

Thurston County BOCC Shoreline Master Program Public Hearing
Written Public Comments Matrix

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment Summary (View Individual Comment Letters For Full Text & Attachments)	Affiliation / Geo. Area
1	10/25/21	Tom	Goldsby	Hi Andy, Thanks for your help. Hopefully, our efforts will result in a more appropriate designation "Shoreline Residential".	Deschutes River
2	10/26/21	Patty	May	I'm writing to let you know that I live on Black Lake and the quality of life is very poor here, because of the way we honor boaters rights and not the environment, spotted frogs and shoreline birds etc! I am very much in support of limiting boaters rights, which are almost never even enforced by the Thurston county sheriff as far as I can tell!! Thank you Esther Kronenberg and Suzanne Kline for your wonderful letter. I applaud your efforts, and hope that Thurston county starts to value our resources and protect our shorelines.	Black Lake
3	10/26/21	James	Chaloner	My name is James Chaloner, my family has had lake front property on Lawrence Lake since 1965, I want to let you know that I support the 5 items below and ask your support in getting these done. 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
4	10/28/21	Glenn	Schorno	In organic farming, it takes 3+ years to transition ground from conventional to organic. As you probably know, during the transition period, no herbicides or pesticides may be used. A common and least expensive way to transition ground is to till the ground and put a low cost grass in and then let it sit for three years and then start planting the following spring. If you planted your transitional biannual cover crop in late summer, it would essentially put you 3 years and 8 mo.+/- from going back into that field. Yet another reason to get rid of the 2 year "use it or lose it" rule.	Yelm
5	10/28/21	Lee	Riner	We must protect our shorelines in Thurston County, for future generations. The construction of bulkheads should not be allowed. We know that bulkhead effect the habitat. We know that bulkheads effect the plants in the water, the flora. Bulkheads decrease habitat. They should not be allowed. We should not allow residents to continue to improve their "Grandfather-in Bulkheads". We should not allow impervious surfaces near shorelines. For example, in Budd Inlet, the shorebird population has been reduced drastically. Now you see almost no birds. The fish stock, the Chinook, coho and steelhead populations in Puget Sound have declined. There are several possible reasons for this, but shoreline habitat issues are involved. Our wastewater facility, the billion dollar LOTT plant, is finding chemicals in our rivers, in our water. They find cancer-causing chemicals and medications in ground and surface waters. Highly treated reclaimed water, from LOTT is pumped into Puget Sound, this also effect the health of our Budd Inlet. This also effects the habitat in Puget Sound. All of these issues degrade the habitat. The plastic from oyster beds and goeduck farms destroy the habitat. These farms should not be allowed in Puget Sound. They should not be allowed on our shorelines. There should be a 100 foot buffer from real estate development, and our water bodies. This shoreline is an important buffer for the water quality, for the shoreline habitat. Please help us preserve our beautiful Puget Sound. Please help us preserve our shorelines.	Puget Sound
6	10/29/21	Linda	Wolfe	Andrew, I enjoyed learning more about setbacks and rezoning but much seems to be at the whim of the people doing the restructure? The Carpenter's Union park however needs to have the new rezoning as the people who purchased it have had it zoned to 38 homes. If that happens the eagle, green herons and other wildlife will lose their habitat. I think John Woodford has shown you pictures of the lovely forested hill to the lake property. To keep the area in this condition, with 38 more houses polluting the lake should be in everyone's best interest. Thanks for listening.	Long Lake
7	11/1/21	Barry	Halverson	Andrew, as you know this came up several times during the public hearing. Here are a few questions: 1. Is the Inventory and Characterization Report (Appendix A to the SMP) part of the SMP or not? a. If it is, how can the SMP be sent to the BoCC without it being vetted by the planning commission? b. How can it be sent to the BoCC with obvious errors in the report being corrected? 2. The Inventory and Characterization Report is dated June 30, 2013: a. Is it an approved document? b. If it is, when and who approved it? c. If not, when and who will approve it? 3. If it is has not been approved by the BoCC, and I can find no previous vote from the BoCC that approved it, how can the permits department use this report to deny, require mitigation, etc. for permits until it is an approved document? 4. How can this report be used to update the GEODATA/GIS Data base, which I have shown you has already been done?	Lake Lawrence

Thurston County BOCC Shoreline Master Program Public Hearing
Written Public Comments Matrix

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment Summary (View Individual Comment Letters For Full Text & Attachments)	Affiliation / Geo. Area
8	11/18/21	Bob	Jensen	<p>I have testified previously at public hearings and submitted written comments to you and the Planning Commission, in which, I am seeking regular inspection and maintenance of septic systems on shoreline lakes. The purpose of this proposal is to control the increasing toxic blue-green algae blooms thereon. This is particularly egregious on County lakes because most of them are either completely or partially unsewered. Unfortunately, there is no reasonable probability these lakes will be served by sewers soon enough to reduce the current incidence of these algae blooms. These algae blooms regularly violate the state recreational standards. This has caused portions or all the lakes to be closed to public use, until the County Health Department determines the blooms no longer violate these standards.</p> <p>I attempted to testify about this major issue at tonight's hearing. However, as I more closely read the agenda, the public hearing aspect of the meeting, was not applicable to topics that had been covered previously in public hearings. I gather this included the Shoreline workshop, which started at 7:00 pm. This could explain why, although I successfully entered the Zoom meeting, I was unable to open the video, or use my computer camera in the meeting. Nonetheless, I was able to watch the entirety of the Shoreline workshop on my desktop computer. Most of this time was devoted to the Planning Commissioners and you discussing the public input and proposed changes to the master program. I did not hear a reference to the increasing incidence of, or control of toxic blue-green algae blooms, on County shoreline lakes. I intend to express my concern about this failing, either in the proposed master program amendments, or in your summary of public comments. I hope you will provide a public summary of all the proposed changes to the master program approved by most of those Commissioners present at tonight's meeting, and to which you agreed to pursue.</p> <p>There is currently no reference to the significant manifestations of toxic blue-green algae blooms in the County Master Program. This may be due to the fact they were not publicized until within the last few years. However, I believe it was because the County Health Department did not address the connection between these blooms and residential sewage until relatively recently. However, I do not understand your reluctance to address this issue in any public arena where I have been present. Nevertheless, I expect you to address this issue in the Planning Commission's further consideration of amendments to the master program. At the public hearing on the master program hearing in October, I orally testified. I submitted as an exhibit, the summer 2013 edition of the Pipeline, which I received from the County Health Department that year. It did so, after I first notified it and took samples of the blue-green algae bloom that occurred in the north end of the lake. Shortly after my sampling, I received a sign from the Health Department to post on the shoreline access of our development. I did. It warned all people at our dock, not to use the lake until further notice.</p> <p>(Please refer to comment letter #8 to review the remainder of this comment.)</p>	Pattison Lake
9	11/19/21	Carole	Mathews	<p>Thank you for the helpful information. I checked out the code for my zone, RL 1/1, and didn't find anything that addresses view protection. I am sure the structure across the street is exactly 35 feet so the protection from the SMP would not apply. I think it is kind of sad that one property (with a primary and an accessory structure) can either partially or completely obstruct the view of seven residences. Not that anything can be done about the property across the street now, but I am concerned about future growth in this area. I plan to write to the commissioners, but doubt it will have an impact. I really appreciate your time and all the information you have provided. Have a good weekend and a wonderful Thanksgiving!</p>	
10	11/24/21	Glenn	Schorno	<p>Regarding the topic brought up during the Ag committee of open space, farmers that own land zoned as agricultural in Thurston county do not want more restrictive time periods or penalties in order to remove the open space designation. They want flexibility. Restrictions result in lowering the value of the land. More restrictions will decrease farmer's ability to get farm financing translating into less farming and financial loss. Farms that are unprofitable are unsustainable.</p> <p><u>Comments made to the contrary we're not made by a farmer producing crops or a holder of agricultural zoned land.</u></p>	Yelm
11	12/1/2021	Frank	Hudik	<p>I'm a bit concerned about this one. While the shading of fish may have been a consideration in the past, it seems it is no longer per the diatribe I heard today. But another set of considerations now enter the picture if boathouses are allowed: construction materials, size limits, height limits, obstruction of a neighbor(s) view, HOAs building a Taj Majal, among others. I tried to raise my hand but wrong forum for public input. Perhaps the appropriate limitations will get vetted in the future if boathouses are allowed by a Permit process?</p>	
12	12/2/21	Bob	Jensen	<p>Thank you for your response. I appreciate your bringing this before the Planning Commission. Unfortunately, I am not convinced the Planning Commission is considering the inspection and maintenance of septic systems to protect against toxic algae blooms. The Shoreline Management Act (SMA) is not restricted from regulating these systems. These systems are part of residential development, which much be consistent with the policies of the SMA.</p> <p>You suggest I contact The Health Department, which is specialized in septic systems. It is a separate entity. It has failed to initiate this type of inspection requirement in the past due to lack of funding. Rather than have me contact the Health Department, I suggest you, as the Shoreline Administrator make that contact.</p> <p>My proposal is to place the burden upon the individual land owner to provide the County, annual assurances this inspection has been done, and provide the results of these inspections to the County Health Department. It would be the obligation of the Department to make a determination whether the septic system is contributing, or is likely to contribute phosphorous to the adjoining lake. This determination would then be submitted to the County official responsible for enforcement of the Shoreline Management Act and the County Shoreline Master Program. That person would take the appropriate measures to enforce this provision, to ensure the deficient septic system is repaired.</p> <p>The costs of this enforcement would be a county obligation under the Shoreline Management Act. Accordingly, it would become a part of the county budget. The lack of funding is no excuse for pardoning this increasing tragedy, which is not only harming our lakes; but is limiting the public use and enjoyment thereof, by both private owners and the public. We can afford no less than to halt these toxic algae blooms, as soon as possible.</p>	Pattison Lake

Thurston County BOCC Shoreline Master Program Public Hearing
Written Public Comments Matrix

