, especially in the face of climate change. There are scenarios where the use of nonnative species (but not invasive nonnative species) can in fact benefit habitat and might be advantageous to plant in setback areas - such as installing drought-	Thurston Conservation District