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment Summary (View Individual Comment Letters For Full Text & Attachments)	Affiliation / Geo. Area
13	12/3/21	Anne	Van Sweringen	<p>Environmental stakeholder groups of Thurston County submitted a proposed SMP code amendment on November 15 to Maya Teeple, which she sent to you (attached). The code amendment is in regard to a part of the Shoreline Master Program Update.</p> <p>The three other attached documents, below, are a letter to the BoCC. The letter describes the proposed code amendment, followed by the 3-page proposed code amendment itself. On December 2, I sent the full letter to the assistants of the BoCC Commissioners, Mejia, Edwards, and Menser.</p> <p>Please Note: I made a very minor change in the proposed code amendment following the letter (not in the original): I added the titles to two heads of concerned groups (E. Kronenberg, Co-Chair; S. Patnude, Executive Director) that I had left off in the actual proposed code amendment.</p> <p>It is important that the BoCC attends to our letter and proposed code amendment as the Shoreline Master Program continues to be reviewed.</p> <p>(Please refer to comment letter #13 to view attachments.)</p>	
14	12/13/21	Howard	Glastetter	<p>I know time is past for written comments on the Shoreline Master Plan. However, my comment suggestions were unique on the Nisqually Valley part of this plan. I don't know of anyone else offered any Nisqually idea comments. I saw one complaint about being flooded by Tacoma Power Utility (TPU) in February 2021. That was it. Thurston County's Nisqually Valley is a unique treasure in Western Washington at this moment. It is positioned to improve or degrade in many ways, soon. Most citizens here are not aware of the pending issues. I think my official SMP comments of October 10th and 21st lay out serious ecological and financial issues and opportunities that should be considered.</p> <p>Holroyd Gravel Mine, in the lower valley, is positioning to be allowed to mine 100 feet below the water table in a lower valley wellhead protection area. This should not happen. Please note the last paragraph.</p> <p>TPU has no flood control responsibilities. Valley flood dangers could be mitigated with the stroke of a pen by adding some protections to TPU's Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) licenses. Instead, a FEMA study is positioning to give official support to this dangerous situation by changing the Nisqually Valley Migration Zones to be the same as the levels of the February 1996 flood. Even though that flood impacted three states, it could have been mitigated in Nisqually. Instead, TPU simply topped off the reservoir on the first day of a predicted three-day storm. The reservoir was seventeen feet below capacity at the start of that storm.</p> <p>The Olympian recently discussed an effort to spend 4.2 billion federal dollars to replace the current Nisqually River bridges to "protect against potential floods". There was no mention of a change to TPU's FERC license that could go a long way to offer almost as much protection as building much higher bridges across the Nisqually. Placing a train, bus, park-n-ride in the mined-out portion of Holroyd's pit would double the transportation options to get across the river to Pierce County military bases in an extended bridge emergency. Adequate safety could still be built into the replacement bridges, with enough left over for a Holroyd transportation hub.</p> <p>I hope my suggestions will be given serious consideration. I have been a Nisqually Valley resident formore than 50 years and care about where I live.</p>	Nisqually River
15	12/18/21	Howard	Glastetter	<p>Tacoma Power Utility (TPU) and Thurston County showed a high degree of cooperation in mitigating a potential November 2021 Nisqually flood. This, when most Western Washington rivers were already flooding. Thurston County requested and TPU released 4,600 cubic feet per second (cfs) (twice the generator capacity) for a day and a half before the storm. During the storm TPU was attempting to raise the release to 6,500 cfs or higher. Thurston County requested this be cut back, because the Mashel River tributary was adding 5,000 cfs below the dam. TPU complied. Moderate flooding was avoided. This showed TPU can mitigate lower valley flooding with little to no financial effect on their power generating bottom line.</p> <p>The rest of the story is that I emailed Thurston County prior to the storm and said TPU must let water out now due to very high NOAA forecasted inflows. TPU almost immediately complied. Later Ed Kenney contacted the county and said TPU must lower the increased outflow from the dam because of flood waters the Mashel was already adding to the Nisqually. Ed came to his conclusion via the McKenna USGS gauge.</p> <p>TPU appears to have a unique flood control standard. They mainly want to protect Alder Dam. They normally do not start flood mitigation until after a storm and any related snow melt begins. This way the reservoir ends as full as possible when the storm ends. The main goal appears to fill the reservoir to close to maximum with little thought of flood protection to the valley below. This may not violate their Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) license, but I find it unethical. It unnecessarily places life and property below the dam in flood season danger. An example of this technique can be found in the February 8, 1996, Nisqually flood of record. TPU had seriously flooded homes in the lower valley in late November 1995 just over 2 months earlier.</p> <p>So, this issue had to be in TPU's near term memory. The predicted three-day storm hit 2 days earlier (Feb. 6, 1996). The reservoir was 17' below capacity when the 1996 storm hit. The lower valley Nisqually River did not rise until a day and a half into the storm. TPU simply topped off the reservoir in the early part of the storm (i.e., no early evasive actions). The poetic justice to all this was that TPU not only seriously flooded the valley below the dam, but they also flooded their own La Grande generators just below the tune of \$20,000,000 damage.</p> <p>The recent flood of February 7, 2020, about which, I sent an official complaint to FERC had similarities to the 1996 flood. Thurston County has copies of my complaint. I think it is time to press FERC to build some safety into the TPU Alder Lake Dam license. TPU was given a 40-year license in 1998 that continues to allow them to act cavalierly towards the valley below. This was just two years after the 1996 flood. There was no opportunity for residents, who went through this flood, to comment or even know about this license renewal. That license should be changed to require reasonable safety protections to those who live in harm's way below the dam. Due to personal family circumstances, I find it necessary to ease away from my efforts in this area. I hope others can follow through on this issue.</p>	Nisqually River

Thurston County BOCC Shoreline Master Program Public Hearing
Written Public Comments Matrix

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment Summary (View Individual Comment Letters For Full Text & Attachments)	Affiliation / Geo. Area
16	12/23/2021	Barry	Halverson	<p>After reviewing the SMP sessions I have a couple comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There was comments about only three lakes in Thurston County that supported Salmon. Scott Lake, ? , Summit Lake. But Summit Lake didn't support Salmon. It had Kokanee, which is a land locked Atlantic Salmon. They are a fish that stays in the deepest parts of a lake. I can't imagine a grated dock being needed for Kokanee - makes no sense. If WDFW is supporting that I would like to know specifically who at WDFW is saying that? 2. The SMP needs to specify which (2) lakes of the 108 lakes in Thurston County support Salmon that would require grated docks. That will make it much easier for planners/staff/permits. Not doing that would be negligent and irresponsible. 3. There was more discussion on SED's. We at Long Lake, Lake Lawrence, Pattison Lake and Offut Lake support the hybrid option Doug Karman and Eric Casino recommended. 4. We also agree with the Planning Commissions suggestion regarding paragraph 19.400.100 Existing Development/Uses/Structures regarding conforming/nonconforming. 5. We also agree with the Planning Commissions suggestion to get rid of paragraphs 3 and 4 re: Pilings and Piers and go with HCP standards/wording. being too specific in this area could have a negative effect. 	Lake Lawrence
17	1/3/22	Phyllis	Farrell	I have been advocating for SMP regulations on industrial aquaculture practices..phasing out the use of plastics, the use of heavy equipment on fragile beaches, restricting the use of pesticides and herbicides and the use of hydraulic harvesting (without permits) disrupting substrate ecosystems. These practices may be factors affecting forage fish habitat, salmon and orca recovery. Thurston County shorelines have over 10,000 acres in aquaculture.	Puget Sound
18	1/5/22	Howard	Glastetter	<p>I passed a copy of that summary to you as a cc, when I added more details to it and resent it to Commissioner Edwards about a month later. The county sent post cards to people in Nisqually valley asking for SMP suggestions. That was what I responded to. Since there was a great deal about Channel Migration, Mining and Bridge Construction in the plan (and in my neighborhood); that's what I responded to. I believe that mine were the only comments on these -important to the valley- issues. Please note attachment.</p> <p>(Please refer to comment letter #18 to view attachments.)</p>	Nisqually River
19	1/13/22	Barry	Halverson	<p>Andrew, it would be very easy to say something like, "There are currently only three lakes in Thurston County that support salmon. Those lakes are: _____". These lakes are the only ones at this time that would require grated dock decking, etc... The SMP, as you have said, many times, is suppose to be a one stop shop for all things related to shorelines. Let's make it so.</p>	Lake Lawrence
20	1/27/22	Donovan & Meredith	Rafferty	<p>As property owners of shoreline in MBU 16-17, we are providing corrections to the discussion of the current conditions and status of the properties. In your January 19, 2022 presentation on shoreline designations, you said that it is important that the proposed new shoreline designations reflect existing shoreline conditions. The information about our properties is attached.</p> <p>Sincerely, Donovan and Meredith Rafferty 360-754-8510, John and Reita Marshall, Abby Ruskey, Chris and Dory Simmons, Allen Lebovitz, Kathryn and Patrick Townsend, Kathy Knight, Cynthia Walker and Larry Seale, David & Kim Phillips, Jeff Nejedly, Maribeth Duffy, Kurt & Lisbeth Sheafe</p> <p>(Please refer to comment letter #20 to view attachments.)</p>	Budd Inlet
21	2/24/22	Helen	Wheatley	<p>I am putting together a Thurston County Planning Commission Minority Report regarding the shoreline (SMP) zoning adjacent to Zangle, reaching westward around the point. I believe my son Adrian showed you the map of the area in question. Online I found a 2015 memo from Nisqually Reach Nature Center (Bobby Moody) to ProtectZangleCove.org that provides a detailed discussion of the presence of foraging and breeding Pigeon Guillemots and their significance. It also includes a link to the 2013 monitoring report. However, neither document provides usable location information. Could you possibly provide me with a fairly precise map or sketch of Zangle Cove area nesting and foraging locations and summary (or link to source) of more current survey data? This would not be to provide an opinion, but to assist with findings of fact.</p>	Budd Inlet
22	3/22/22	Melodye	Cosley	<p>Below is a copy of an email that I have submitted to our District 3 Commissioner and also cc'd all County Commissioners and staff. The email pertains to action taken at last Wednesday's meeting by the Planning Commission. I hope after reviewing this email, you will have a clear understanding of our position with regard to the actions taken by the Planning Commission, which affect our property on the north side of Green Cove. I also hope that you will help us to quickly correct the SED on our property, so that we are not forced to engage legal help.</p> <p>I am writing to ask for your help in resolving an issue created by the Thurston County Planning Commission's actions at their last meeting, on Wednesday, March 16, 2022. The issue involves the Planning Commission's preparation of the Shoreline Master Program (SMP) update and actions taken by the Commissioners that impacted our private property. The Planning Commission's action affected our property (APN 12933220400), which is located on the north side of Green Cove on the Eld Inlet. My husband and I are the sole owners of the property, and the property is vested in our family trust. To be clear, we received absolutely no notice that the Planning Commission would be considering any action regarding our property at this meeting. It was only when I went online, five days later, to check for upcoming SMP update meetings, that I discovered what had occurred. It was the last item on the evening's agenda and considered a request by an unidentified citizen to expand the "Natural" zoning designation in Green Cove. After an extensive review, the Planning Staff's recommendation to the Planning Commission was to: 1) only expand the "Natural" designation on the south side of Green Cove, where an existing HOA recreational park is located and 2) to re-align a small portion of the southeastern corner of the designation zones, so that they would follow property line boundaries. The Staff's recommendation was to designate the north shore (our property) as "Rural Conservancy", since it contained structures within the buffer zone and the natural habitat had been altered from its natural state. After some discussion over whether the property was privately held, the Planning Commission voted to approve a motion made by Commissioner Wheatly that would also designate our north shore property as "Natural".</p> <p>We believe this motion was completely inappropriate and the correct designation for our property should be "Rural Conservancy", as was recommended in the Staff report. As defined in the Shoreline Environment Designation (SED) Criteria: the "Natural" criteria states properties should be "generally free of structural shoreline modifications, structures, and intensive human uses." Again, our house sits within the affected Shoreline buffer zone. The "Rural Conservancy" criteria would accommodate residential uses outside urban growth areas and is "supporting human uses but subject to environmental limitations, such as properties that include or are adjacent to steep banks, feeder bluffs, or flood plains or other flood prone areas". This is exactly the situation with our property. This designation would protect the wildlife habitat and also protect our residential use of the property. During their discussion, Commissioners Halverson and Karman both voiced concern over approving a motion when property owners had not been notified of an action affecting their property. Chair Commissioner Eric Casino called for a motion, which was made by Commissioner Wheatly to include our private property as "Natural". Unfortunately, with no further discussion the motion was swiftly approved and the meeting was concluded.</p> <p>(Please refer to comment letter #22 to review the remainder of this comment.)</p>	
23	8/22/22	Rob & Valerie	Hammett	<p>We would like you to forward our request for the shoreline protection zone to be set at 150' to the Community Planning Group. Our understanding is that this was to be decided this fall. We would also appreciate a status report about the process.</p>	

Thurston County BOCC Shoreline Master Program Public Hearing
Written Public Comments Matrix

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment Summary (View Individual Comment Letters For Full Text & Attachments)	Affiliation / Geo. Area
24	10/6/22	Anne	Van Sweringen	<p>Dear Commissioners Edwards, Mejia, and Menser, Attached is a Comment from Black Hills Audubon concerning the Minority Report re the Shoreline Master Program Update. Could you confirm that this has been received in good order? Thanks for your continued efforts for the County.</p> <p>Best wishes, Anne Van Sweringen, Member, Conservation Committee Sam Merrill, Chair Conservation Committee Black Hills Audubon Society</p> <p>(Please refer to comment letter #24 to view attachments.)</p>	
25	11/9/22	Bob	Jensen	<p>My name is Bob Jensen. My wife, Maria and I live in Lacey at Panorama. From 2004 to 2019, we lived off Mullen Road, on the north end of Pattison Lake. We moved there because of the beautiful environment. We used the lake to kayak and swim. During the summers, I swam regularly in the mornings to a buoy in the middle of the northern basin.</p> <p>In 2013, I first noticed in the morning, a green sheen on the water, which I had never previously seen. I immediately contacted the County Health Department, because our property was outside of Lacey, the urban growth area. Pattison Lake Townhomes, our continuum development, unlike almost all of the remaining lake, sewer. The Health District sent a representative to sample the water. It reported back the green sheen was a toxic blue-green algae bloom, and I asked if I would post our community dock to advise people and domestic animals use the lake because of health concerns. I did so.</p> <p>These toxic algae blooms have continued until now and manifest themselves nearly every year. I was given a pamphlet by the representative of the Health Department published in the summer of 2013, entitled The Pipeline. It addresses septic systems and phosphorous, concluding on page 3: "... phosphorous is usually the limiting nutrient when it comes to eutrophication of freshwater systems." Similarly, the Thurston County Water Resources Monitoring Report 2017 Water Year," page 8 declares: "In Black Lake, as with most freshwater lakes, algae production is limited by the amount of available phosphorous."</p> <p>I need not repeat the litany of toxic blue-green algae blooms in our county lakes. Suffice it to say the reasonable use and enjoyment of those lakes is substantially impaired by these blooms. Pattison Lake, for example, just formed a Lake Management District. One of its principal challenges is to eliminate these repetitive and offensive blooms. Pattison Lake has trunk sewer lines running along both the western and eastern sides. They unfortunately have never been connected to residences, and probably will not be until Lacey annexes the lake.</p> <p>I have submitted numerous comments, written and oral, requesting the county to include in its pending amendment of its Shoreline Master Program, to prohibit more septic tanks along the shoreline lakes of the county, and to require annual inspection and maintenance of septic systems. I have not seen any written document version of the master program amendments, to this day, which would require these restrictions. Please advise me if the joint planning effort, which purportedly is taken under the Growth Management Act, includes the proposed Shoreline Management Act amendments.</p>	Pattison Lake
26	11/28/22	Deanna	Gonzalez	<p>On behalf of Heather Burgess, attached please find correspondence regarding the above-referenced matter. Please contact Ms. Burgess should you have any questions.</p> <p>(Please refer to comment letter #26 to review the attachments.)</p>	Pattison Lake
27	3/6/23	Genevieve & Tim	Cass	<p>It is difficult to understand why the Thurston County Commissioners would even entertain a Minority Report related to Lake Lawrence when the Shoreline Master Program (SMP), still in draft form, has even yet to be decided upon. As property owners on Lake Lawrence since 1999 we have seen many changes on the lake and shoreline. When a 'new' Lake Management committee members decide to make changes when they have not been directly involved with the lengthy process, how can this lack of experience on the area of Lake Lawrence benefit those who have lived there?</p> <p>TOPIC 1: Vegetation Conservation and Buffers The minority report fails to address the use of fertilizers and other 'additives' which people have added and continue to add to their lawn area as well as their shoreline. If there was better enforcement of property owners to NOT use such chemical additives along sensitive shoreline areas this would mitigate the claimed areas within the paragraph of the report.</p> <p>TOPIC 2: CRITICAL AREAS The minority report addresses saltwater and Lake Lawrence does not have any saltwater affiliation. Again the lack of knowledge related to Lake Lawrence is clearly lacking and although the author(s) may address specific saltwater areas these areas are not called out within the report.</p> <p>TOPIC 3: AQUACULTURE Again, the minority report addresses areas which do not pertain to Lake Lawrence. Recommend the either the areas be specifically called out by location or stricken from the report as the author(s) are lacking in knowledge of Lake Lawrence.</p> <p>TOPIC 4: MOORING STRUCTURES, OVERWATER STRUCTURES AND ACTIVITIES (19.600.160) Until the SMP is an approved document the areas contained within the minority report should not be considered due to the lack of basis. Although the Army Corps of Engineers has written areas which pertain to the above mentioned area the current SMP which will encompass Lake Lawrence has not been approved so therefore this should not apply. Again, the author(s) are lacking in knowledge related to Lake Lawrence.</p> <p>Bottom line is this. Until the SMP is finalized and approved the minority report and it's recommendations should be stricken from applicability in all areas related to Lake Lawrence as the author(s) have failed terribly to recognize the specific area. We continue to support the Planning Commission's recommendations that have been in the process of creation for eight years, for the Shoreline Management Program and emphatically do not support the minority report!</p>	Lake Lawrence

Thurston County BOCC Shoreline Master Program Public Hearing
Written Public Comments Matrix

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment Summary (View Individual Comment Letters For Full Text & Attachments)	Affiliation / Geo. Area
28	3/6/2023	Reggie	Grantham	I am a property owner on Lawrence Lake in Yelm. I have participated in support of our local commissioner & spokesman Barry Halverson to draft a proposal for the Shoreline Master Plan. It has come to my understanding that following initial approval of the draft plan, a minority report has been assembled and is being considered. I along with many other lakefront owners find the minority report unacceptable. Barry and our community have worked hard for many years to construct a reasonable plan. It appears that the draft plan is threatened to be overrun by non stake-holders with a personal agenda. This ultimately has the feel of a government land grab under the environmental banner of 'climate change'. Nothing in the minority plan has any relevance to climate change. As a concerned citizen and landowner at Lawrence Lake I strongly advise accepting the previously approved draft plan and rejecting the minority plan.	Lake Lawrence
29	3/6/23	Fred & Cindy	Wahl	To the County Commissioners : I totally support the Planning Commissions recommendations for the SMP and do not support the minority report. We have lived here for 30 years and have supported The planning commissions ever since. We also comply with their recommendations on property vegetation and lawn care. Paying into our community dues yearly for their support of our lake. Again WE DO NOT SUPPORT THE MINORITY REPORT.	Lake Lawrence
30	3/6/23	Gary	Witley	I am very dismayed that the proposed changes to the Shoreline Master Program (DRAFT SMP) that the Thurston County Planning Commissioners worked on for years and was approved 5 to 3 by the Planning Commissioners last year is now in jeopardy. I strongly urge you to vote to respect their work and endorse the DRAFT SMP that the Planning Commissioners worked so hard to improve.	
31	3/6/23	Derick	Mordus	I received word of SMP changes that affect my community and wanted to contribute. Thank your for your consideration. In response to the minority report: I disagree with the false urgency pushed by the minority report. The planning commission review may have been lengthy but this is the purpose of the government, to do the will of the people. I do not see where this urgency exists. This false urgency portends making a hasty decision which would lead to negative outcomes long term. I agree with the shorter buffer areas in opposition to the minority report and in accordance with the planning commission. The minority report focuses on "climate change" which is not in accordance with WAC 173-26-010 stating: "Shoreline Management Act is intended to be a cooperative program between local government and the state. It is the intent of this chapter to provide minimum procedural requirements as necessary to comply with the statutory requirements while providing latitude for local government to establish procedural systems based on local needs and circumstances" Climate change is not local. Climate change does not fall under the purpose of the SMA WAC. This push is an appeal to fear and is logically inconsistent. Setbacks in Thurston County have limited effect on climate change. As president of the Lake Lawrence Community Club, I can only speak to our lake but we have not experienced ecological loss discussed by the minority report, nor the climate change yet again stated as the reasoning for this. Obviously the minority report believes the climate takes precedence over the will of the governed, upon which we disagree. In my community most of our residents want to do what they feel is in the best interest of their property. Not the interest of someone who has never seen their lake or land. In regards to decision points for the BOCC: Topic 1: I support the PC approved recommendation prior to the 2/22/23 meeting. Topic 2: I support the PC approved recommendation prior to the 2/22/23 meeting. Topic 3: I support the PC approved recommendation prior to the 2/22/23 meeting. Topic 4: I strongly support the use of conforming. Using anything otherwise allows any current structures to later be affected by the next SMP update. This adds confusion to the local owners and layers of complexity to any changes they would make to their property which when built was conforming and legal but now arbitrarily is not. Topic 5: I support the PC approved recommendation prior to the 2/22/23 meeting. In response to ecology required items: Topic 7: I agree with designation of eutrophic lakes being different. Topic 12: I agree with PC approved recommendation. Topic 24: I agree with PC. How is spending more money for public access ever ecologically prosperous? This seems an overstep via Ecology as this would entail construction inside buffers. Topic 26: Agree with PC. Thank you for your time and consideration. We appreciate the planning commission's time and dedication and care of those they represent.	Lake Lawrence
32	3/6/23	John	Woodford	We, the Thurston County Shoreline Stakeholders Coalition, have serious concerns about the BOCC Decision Matrix prepared by CPED staff. There seems to be an ever widening divide between 1) the acknowledgment that single-family residential uses are given preference under the Shoreline Master Act and 2) the ever tightening of restrictions on what we waterfront dwellers can do with our own homes and yards. In this email I will focus on Topic 1, Shoreline buffer widths, and Topic 4, Referring to non-conforming uses. Topic 1, Shoreline buffer widths. The County has been operating under its original Shoreline Master Plan since 1990; it is still in place. Residential shoreline reaches were designation as Rural, an inappropriate nomenclature for what is now called Shoreline Residential. The buffer width, per the extant SMP, for thirty three (33) years now, has been 50-feet for these residential reaches. And, even further back, my humble 1,176 square foot home was built here on Holmes Island, Long Lake, in 1955 (68 years ago) with a 50-foot setback from the lake...that's what Code called for and my home complies. Community Planning and Economic Development's own Cumulative Impacts Analysis of Thurston County's Shoreline Master Program acknowledges that the 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%. So, Shoreline Residential makes up only a very small portion of the County's shoreline. Further, the vast majority of parcels located in Shoreline Residential SEDs are already built out; there are very, very few vacant parcels available for any form of new development. What's to be gained by increasing the Shoreline Residential buffer? How will an increased buffer width impact Net Loss in either a positive or negative manner? Our homes won't move; the buffers will just wrap around them. What's to be gained by that? While members of the Coalition are divided regarding other SED buffer widths, I would have no problem with returning to wider buffers in Urban Conservancy, Rural Conservancy and Natural SEDs. Topic 4, Referring to non-conforming uses. On August 31, 2020, I submitted a letter to the Planning Commission addressing this very issue. Rather than just copying that material here, I am attaching that letter below. The way the Coalition sees it, any legally established structure that does not meet the standards of later implemented Codes or Ordinances shall be considered a conforming structure. The way we see it, the State of Washington agrees. CPED oversees permit applications and issues permits for new construction and alterations all the time. And Codes (Plumbing and Electrical, for example) are all periodically revised and updated. Buildings of all types and/or location are not declared "nonconforming" or "legally existing nonconforming" upon the adoption of a new Code update. This should not be an issue with the SMP. (Please refer to comment letter #32 to read remainder of comment and view attachments.)	Long Lake
33	3/7/23	Chris	Ireland	I have been reading about the Shoreline Master Program. I would like to voice that I do not support the minority report! I support the Planning Commissions recommendations for the SMP.	

Thurston County BOCC Shoreline Master Program Public Hearing
Written Public Comments Matrix

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment Summary (View Individual Comment Letters For Full Text & Attachments)	Affiliation / Geo. Area
34	3/6/23	Paul	Fossum	I am writing in support of the Planning Commission's recommendations for the SMP and more importantly to express that I adamantly reject the recommendations made in the minority report. This hope that you will too.	Yelm
35	3/6/23	Raed	Gyekis	<p>Dear Elected Representative of the People,</p> <p>I am writing to emphatically support the Planning Commissions recommendations for the SMP. I do NOT support the minority report, nor should you. My wife and I have raised our children on Lake Lawrence, we deeply care for our community and the health of our lake, and we've served our nation in the military for the last 25 years.</p> <p>The DRAFT SMP approved 5 to 3 by the Planning Commissioner last year was a product of 8 years of collaborative community and government work. As someone who has worked across party, nationality, and ideological lines to construct solutions to complex problems and civic issues, that is no small feat. It is an incredible miscarriage of our Thurston County and American process to sideline almost a decade of collaborative efforts and compromise, and instead support this minority report by those who declined to even take part in the collaborative process.</p> <p>Bottom Line: support the Draft SMP and the team of civic leaders and community members who took the time and made the effort to develop a comprehensive, 8 year collaborative solution for our community. Do NOT support the Minority Report.</p>	Lake Lawrence
36	3/6/23	James	Chaloner	My name is James Chaloner and I have 2 lots on Lake Lawrence. I am the President of the HOA board for Wildaire Estates. My family has owned this property since 1965. The commissioners approved the draft SMP which I APPROVE with this draft. I DO NOT APPROVE the Minority Report that was written. There are hand tying regulations in this document and you are penalizing the owners of shoreline property. Please stay with the already approved SMP.	Lake Lawrence
37	3/6/23	Joseph	Okeefe	<p>As a resident of Thurston County who owns property on Lake Lawrence, I have serious concerns with the proposed changes to the Shore Master Program. I wanted to lend my voice as a taxpayer that the DRAFT SMP that was voted for last year should be approved. The currently proposed MINORITY REPORT has significant deficiencies the will have a negative impact on myself and MANY other residents.</p> <p>Namely;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A push for larger (wider) buffers isn't feasible for many of us and limits our property owner rights. 2. Designating existing structure within the buffer as "nonconforming" or "legally existing nonconforming" instead of "conforming," puts lawful structures at risk. 3. Reimposing rigid dimensional standards for docks and piers is problematic for historical docks that have been in existence as well as the fact that not all properties are the same relted to access, not all water levels and not all docs are used the same, therefore sizes need to be different. 4. Removal of acknowledgement that non-salmon bearing eutrophic lakes are different. These ecosystems are not the same and shouldn't be treated the same. 5. Impose restrictions on any alterations to a structure within the buffer. MANY houses and structures are in the proposed buffer and ANY improvement would have to endure unnecessary process and permitting. <p>I urge you to please consider moving forward with the original DRAFT SMP and NOT the MINORITY REPORT.</p>	Lake Lawrence
38	3/6/23	Rick & Lacie	Norton	We support the Planning Commissions recommendations for the SMP and do not support the minority report. We just purchased a cabin at 15840 Lawrence Place SE on Lawrence Lake. Our names are John (Rick) Norton and Lacie Parrino. Our phone numbers are 253-261-4009 (Rick) and 206-850-8653 (Lacie).	Lake Lawrence
39	3/6/23	Aaron	Weller	<p>Greetings commissioners. Firstly, I'd like to thank you for all of the work that you do to help maintain healthy water and shorelines in Thurston County. I write to you with some concerns about the proposed changes to the Shoreline Master Plan, and in particular the recommendations of the "minority report" which would directly impact me. I am a resident of Thurston County, with lakeside property on Lake Lawrence. I live in a house that was constructed in the 1960s approximately 15 feet from the high water line of the lake. By definition, non-conforming with the current SMP. As a result, I spent nearly 3 years and over \$15,000 obtaining a permit to replace a dangerous deck which was rotting, and to obtain approval for a dock for this property, which was finally granted last year. This process was extremely time consuming and expensive, but I wanted to do the right thing and both protect the existing shoreline and vegetation while maintaining the value of my property, and the safety of my children who use the existing rotting deck. Some of the recommendations that were provided to me during this process included:</p> <p>Your deck can have a maximum height of a few inches off the ground. When it already had 3 sliding glass doors on an upper level that would have had a 6 foot drop to the new deck.</p> <p>"You need to plant vegetation on your property (where none currently exists) for the first 20 feet from the lake". This would literally have resulted in not being able to enter my lower level, where the door is closer than 20 feet from the lake if applied fully. And similar nonsensical requirements that didn't consider the fact that my property, including a deck, has been in the same location since 1963, now well inside the buffer zone.</p> <p>I was informed by county officials during a site visit that "Over 80% of what you see around the lake has not been permitted" and that "we do not have the resources to take action against people who do not obtain permits" The proposed minority report amendments to the Shoreline Management Plan will serve to further exacerbate this situation. By making requirements even more onerous than they already are, more people will simply choose to bypass the process – which will have an overall negative impact on shorelines across the county. As one memorable figure stated, the more that restrictions are tightened, the more people will choose to willfully non-comply. While we are not talking about the destruction of planets here, the SMP directly affects my day to day life and ability to enjoy my property.</p> <p>To best achieve the desired outcome of the Shoreline Management Plan, restrictions cannot be so onerous as to create a clear incentive for residents to bypass the process altogether. Residents need to feel that there is a balance between overall objectives to preserve and maintain important ecological habits, and the benefits of living on waterfront property that we are incentivized to protect and maintain. When I hear from a county employee that many people are ignoring the existing code completely due to how onerous it is, the answer for me is not tightening restrictions further, rather it is enforcing the ones that we have.</p>	Lake Lawrence
40	3/6/23	John	Carpenter	Our family has happily lived here on Lawrence Lake for over 50 years, three generations now and we expect our heirs to be here for many many more years. Thus, we are concerned with the changes being proposed to the Shoreline Master Plan particularly ones that may hamper or incur a very high cost to maintain our home and accessory buildings, dock etc. in the future and impact our home. By all means we want the lake development controlled to protect our water and wildlife and have been involved in the LMD program, but we also want to be able to AFFORD to maintain what we have and that goes for many if not most other people around the lake as well. Our house was built to all existing standards of the time, so I find it concerning nor do I appreciate that we might be designated as "non-conforming" or "legally existing non-conforming." I think this raises the possibility of a definition being used against us drastically raising our cost and effort to repair/replace after say an earthquake or wildfire or other natural disaster.	Lake Lawrence
41	3/6/23	Muriel	Rockman	As a landowner on Lawrence Lake I want to let you know that I support the planning commissioners recommendation for the SMP. I DO NOT support the minority report.	Lake Lawrence

Thurston County BOCC Shoreline Master Program Public Hearing
Written Public Comments Matrix

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment Summary (View Individual Comment Letters For Full Text & Attachments)	Affiliation / Geo. Area
42	3/7/23	Donovan & Meredith	Rafferty	<p>We are homeowners in unincorporated Thurston County who have actively participated in the update to the Shoreline Master Program since 2013. Approved by your Planning Commission, that update is now before you. Thousands of residences line the shores of our County's rivers, lakes and marine waters. In our minds, that puts homeowners up front and center in protecting our shorelands. So we and many others stepped up to the challenge of updating the SMP that so intimately affects our properties. This update had a special challenge: to rethink the myriad regulations within the SMP because we, the County, are tasked by the State to address a new goal, the goal of "no net loss" from this day forward.</p> <p>Now you are being asked by staff if you wish to revise this draft SMP before you hold your public hearing on it. Making technical corrections and additions is understandable. However, before making changes such as buffer widths, we ask that you consider this: You do not yet have the analysis that says whether the draft SMP would achieve the mandated "no net loss". The draft as it sits before you today is incomplete. It is missing Appendix D of the SMP, the "cumulative effects" analysis. In other words, what is presented in this draft SMP may work well and not require revision. We need the cumulative effects analysis.</p> <p>There is an interplay between various restrictions that was considered. For example, protections exist in three tiers across each shoreland property: there is the 200 foot width of the SMA jurisdiction itself and within that is a more restrictive "buffer" and a "setback". Each tier has protections. The buffer width is not the only control. And its width is allowed to vary within a given range, in consideration of the density of existing development and quality of the environment.</p> <p>We also ask that you support wording of a "conforming" rather than "nonconforming" status for legal development that occurred before SMA requirements. "Nonconforming" puts our property in jeopardy; we are forever dependent upon our regulator (the County) to continue use of our property. These are days of constant legal challenges over the intricacies of wording. It is not enough to have our regulator verbally say, "Don't worry, we would never act to stop your use because you're nonconforming." We are legally conforming.</p>	Budd Inlet
43	3/7/23	John & Cindy	Wilson	<p>As long time residents of Lake Lawrence our family has followed the progress of the updates to the SMP with concern and interest. We would like to convey to you our strong support for the work done by the planning commission since it's inception and think that the Draft SMP is the best approach. We do not support the proposals in the minority report. Implementing the changes proposed in the minority report will have significant negative implications on our lake front community. Please support the Draft SMP as written.</p>	Lake Lawrence
44	3/7/23	Dan	Moffett	<p>I support the Planning Commission's recommendations for the DRAFT Shoreline Master Plan without the added Minority Report. I do not support the Minority Report.</p> <p>I am specifically concerned with short notice minority report that includes changes having to do with:</p> <p>A push for larger (wider) buffers</p> <p>Designating existing structure within the buffer as "nonconforming" or "legally existing nonconforming" instead of "conforming"</p> <p>Reimposing rigid dimensional standards for docks and piers</p> <p>Removal of acknowledgement that non-salmon bearing eutrophic lakes are different</p> <p>Impose special restrictions on any alterations to a structure within the buffer</p> <p><u>Minimize the size of decks and viewing platforms</u></p>	
45	3/14/23	John & Melodye	Cosley	<p>We are the current owners of a shoreline lot at 3125 46th Ave NW, Olympia (Parcel #: 12933220400) which is being proposed to have its shoreline designation changed from Conservancy to Natural. In the original Planning Department recommendation it was to be changed to Rural Conservancy, which we agreed with. This shoreline area contains a house which we are currently remodeling and plan to move into when completed, several acres of graded, fenced areas which for many years were part of a horse ranch, and various existing trails to the shoreline as well as garden areas. In our plans for cleaning up and rehabilitating this parcel we have every intention of doing everything possible to stabilize it and enhance its effectiveness as a natural reserve area. However, since it does have a house on it and some amount of human presence/activity it does not seem appropriate to categorize it as Natural. Rural Conservancy is a much better fit for this parcel as originally recommended by the Planning Department, we respectfully request that this designation be applied to our lot. Thank you for your consideration.</p>	Green Cove, Eld Inlet
46	4/2/23	Harry	Branch	<p>Re: Minority Opinion and other opinions regarding updates to the Shoreline Master Program (SMP).</p> <p>Shoreline buffers need to be increased not decreased. The majority opinion violates our mandate to "do no further harm" and "take a precautionary approach when developing along marine shorelines to prevent further, irreparable damage". (1) (2)</p> <p>Science tells us that ecological buffers in nearshore areas span varying widths depending on geological parameters. Estuarine tide flats and salt marsh in Budd Inlet would in places require over a thousand feet to be 80% effective. "The range of buffer widths that met a minimum 80% effectiveness for this function was 5 – 600 m (16-1920 ft; Appendix G). This wide range relates to the breadth of water quality issues..." (3)</p> <p>The County's SMP claims to protect shorelines, ensuring their ability to: "remove sediment, nutrients and toxic compounds before they enter the water"; provide "habitat for fish and wildlife"; "maintain water temperatures vital to fish and other marine organisms' survival"; and "promote preservation and restoration of ecological areas". How? Where?</p> <p>To the question "Are Shoreline Environmental Designations (SEDs) based on Science?" the answer is: "Yes. Thurston County used aerial photographs, site visits, and other data to guide the proposed SEDs." What data? We should at least get a summary. "Thorough studies were done to ensure that no net loss of shoreline ecological function occurs through time." What studies? We have some observation and perhaps a vague hypothesis but no tests or supported conclusions.</p> <p>"We're evaluating a site based on whether it has characteristics of high-quality habitat and/or minimal shoreline modification". In other words, the baseline is what exists today, in a damaged state. A site should be evaluated on how physical parameters are impacting chemical and biological parameters. Federal law requires that in a damaged water body like Budd Inlet restoration must at least be on the table in every consideration.</p> <p>(1) https://wsg.washington.edu/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/Marine-Riparian-Function-Assessment.pdf (2) https://s3.us-west-2.amazonaws.com/thurstoncountywa.gov.if-us-west-2/s3fs-public/2023-01/cped-cpdocs-A-6_SMP_Minority_Report-Signed.pdf (3) https://wdfw.wa.gov/sites/default/files/publications/00693/wdfw00693.pdf</p>	Budd Inlet
47	4/12/23	Tris	Carlson	<p>As you transition away from the SPD I await the adoption of the SMP. I believe you also would like to see that item off your agenda. I have letter of concern in regards to the planning commission SMP minority report. I have attached a draft copy.</p> <p>(Please refer to comment letter #47 to view attachments.)</p>	

Thurston County BOCC Shoreline Master Program Public Hearing
Written Public Comments Matrix

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment Summary (View Individual Comment Letters For Full Text & Attachments)	Affiliation / Geo. Area
48	4/17/23	Gary, Esther	Kline, Kronenberg	<p>The Clean Black Lake Alliance writes in support of the Minority Opinion updates to the Shoreline Master Program (SMP). We previously commented on the SMP in October 2021 pointing out the failure of the current “no net loss” standard to safeguard water quality and aquatic habitat in our lakes and marine waters. Healthy shorelines are essential for fish and wildlife habitat and as filters to remove nutrients and toxicants before they enter the water. However, it is clear from the continuing loss of shorelines and increasing problems of water quality in our lakes and marine waters that the “no net loss” standard is insufficient to protect our shoreline ecological systems and the life they support. Thurston County’s use of already degraded shorelines and habitats as a baseline to evaluate its compliance with the intent of the Shoreline Management Act is clearly flawed. There is insufficient data to make a true assessment of how the physical parameters are impacting water quality and habitat. Restoration of these damaged shorelines is not being considered, contrary to federal law.</p> <p>The Minority Report calls particular attention to the Planning Commission’s recommended reduction of shoreline buffers, which include vegetation buffers, urban/shoreline residential buffers and riparian buffers. Further reduction of already struggling shoreline buffers conflicts with best available science and the goals of the Thurston Climate Mitigation Plan. We propose a “net ecological gain” standard to begin the important work of restoration.</p> <p>The Clean Black Lake Alliance has been working to come up with solutions to water quality in our lakes through the use of low cost filtration systems that remove nutrients and toxicants from effluent streams before they enter a water body. Obviously, reduced buffers will decrease the effectiveness of these kinds of filtration systems, leaving the County with much more expensive and unwieldy methods to control the recurring algae blooms and increased water pollution from stormwater runoff that promises to increase according to climate change predictions.</p> <p>We also note the need for larger buffers to mitigate for the effects of wave action that are eroding the shoreline from boats, and the need to protect any endangered species habitat for the Oregon spotted frog existent in ditches. Now is not the time to further loosen regulations and requirements for the protection of our natural resources. We are all witness to the increasing degradation and cannot continue to pretend that the loss of healthy habitat and biodiversity will not cause serious environmental consequences to our ecosystems and the public health.</p> <p>Please incorporate the recommendations of the Minority Opinion of the Planning Commission into the SMP. They will provide the greatest long term benefit for County residents and for generations to come.</p>	Black Lake
49	4/20/23	Brian & Nancy	Muirhead	<p>Commissioner Mejia,</p> <p>I’m writing to you as a follow up to an email I sent to all commissioners on 3/1/23 with respect to an issue we have with the proposed Shoreline Environmental Designation (SED), in the proposed SMP, for a parcel of land we own on Pattison Lake. I have been in contact with Andrew Deffobis on this topic many times over the past couple of years.</p> <p>At the BoCC February 28, 2023 meeting I made comments on our issue during the public comment period. This was one week after Andrew had present to you on the status of the SMP. Attached is the letter and support information on our issue and our requested action by the BoCC. This package was filed with your Community Planning and Economic Development Department back on 11/28/22.</p> <p>We are asking you to have your staff look into our issue and our proposed solution and get back to us and you on their assessment before the SMP public hearing on May 16. Thank you for all your hard work on behalf of the citizens of Thurston County.</p> <p>(Please refer to comment letter #49 to view attachments.)</p>	Pattison Lake
50	4/21/23	Melodye	Cosley	<p>My husband and I are the property owners of parcel #12933220400, which represents the north shore of Green Cove on the Eld Inlet. As my husband stated in his public comment on March 14, 2023, at the Planning Commission (PC) meeting on 3/16/2022, commissioners voted to over-ride the Planning Department Staff’s recommendation and to recommend that all of Green Cove shoreline have a SED of “Natural”, instead of Staff’s recommendation of “Rural Conservancy”. This vote was taken without notice to the six affected private property owners on Green Cove. Most importantly, a “Natural” SED is in direct conflict with our residential use of our properties. At that March 16,2022 PC meeting, Planning Staff’s presentation stated that they were aware of residential uses on the Green Cove parcels and that there was a “lack of information about the condition of the understorey” in the area. For discussion purposes that evening, the PC looked solely at an aerial overview, which did not clearly show the location of affected homes on the south shore of Green Cove. Our house (which is located inside the buffer area) was clearly visible in those aerial photos but was quickly discounted by one Commissioner’s comment that our house looked like some kind of barn-type structure. We had no opportunity to correct these misstatements prior to the PC taking a vote to designate all of Green Cove shoreline with a Natural SED. There were two planning commissioners that evening who did express concern over the fact that affected property owners had not been notified of this impending change. When I became aware of what had transpired at the meeting (four days later), I tried to address the problem by writing a letter to my Commissioner, Tye Menser, and I also cc’d the entire BoCC and staff. In my letter I requested that, given the facts of what had occurred, he direct the PC to revisit their decision at their next available PC meeting. Unfortunately, my efforts were ineffective. I was told that my opportunity would come to address this situation when the SMP update came before the Board of County Commissioners (BoCC). That time has now come and here we are. We realize that the SMP update project is a very lengthy and comprehensive process, one that has required considerable time and effort by Planning Staff and the PC to bring before the BoCC. We also understand that some Commissioners may be reluctant to delve back into the “granular” layer of specific parcel SED issues. However, since we have been denied an opportunity to address what is, by definition, an unsuitable SED for our residential properties, we are respectfully requesting here, in public forum, that our elected BoCC direct Planning Department Staff to re-evaluate the SED recommendations for all of Green Cove’s shoreline. In closing, we fully understand and support the need to protect the ecological balance of Green Cove. The “Rural Conservancy” SED would put extensive protections and constraints upon parcels, while still allowing property owners to enjoy “human use” of their properties. We understand the SMP has a requirement of “no net loss of ecological function”; however, longstanding residential property owners should not be used as an aid to achieve that balance.</p>	Green Cove, Eld Inlet
51	4/22/23	Chris	Cannon	<p>Last night, 4/21/23, I found out for the first time that there has been an ongoing effort to designate Green Cove and the surrounding properties as “Natural.” This affects our property, 4514 Green Cove Ct NW, Olympia, WA, and the HOA beach access that we use and that was an important part of why we moved here. There was no attempt from the government to inform us that this has been taken been taking place. We only recently found out about this from another neighbor who has an affected property. I feel like we should have been informed and involved at the onset.</p> <p>As I have studied this proposal, it would appear that the designation of “rural conservancy” would be much more appropriate than “natural”. This would take into account the fact that there has been establish residency’s in this area for many decades. The residents in this area take good care of the cove and wish to preserve its natural beauty. We feel like we can do this without negatively impacting all of us that live here. We deserve to have some involvement on deciding what happens to our property. Such decisions should done without our knowledge or consent. We respectfully ask that the designation be changed to “residential conservancy”. Thank for your time and consideration, Chris Cannon</p>	Green Cove, Eld Inlet

Thurston County BOCC Shoreline Master Program Public Hearing
Written Public Comments Matrix

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment Summary (View Individual Comment Letters For Full Text & Attachments)	Affiliation / Geo. Area
52	4/22/23	Lindy	Cannon	<p>I was surprised to learn that the property that we have lived on for almost a decade (4514 Green Cove Ct. NW) may soon be considered a "natural" habitat and we will be in violation of having a home on this property. Our home was built in 1977. That makes our property nearly 50 years old. How can it suddenly be illegal?</p> <p>Even if we are grandfather in what will that mean for us when our children are grown and we need to eventually move into a smaller home? Will we be able to sell our home? A home is a major investment. How can we as members of this community never have been consulted or even informed?</p> <p>This reminds me of the way Native people were once treated when they were told they did not belong on the land they have always inhabited. "Natural" land seems best suited for property that has not already been inhabited for decades. Do not get me wrong. I am a believer in caring for the environment and preserving nature.</p> <p>I just don't understand this proposal. As residents we care for the beach and the wild area that is next to our property. We maintain a trail that is only used by residents in the community. It is not heavily trafficked. We do not litter or mistreat the land. We love it and are committed to preserving it.</p> <p>How would stripping residents of our property rights and putting us in violation improve anything. Please don't make a rash decision that looks fine on paper but is actually unfair and unreasonable. Please change this from a "natural area" to "Rural Conservancy" or "Shore-land Residential."</p>	Green Cove, Eld Inlet
53	4/24/23		Multiple	<p>RE: Green Cove Property Owners Request / Proposed Green Cove SED</p> <p>Dear Commissioner Tye Menser:</p> <p>We are writing to ask for your help in resolving an issue that originated when the Thurston County Planning Commission voted to recommend changing Green Cove's Shoreline Environmental Designation (SED) from its current "Conservancy" designation to a "Natural" designation, in its Shoreline Master Project (SMP) Update. This recommendation is now before the Board of County Commissioners (BoCC) for your review and approval. Our group consists of the six Green Cove property owners whose properties would be directly affected by this proposed change, as well as the Green Park Community Club (Green Cove's HOA) whose recreational community park and beach access would also be directly affected.</p> <p>The Green Cove estuary is a beautiful, well-functioning natural resource which currently supports a wide variety of wildlife. All property owners living in the cove cherish this sanctuary and understand the need to protect it. Since the 1990 Shoreline Master Program Update, Green Cove has been designated as "Conservancy". It is important to underscore that the current "Conservancy" designation has been extremely effective in protecting Green Cove's ecological system. Within the current Proposed SMP Update, the "Rural Conservancy" SED provides the same balance between natural protections and reasonable use of private property.</p> <p>Conversely, the "Natural" SED is inappropriate for our shoreline, as it is intended to protect properties that are "relatively free of human influence". It specifically applies to properties where the goal is to protect non-human use. Clearly our long-standing residential uses of our properties and Green Cove HOA's Community Park recreational use and beach access do not align with the "Natural" SED criteria.</p> <p>As your constituents, we are respectfully asking for your help in rectifying this situation. We are requesting that you direct the Planning Department Staff to re-evaluate the SED recommendation for all of Green Cove's shoreline. The new "Rural Conservancy" SED would continue Green Cove's longstanding tradition of ecological protection, without removing our property rights of residential and recreational use.</p> <p>We sincerely hope that we can rely on your help and support.</p>	Green Cove, Eld Inlet
54	5/1/23	Heesoon	Jun	<p>First, I would like to express my sincere appreciation to Andrew Deffobis, Interim Senior Planner, for providing necessary information for me to understand what factors contributed to propose "Natural" in place of "Conservancy" for the south side of Green Cove. As I was reading all the comments in Comment Letter 43, I re-realized his excellent professionalism (delivered "exceptional public service") which is one of the Core Values of Thurston County. I was also glad to read others' appreciation of him and his staff.</p> <p>Actions taken by the Planning Commissioners will impact 6 private property owners (3 in the north side of Green Cove and 3 in the south side) and our HOA recreational property. I was not aware of the proposed SED until I received a call from one of 3 property owners in the north side on 4/6/2023. None of us received the postcard in the fall of 2021 and 5 of us knew nothing about what had happened before Melodye informed us. Since then, I have been reading WACs, RCWs, "Avoiding Unconstitutional Takings of Private Property" (Attorney General's Office, 1992; 2018), SMP materials from Andrew and Melodye (e.g., Shoreline Master Program, Shoreline Environment Designation Reviews & Background, Comment Letter 43, etc.) Constitution of the State of Washington, and my HOA minutes since 1998. I was also gathering information from Melodye about the north side of Green Cove while gathering information from the other two in my side (south). This extensive work was to understand what caused the Planning Commissioners to propose "Natural" SED without our input when we (N=6 + HOA) have worked hard to preserve the natural beauty of Green Cove.</p> <p>I am grateful for the opportunity to share what I think is the main contributing factor with the Board of County Commissioners who are faced with making the best decision that reflects "keeping harmony between the needs of Thurston County homeowners..... and salmon,...." (From the SMP website, 4/30/23). The decision that keeps harmony will also meet the requirement of RCW36.70A.370, Protection of Private Property which states, "(1) State attorney general shall establish... an orderly, consistent process,....that better enables state agencies and local governments to evaluate proposed regulatory or administrative actions to assure that such actions do not result in an unconstitutional taking of private property...." (Office of Attorney General, Sept. 2018).</p> <p>The major contributing factor seems to be not collecting data from the property owners (N=6 + HOA) who will be impacted by "Natural" SED. As a person who has spent most of her adult life analyzing social science research to examine the validity, generalizability, and applicability in real life it makes no sense that no one asked us (6 + HOA) about the impact of the decision on our properties. How could a citizen whose property will not be impacted by the SED, "Natural" recommend the SED "Natural" to our properties without evidence to support her suggestions? She did not interview us, and she did not provide evidence to support her suggestions (Comment Letter 43, #53). For example, she did not state what deteriorations she had observed to recommend "Natural". She wrote, ".....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."</p> <p>(Please refer to comment letter #54 to view remainder of comment.)</p>	Green Cove, Eld Inlet

Thurston County BOCC Shoreline Master Program Public Hearing
Written Public Comments Matrix

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment Summary (View Individual Comment Letters For Full Text & Attachments)	Affiliation / Geo. Area
55	5/4/23	Phyllis	Farrell	<p>Greetings, thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft SMP. I commend the staff and Planning Commission for the extensive research and work in developing the draft. I have followed the process for several years and it has been arduous! Overall, I think the draft has many good provisions and improvements, but there are some areas that need to be addressed.</p> <p>Vegetation Buffers:</p> <p>The Minority Report states the proposed provisions are not protective enough to meet Shoreline Management Act (SMA) policy goals and prevent net loss. The Planning Commission recommended Option A to decrease Shoreline Environmental Designation buffers. They also recommended buffers for Rural Conservancy designations to be reduced by 50% or 125 feet. The Minority Report states these recommendations do not "reflect the policy goals of the act" (WAC 173.26.186) Thurston County SMP buffers need to reflect best available science. Option B had more protective buffers, especially in marine shorelines (85' Marine Shoreline Residential and 250' in Urban Conservancy, Rural Conservancy and Natural). Buffers are important for maintaining ecological function! Projected sea level rise might shorten buffers. Reducing buffers will make mitigation and restoration efforts more expensive and complicated.</p> <p>Gwen Lentes, WDFW, shared in an email 10.19.20, WDFW recommends designating riparian buffers as critical areas and using the larger buffer option to more closely align with recent best available science. The riparian wetlands guidance for fish and aquatic species recommends prioritization of the "pollution removal function when appropriate;" and adoption of Site-Potential Tree Height (SPTH), based on potential tree height at 200 years, as "a scientifically supported approach if the goal is to protect and maintain full function of the riparian ecosystem."</p> <p>The Department of Ecology recommends a Riparian Habitat Area width of 250 feet for Type "S" (Shorelines of the State) and all fish (Type "F") streams regardless of whether they are currently or just potentially used, and whether they flow all year or not. The Draft SMP matches the Ecology guideline of 250 feet only for Type S streams and other streams greater than 20 feet wide. The range of protection for other fish streams is 150 to 200 feet. The more protective buffer width of 250' for both Type S and F streams is needed to ensure NNL and account for climate changes in stream temperatures. Vegetation requirements should be for mitigation purposes should be native vegetation; the non native vegetation allowance in the Planning Commission recommendations should be removed. No Net Loss can only be achieved with restoration of vegetation in buffers.</p> <p>Critical Areas:</p> <p>Critical areas are an essential tool of the GMA for preventing loss of environmental function. The Minority Report states: The SMP should assure that critical areas within the shoreline are protected in a manner consistent with the Critical Areas Ordinance (CAO) of the Growth Management Act (GMA). We are concerned that there is insufficient consideration given to critical saltwater areas. We note that permitting of critical areas is treated differently in the Draft SMP from the CAO in an important respect: the application of the principle of Reasonable Use (which is highly protective of ecological function) is replaced by shoreline variances. Without some revision, the Draft SMP will likely result in net loss of shoreline critical areas and their functions.</p> <p>Per the Minority Report, it is recommended to add a Policy (SH-15) "Critical saltwater habitats should be protected and restored according to the principles of WAC 173-26-221"</p> <p>(Please refer to comment letter #55 to review remainder of this comment.)</p>	
56	5/5/23	Howard	Glastetter	<p>I'm writing this as a comment to the Thurston County Shoreline Master Plan (TCSMP). I live on the Nisqually Valley Delta between I-5 and Old Pacific Hwy. My location is affected by several government entities. Please note the URL below. The URL from Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) shows they will be replacing the Nisqually River bridges. They will also be removing fill under the current I-5 freeway when finished. This could have a detrimental high water effect on my three contiguous lots (that were in the 500 year flood plain) and the two houses there on. WSDOT and consultants are studying this issue, but there are currently unknowns. Read the first page of the URL carefully. The Federal Government, WSDOT, the Nisqually Tribe and JBLM apparently support this effort. There should be a way to make this win / win for all parties.</p> <p>https://wsdotblog.blogspot.com/2022/11/i-5-nisqually-river-valley.html</p> <p>Below is an unpublished letter-to-the-editor I sent to the daily Olympian about how the Tacoma Power Utility could run the Alder Lake Dam more safely. It has yet to be published. The City of Tacoma is evidently satisfied with their modus-operandi. Pierce County evidently has no objections. Nor does the Nisqually Tribe or JBLM seem to.</p> <p>Alder Dam & Nisqually Valley Flood Avoidance</p> <p>Thurston County's Nisqually Valley had no Pineapple Express or Atmospheric River floods from Hawaii this fall / winter. Mother Nature sent this season's storms to California. However, we don't need to hope that our misery gets passed to other states in order to avoid it. Most of the flooding in Nisqually Valley from severe storms is the result of how the Tacoma Power Utility (TPU) runs Alder Lake Dam. They have no flood mitigation responsibilities in their Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) license. TPU's goal is energy production. They attempt to keep the reservoir as full as possible, even in fall / winter. Often little action is taken even when the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) graphics* predict a storm on the horizon. NOAA produces three graphs that predict Alder Lake flood dangers 10 days in advance, with increasing accuracy until the storm hits. Simple evasive actions by TPU, (e.g., running the La Grande generators below Alder Dam at full capacity (2,300 cubic feet a second) for a few days prior to a predicted storm), would easily avoid or strongly mitigate potential Nisqually floods. Paying close attention to these graphic predictions would allow simple protection of the valley below the dam. This is becoming an even bigger issue as the proposal to rebuild I-5 across the lower valley nears. This simple evasive action can be done at no financial disadvantage to TPU.</p> <p>*https://www.nwrfc.noaa.gov/river/station/flowplot/flowplot.cgi?ALRW1</p> <p>-----</p> <p>So, folks on the border of an issue, need cooperation from other contiguous government entities, beyond their boundaries. Thurston County has at least an obligation to raise this issue to other entities.</p>	Nisqually River
57	5/6/23	Derick	Mordus	<p>I will not be able to make the SMP meeting on May 16th, 2023. Please present this to the commissioners in my absence.</p> <p>(Please refer to comment letter #57 to view attachments.)</p>	
58	5/7/23	Darryl	Kaurin	<p>I greatly appreciate the work of SMP personnel and the dedication to preserving and protecting our environment and communities. I also appreciate the opportunity for public comment and for your committee's listening and thoughtful comment consideration. In my zeal to "save the planet", I suggested our parcel, 72000001000, be changed from the initial planned SED of "Shoreline Residential" to "Rural Conservancy". I was motivated by concern for preservation of the spit in front of the property. I must confess I was ignorant of the details of my request.</p> <p>Following your kind email of 4/20/2023 acknowledging my request and proposing the change I requested, I became better informed. I am now aware of the property lines, and our property contains just a toehold on the spit. For WAC 173-26-211(iii) designation criteria, I recognize only one criterion for "Rural Conservancy" need be met – but I think there is only one, which is the steep bank. The 125ft buffer from the high-water mark into our lot includes all the house and all but 7ft of the attached garage. The draft SMP fact Sheet #2 says we can rebuild after a natural disaster or fire, and do an interior remodel. It isn't clear if we can maintain the exterior.</p> <p>Follow up request:</p> <p>After consideration, your original proposal of "Shoreline Residential" designation seems most appropriate for this property. The 50-foot buffer would be at the edge of the deck to the house. This still protects the steep bank and spit. My initial concern was that construction not encroach on the spit, which I now understand was unfounded. Thank you for your time.</p>	Eld Inlet

Thurston County BOCC Shoreline Master Program Public Hearing
Written Public Comments Matrix

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment Summary (View Individual Comment Letters For Full Text & Attachments)	Affiliation / Geo. Area
59	5/8/23	John	Woodford	Please forward my attached letter to the County Commissioners ASAP. We, the Coalition, have many questions about developments following finalization of the Planning Commission SMP Recommendation on August 3, 2022. (Please refer to comment letter #59 to view attachments.)	Long Lake
60	5/8/23	Mark & Karla	Bryant	As we are unable to attend the hearing regarding the Shoreline management Plan (SMP) on the 16th, we wish to present our input. Updating this plan has been in the works by the Thurston County Planning Commission and has been thoughtfully and thoroughly developed to meet state requirements as well as concerns of property owners. We have been fulltime residents on Lake Lawrence for 20 years in a home built in 1989. As longtime lake owners, we are very cognizant and careful to be good stewards of our special and fragile environment. We are supportive of an updated shoreline management plan and believe the extensive work of the Planning Commission over the years has sufficiently addressed this. We have several concerns as Shoreline Residential Property owners 1. Our lake properties are nearly fully built out and as such, human environmental impact due to further development is unlikely. Therefore, Shoreline Residential properties should not bear the brunt of the SMP's very restrictive regulations. 2. Maintaining the 50' buffer for lake properties has been established by Ecology as "within the realm of justifiable", has been in place since the 1990 SMP and therefore should be maintained 3. Legally built structures should be maintained as being "conforming". Extensive work done by the Planning Commission with conjunction with ecology agrees upon this point. The State of Washington recognizes that such structures are "conforming" in RCW 90.58.620 Therefore, we urge the acceptance of the Planning Commissions SMP Recommendation of August 3, 2022. This is a very reasonable path toward "no net loss" of ecological function while protecting homeowner rights and property use.	Lake Lawrence
61	5/9/23	Michael	Cerovski	My wife Valerie and I purchased 3041 46th Ave NW July 6th, 2021. Changing this designation prevents our family, including our three children, from enjoying our 5-acre property recreationally. This proposed redesignation is inappropriate as the term Natural refers to locations free from human activity. The land which is under question is steep terrain and not usable in any real sense, except for recreational enjoyment. This redesignation potentially jeopardizes our property investment and our future property value.	Green Cove, Eld Inlet
62	5/10/23	Michael & Valerie	Cerovski	Thank you for meeting with Valerie and I along with our neighbors and County Commissioner Ty Menser a few weeks ago regarding the shoreline environmental designations as they relate to Green Cove Creek and our properties. I have attached for you a letter regarding our property and our request for you to consider refraining from the redesignation as proposed from Rural Conservancy to Natural, specifically in the areas of MEL 29-30. I look forward to the May 16th Public Hearing and am hopeful that we can identify a healthy balance between protection of our environment as well as taking into account the homeowners and their properties. (Please refer to comment letter #62 to view attachments.)	Green Cove, Eld Inlet
63	5/14/23	Doug	Karman	When at all possible, the Planning Commission recommendation should be the one used to move forward. Their recommendation was developed after years of testimony from the public as well as County and State presentations. The Minority report should be given no more credence than any single individual from the public. The 4 Commissioners supporting this minority report were not present for 99% of the work sessions, public testimony and agency presentations on the SMP. Therefore, they were not part of the public process. The majority report/PC recommendation was made by 5 Commissioners who were part of the full public process from the beginning to the end either as a commissioner or as public participant. The decision matrix you have been provided by staff is extensive and should have been presented to the Planning Commission prior to moving the SMP forward to the BoCC. In addition, the public should have been given an opportunity to comment on the document before the Planning Commission finalized its recommendation. Following are my comments on the Matrix: 1. Buffers: Use the Majority Report recommendations which is supported by Ecology. 97% of the shoreline residential classification has already been developed with these buffers. To make them wider makes no sense and would unduly burden the Shoreline Residential property owners without benefit. 2. Docks/Floats/Buoys in the Natural environment: If these are not allowed the property owner will do one of two things – a) build a dock anyway or b) keep removing shoreline vegetation to be able to park their rowboats, kayaks, and other water toys. A dock or float has the least impact on the shoreline ecological function. 3. Dimensional standards for mooring structures: Go with the Majority recommendation as approved by Ecology. There was lengthy discussion and testimony that the Minority report sponsors were not a part of. 4. Referring to nonconforming uses vs conforming uses: The legislature recognized in 2011 that there would be great concern by the public if their legally established shoreline structure was now classified as nonconforming and required that this be clarified. Ecology briefed the Planning Commission and stated that they did not have a problem with classifying legally established shoreline structures as conforming. I am not sure where the Ecology reference in the matrix came from but there was a county staff member who disagreed with this. Even the county attorney said that it didn't matter if it was called non-conforming, conforming, legally conforming and such. The majority disagrees with the Ecology statement in the matrix especially for the Shoreline Residential classification. 97% of the SR properties are already developed. Not making some concessions here will result in a significant uproar from those residents who own SR properties. 5. Permit requirement for all bulkheads: A hearing examiner should not be needed for bulkheads. An Admin CUP should be adequate. Hearing Examiner in this case only adds cost with no benefit. 6. References to critical areas within the SMP: Prefer having specifics in the SMP as directed by the CAO. 7. Allowing bulkheads for eutrophic lakes: Allowing lakes to die is not what the WAC's say. There are heavy pressures on our shorelines from large waves caused by the new wake boats and by climate change. Not trying to slow down the eutrophication of our lakes is like saying you shouldn't get bypass surgery for your heart or have Chemo therapy for cancer. (Please refer to comment letter #63 to review the remainder of this comment.)	Long Lake
64	5/14/23	Harry	Branch	Shoreline buffers need to be increased. Work needs to be science based. Check out: Shoreline Master Program Needs a Metamorphosis at: gardenbayblog.com	
65	5/14/23	Frank	Hudik	Attached are our comments to the Planning Commission's DRAFT SMP. Please include these comments as public testimony (Please refer to comment letter #65 to view attachments.)	Lake Lawrence

Thurston County BOCC Shoreline Master Program Public Hearing
Written Public Comments Matrix

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment Summary (View Individual Comment Letters For Full Text & Attachments)	Affiliation / Geo. Area
66	5/15/23	Diani	Taylor-Eckerson	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Thurston County's Shoreline Master Program (SMP) update. I am submitting these comments on behalf of Taylor Shellfish Company, Inc. (Taylor). Taylor is a family-owned company headquartered in Shelton, Washington and cultivates oysters, clams, mussels, and geoduck in the Puget Sound and other Washington State shorelines. The Taylor family has grown shellfish on Washington shorelines, including in Thurston County, for over 130 years. We appreciate the updated SMP will play a critical role in guiding future shoreline uses and development in the County, including aquaculture, and have actively participated in the SMP update process over the past several years to ensure the SMP protects the environment and fosters aquaculture as a preferred use of statewide interest consistent with state law and policy.</p> <p>The draft SMP is the result of hard work by the Planning Commission and County staff over many years, including multiple workshops focused on aquaculture. The draft SMP strikes an appropriate balance in addressing a number of interests, is supported by the best available science and consistent with the Department of Ecology's regulations. We recommend moving forward with the draft SMP as proposed.</p>	Puget Sound
67	5/15/23	Meredith & Donovan	Rafferty	<p>We are homeowners on salt water waterfront of unincorporated Thurston County. We are submitting the attached letter of testimony for the hearing on the Shoreline Management Program update, May 15, 2023. Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>(Please refer to comment letter #67 to view attachments.)</p>	Budd Inlet
68	5/15/23	Joe	Rehberger	<p>Please see attached written comments submitted on behalf of John Cosley and Melodye Cosley, Trustees of the Cosley Family Trust concerning the Board of County Commissioner's consideration of shoreline environmental designations. This comment concerns the Cosleys developed residential property located at 3125 46th Ave NE, Olympia, WA (TPN 12933220400) adjacent to Green Cove and Eld Inlet. We ask that these comments be transmitted to the Board of County Commissioners for consideration prior to and at the public hearing. If you have any questions, or require anything further please do not hesitate to contact me.</p> <p>Please let me know if you have any difficulty accessing or downloading the attached comment letter. Thank you for your and the County's consideration of this issue.</p> <p>(Please refer to comment letter #68 to view attachments.)</p>	Green Cove, Eld Inlet
69	5/15/23	Mike	Beehler	<p>As a former member (and chair) of the Lacey Planning Commission, and Lake Pattison shoreline owner, I wish to submit my comments regarding the BOCC hearing on the SMP update. I realize the County has spent some years in attempting to arrive at this point in the update process. Having the opportunity to now comment on the update I suggest that a conservative approach be taken in impacting shoreline residents in the County. Specifically, the earlier County Planning staff briefings/open house sessions were well attended by shoreline owners but over time it appeared that input was not being reflected. Even though county planners now appear to be accepting of reasonable language regarding setbacks, status of existing structures, etc., it still seems there is a need to reiterate the concerns held by many shoreline owners.</p> <p>My property is mostly "natural" in its adjacency to the Lake. A permitted dock, with a hand built path to the dock is the only manmade object along the 150-foot waterfront. All else is natural and untouched. I care deeply for the quality of the lake environment and its adjacent uplands. The existing setbacks should be maintained, not increased. Given the geology and topography of the property there is no good reason to extend the existing setback. Keep the lake setback at 50'. Structures on the lakeside property that are existing, permitted, and included in the taxable value of the property should be considered as "conforming" in the event the structures are within the setback area. To do otherwise is to penalize actions that were allowed prior to any adjustment in the setback provision.</p> <p>I support the County Planning Commission's SMP Recommendation Draft.</p>	Pattison Lake
70	5/15/23	Bob	Jacobs	<p>I write as a former board member of People for Puget Sound. For too long, local jurisdictions have done the minimum to meet state standards. Please don't do that. We need significant setbacks and retained/restored natural shoreline vegetation. In the case of tributaries to Puget Sound, the future of the Sound itself and its natural fauna (including Orcas) depend heavily on the provisions of SMPs. I support all comments submitted by Harry Branch, who is an expert in this subject.</p>	Puget Sound

Thurston County BOCC Shoreline Master Program Public Hearing
Written Public Comments Matrix

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment Summary (View Individual Comment Letters For Full Text & Attachments)	Affiliation / Geo. Area
71	5/15/23	Anne	Van Sweringen	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Thurston County Draft Shoreline Master Program (SMP) Update. On behalf of the five environmental groups I represent (listed above), please accept our comments on the Thurston County Planning Commission's SMP Update recommendations to the BoCC. Our comments conform to the online May 18, 2022 planning commissioners' review of the SMP Update and include responses to commissioners' SMP Update comments during planning commission meetings. Our comments are in two parts:</p> <p>Part I. TECS comments on the Thurston Shoreline Master Program Update</p> <p>Part II. TECS responses to planning commissioners' comments</p> <p>TECS supports the Minority Report. Our comments address points raised in the Minority Report. Citizens of the Thurston Environmental Community Stakeholder groups ask you to consider, support, and include these comments in the county's plans for the final draft SMP update.</p> <p>Part I. Thurston Environmental Community Stakeholders (TECS) Comments</p> <p>Legend:</p> <p>19.400.120.B.1. = Reference SMP location (example)</p> <p>TECS Comment = Thurston Environmental Community Stakeholders' comments</p> <p>A. Marine Resources Committee</p> <p>Have CPED establish a Thurston County Marine Resources Committee. The committee would act as a citizens advisory group that would work closely with state and local officials, while promoting public outreach and education. 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. Clallam, Jefferson, San Juan, Snohomish, Grays Harbor, and Island counties all have established MRCs.</p> <p>B. No Net Loss</p> <p>To achieve no net loss, the success of the SMP will depend on how the county improves mitigation in the permitting process. The SMP must require an evaluation of whether no net loss of shoreline ecological functions has been achieved. If no net loss has not been achieved, the SMP should be revised to address that failure. How is the county going to address this statement?</p> <p>(Please refer to comment letter #71 to review the remainder of this comment.)</p>	
72	5/15/23	Linda	Wolfe	<p>Andrew, I am in favor of the latest changes that the commissioners have seen. I am NOT in favor of most of the Minority report. I am also appalled that the Minority report is still being considered since it was turned in after the deadline. If we would have done that any report would have been thrown at as it was Passed the deadline.</p> <p>My neighbors have been working hard to take very good care of Long Lake. We live here and want what's best for our front yard, so we always do what's best for us.... which makes a better lake for the whole community..... even though the community does NOT follow the speed rules, causes loud noises and uncivil language, and will litter without a care! So please vote with the Long Lake Management District.</p>	Long Lake
73	5/16/23	Esther	Kronenberg	<p>We submit the following comments on the Shoreline Master Plan (SMP) as Thurston County residents and Co-Petitioners of a Petition to the Governor asking for the repeal of WAC 197-11-350, the Mitigated Determination of Nonsignificance (MDNS) regulation that the County used here for this SMP, which we have hereto attached and submitted to the record.</p> <p>Given the available alternatives you are now considering, we urge you to adopt the recommendations of the minority report. A functioning SMP is long overdue. But despite the large amount of work that has been done to put together this SMP, it is not enough. We also urge you to consider the SMP for further review in the Comprehensive Plan update, as it is not based on actual data and there has not been an EIS done to legally identify the impacts from its adoption. An EIS is necessary to analyze the full range of environmental impacts, as noted in RCW 43.21C.</p> <p>The County is obligated to follow RCW 43.21C and federal law in this regard. 33 USC 1251 states toxic pollutants be eliminated from navigable waters by 1985. Judge Pechman of the United States District Court, Western District at Seattle, recently ruled in Northwest Environmental Advocates vs EPA that the Department of Ecology and the EPA were in violation of the federal Clean Water Act by not enforcing updated water quality standards to protect aquatic life in Puget Sound from toxic chemicals. (Case No C20-1362MJP)</p> <p>The NPDES permit regarding the Endangered Species Act also notes that impacts from any developments, such as stormwater runoff and sewage must also be considered under cumulative effects. Neither of these issues is mentioned in the current SMP because it is not based on any analysis of actual scientific data. The County did not even consider changes that have occurred since its own 2013 inventory and characterization of the shoreline in this SMP. Instead it intends to begin baseline monitoring for no net loss upon its adoption, some 52 years after the passage of the Shoreline Management Act. Does the County not want to know how much of our shorelines and water bodies have already been lost or damaged? The baseline starts now for measuring no net loss without accounting for what has happened even in the last 10 years? How does tracking cumulative impacts on a project by project basis, as the County plans to do, conform to the intent of the Shoreline Management Act to "prevent the inherent harm in an uncoordinated and piecemeal development of the state's shorelines." And is there a dedicated and sufficient funding source and personnel available for this proposed tracking?</p> <p>RCW 43.21C, the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) requires that mitigations be identified by an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) before an MDNS can be issued. How did the County legally identify the impacts to mitigate here? Where is the data? What environmental factors were considered? Were climate change, species extinction, increased development, pollution and traffic, effects on the strategic groundwater reservation, etc. considered? Did it consider indirect impacts to habitat and water quality? Obviously the answer is no.</p> <p>RCW 43.21C.031(1) states "An environmental impact statement...shall be prepared on proposals for legislation and other major actions having a probable significant, adverse environmental impact." Clearly, the SMP, which concerns critical shoreline areas and which includes substantive mitigations, is such a proposal, notwithstanding the contrary statement of the Planning Department..</p> <p>SEPA requires more than just asserting that future compliance with existing laws and regulations will provide sufficient mitigation.</p> <p>(Please refer to comment letter #73 to review the remainder of this comment and attachments.)</p>	
74	5/16/23	Tim	Trohimovich	<p>Enclosed please find Futurewise's comments on the Shoreline Master Program BOCC Public Hearing Draft for the May 16, 2023, Board of County Commissioners Public Hearing. Thank you for considering our comments.</p> <p>(Please refer to comment letter #74 to review attachments.)</p>	

Thurston County BOCC Shoreline Master Program Public Hearing
Written Public Comments Matrix

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment Summary (View Individual Comment Letters For Full Text & Attachments)	Affiliation / Geo. Area
75	5/16/23	Scott	Steltzner	<p>The Squaxin Island Tribe Natural Resources Department provides the following comments.</p> <p>Protecting and restoring Treaty guaranteed natural resources, including fish and shellfish for Tribal members, is one of our fundamental missions at Squaxin Island. The Tribe appreciates this opportunity to provide comments and looks forward to working with the County to produce a scientifically sound document that also protects Treaty guaranteed rights.</p> <p>State law may require the update of the 1990 Shoreline Master Program (SMP); however, it is also welcome, as new science and information have been developed over the last 32 years that show the critical need to protect and restore our natural resources.</p> <p>Since the last SMP was approved, it has become clear that the policy of No-Net-Loss has not worked. Much of the environmental degradation documented in this update has occurred since the adoption of the last SMP. The Tribe advocates for the adoption of Net-Ecological-Gain when considering habitat issues. This would, at worst, ensure true No-Net-Loss, and, if implemented correctly, begin the restoration of critical habitats.</p> <p>There is much to commend within the supporting documents. In most instances, environmental protection has been strengthened. However, in others, regulations designed to protect the environment have been lessened in a way that is in direct conflict with the best available science.</p> <p>The most egregious example concerns the relaxing of regulations concerning riparian buffers. The science concerning shoreline buffers has advanced considerably since 1990. In all cases that we know of, science calls for, at a minimum, maintaining the existing buffer widths and, in most cases, expanding them considerably. In the update, the County is proposing, in certain cases, to decrease the width of shoreline buffers. This is unacceptable. For all shoreline designations, a minimum of 250 feet should be used. Where this cannot be achieved for a particular site, then meaningful mitigation that leads to Net-Ecological-Gain should be employed.</p> <p>Another issue concerns piers, docks, and overwater structures. The SMP should explicitly state that in many areas of fresh and marine waters, overwater structures will not be permitted. This can include natural areas, shorelines where few to no overwater structures currently exist, and along forage fish spawning beaches. These areas can be spatially mapped and included in the SMP shoreline designation maps.</p> <p>The Tribe looks forward to working with the County to adopt and implement a meaningful update to the Shoreline Master Program.</p>	
76	5/16/23	Marty	Beagle	<p>Well I looked at the map of proposed SED categories and would like to make supplication for reconsideration of the "Natural" designation of my property at 4120 Gravelly Beach Loop, parcel # 129 20 33 0000, and parcel # 129 29 22 0100. Currently the SED for my place is Conservancy- this designation essentially wraps around Frye Cove but also includes six lots to the "East" of my property- each of which are about 1 acre or so in size. The proposed Natural SED dos not include these 6 lots, instead the change in SED will occur at my "eastern" property line.</p> <p>So the proposed "Natural" SED begins at my "eastern" property line that includes a portion of a ravine that is shared with my neighbor at 3918 Gravelly Beach Loop, parcel 12929211400. Why that parcel is not proposed to have the Natural designation isn't clear to me as from an ecological viewpoint it provides nearly identical functions as much of its property includes the ravine, even more so when you consider the buffers that are mandated for such a topographical feature.Is that distinction simply because my property has no bulkhead? I would note the "stream" is of a seasonal nature and often dries up during the warmer weather.</p> <p>My property lies just to the East of the entrance to Frye Cove and is already "built out" to capacity based on the building codes, as are the four lots to my "west"- they constitute the southern side of the Cove and are also rated 1 unit per 5 acres and currently support residential activities. Beginning sometime around 1900 my property was the homestead for Volney Young and much of the original vegetation within 200' of the bank was long ago altered and is not representative of a "Natural" state. In addition, cultivation of shellfish has occurred on the tidelands for over 75 years, according to Volneys daughter, Mrs. Virginia Chambers.</p> <p>I don't have experience in debating the finer points of the distinction between Rural Conservancy and Natural Designations and would appreciate exploring that with the appropriate staff at the County so that I understand better the nuances between them. My approach to my property is to ensure any activity on it does not negatively impact the ecology of Eld Inlet or influence it's water quality, and I can assure you that will be the case regardless of what SED settles on it in the future.</p>	Eld Inlet
77	5/16/23	Jessie	Simmons	<p>Please find comments from Olympia Master Builders on the proposed Shoreline Management Program Updates attached.</p> <p>(Please refer to comment letter #77 to review attachments.)</p>	
78	5/16/23	Alex	Nielsen	<p>Please see the attached letter regarding our comments ahead of tonight's Shoreline Master Plan hearing.</p> <p>(Please refer to comment letter #78 to review attachments.)</p>	Nisqually Valley
79	5/16/23	Susan	Draper	<p>My husband and I live on Long Lake waterfront. I grew up in the house next door to the family home we built in 2006 and became a member of the Long Lake Management District soon after. Having followed the long progress of the proposed shoreline code update, it was with relief that the Planning Commissioners were able to present an agreed upon Proposal for Shoreline Code Update that took into account that most lakefront is fully built out with residential properties.</p> <p>It is my hope that county commissioner will not allow for further changes or amendments based on outside influence of the planning office personel.</p> <p>BOCC should...</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Accept and support the Planning Commission SMP Recommendation Draft. 2. Keep Shoreline Residential SED buffers at 50-feet. 3. Keep existing dwellings "our homes" classified as 'conforming' <p>Please consider the human factor in the goal of "no net loss".</p>	Long Lake

Thurston County BOCC Shoreline Master Program Public Hearing
Written Public Comments Matrix

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment Summary (View Individual Comment Letters For Full Text & Attachments)	Affiliation / Geo. Area
80	5/16/23	Barry	Halverson	<p>Madam Chair, Commissioners, my names is Barry Halverson. I live in southeast Thurston County and have participated in the Shoreline Master Program Review since 2012 as a County Citizen and since January 2022 as a County Planning Commissioner. I have listened to every E105citizen testimony and every expert's testimony on this program review. I found it interesting that after Planning Commission approval of the DRAFT SMP that staff prepared a decision matrix for you and included many topics that could and should have been brought to the Planning Commission for review/consideration/approval before the DRAFT was sent to you. Many of these topics could and would have been resolved without need for taking your time/effort.</p> <p>I found the minority report to be disconnected from public testimony over the 12 years this DRAFT was being reviewed and I was personally sitting in the audience listening. One of the biggest areas of public concern was the cost associated with the permit process and the frequency of requiring a costly hearing to obtain a permit for something as simple as building a dock or making needed landscaping changes to their shoreline. Administrative permit procedures should be more widely acceptable and the Planning Commission recognized that. The other disconnect was in Shoreline Environmental Designations and corresponding Buffer Widths. The minority report suggests that the Planning Commission recommended changes decreased buffer widths by as much as 50%. The truth is the Planning Commission recommendations increased all buffer widths from the 1990 Shoreline Master Program except for Shoreline Residential which it recommended remain the same. This does not results in Loss of Ecological function, but improves upon it. The Minority Reports recommendation to increase buffer widths in all categories even more would have no significant effect on No Net Loss, but would significantly increase costs to impacted home owners through higher permit fees and reduced home values. As shown in the County's cumulative impacts analysis only 3.5% of all county shoreline acreage is designated as Shoreline Residential. You would therefore once again be placing the highest financial burden on the smallest segment of the county's population. Increasing buffers for Shoreline Residential properties will negatively impact property values. Is the County Assessor prepared to conduct a re-evaluation of all shoreline properties in the County and reduce their property values accordingly thereby impacting county property tax revenue. Placing a Non-Conforming annotation on a persons property tax records will have that affect. The State Shoreline Management Act (RCW 90-58) clearly states: 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.... Even if you decide to expand the buffer from 50' to 75' the decision to retain the Planning Commissions recommendation that residential structures and appurtenant structures that were legally established be designated conforming should be retained and not discounted.</p> <p>Finally, I would like to point out that for years now I have repeatedly told staff that Appendix A to the SMP, the Inventory and Characterization Report that was one of the primary documents used by staff to make Shoreline Environmental Designations is a very inaccurate document. I have specifically pointed to the areas for Lake Lawrence that show salmon, cutthroat trout, winter steelhead residing in the lake. That is impossible given the geography of the lake and the fact that there is no stream, creek, or river that flows into Lake Lawrence and the fact that the Director</p> <p>(Please refer to comment letter #80 to review the remainder of this comment.)</p>	Lake Lawrence
81	5/16/23	John	Callery	The Green Park Community Club board agrees with the Natural designation for our portion of the cove.	Green Cove, Eld Inlet
82	5/16/23	Daniel	Moffett	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to share my opinion on the important matter of the Shoreline Master Plan (SMP). I am a thurston County lake shoreline property owner and voter. After following this SMP issue for many years and providing input to the planning Commission at several key points along the way, I would like you to take my concerns into consideration:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I am significantly concerned about the legal status of existing legally developed and properly used shoreline structures. Whether formerly allowed current shoreline structures may not meet current standards for new development. For areas that have been assigned a Shoreline Environmental Designation (SED) of "Shoreline Residential", I ask that you designate and approve as conforming any residential structures and appurtenant structures that were legally established and are used for a conforming use, but that do not meet standards to be considered a conforming structure: Setbacks, buffers, or yards; area; bulk; height; or density; and that 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. Classifying currently existing structures as legally conforming will not create a risk of degrading shoreline natural resources. It is in the public interest to clarify the legal status of these structures that will apply after shoreline regulations are updated. 2. Accept, adopt, and support the Planning Commission SMP Recommendation Draft. This seems to be a reasonable path forward toward "no net loss" of ecological function while protecting and balancing homeowner rights and property use. 3. For areas that have been assigned an SED of "Shoreline Residential": Keep Shoreline Residential buffers at 50-feet. 4. Reject provisions of the Planning Commission Minority Report dated August 8, 2022. I do not think the Minority Report accurately accounts for the years of public testimony and work sessions to be fully responsive Thurston County needs and desires. 	
83	5/16/23	Alexis	Deutscher	<p>I am a homeowner on Long Lake. I would like to share our voice regarding the Shoreline Master Plan update. It is our hope that the committee will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Accept and support the planning Commission SMP Recommendation -Keep Shoreline Residential SED buffers at 50 feet -Keep our homes classified as "conforming" 	Long lake
84	5/16/23	Barry	Halverson	<p>Commissioners, as stated by Commissioner Mejia tonight I am forwarding Andrew my testimony as citizens were not allocated sufficient time. Thank you for that consideration.</p> <p>(Please refer to comment letter #74 to review attachments.)</p>	Lawrence Lake
85	5/16/23	Beth	Wilder	<p>Please implement the following in regards to the SMP:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Accept and support the Planning Commission SMP Recommendation Draft, 2. Keep Shoreline Residential SED buffers at 50-feet. 3. Keep existing properties that have been legally built classified as 'conforming'. 	Pattison Lake
86	5/16/23	Rebecca	Gibson	<p>Please implement the following in regards to the SMP:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Accept and support the Planning Commission SMP Recommendation Draft, 2. Keep Shoreline Residential SED buffers at 50-feet. 3. Keep existing properties that have been legally built classified as 'conforming'. 	Pattison Lake
87	5/16/23	Paula	Rudberg Lowe	I have been following the SMP process for years. I want to keep the shoreline residential SED buffers at 50 feet. Many of our shoreline properties are narrow and deep, so 50 feet is already a lot of property. I also want to keep our homes classified as conforming.	Pattison Lake

Thurston County BOCC Shoreline Master Program Public Hearing
Written Public Comments Matrix

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment Summary (View Individual Comment Letters For Full Text & Attachments)	Affiliation / Geo. Area
88	5/16/23	Timothy & Peri	Maxey	Thank you for your work on updating the Shoreline Master Plan. Based on what we have learned from neighbors attending these meetings, we are encouraging you to: 1. Accept and support the Planning Commission's SMP recommendation draft, and 2. Keep the Shoreline Residential SED buffers at the current level of 50 feet, which will keep our homes classified as conforming.	
89	5/16/23	James	Biehl	Well done ,Frank.You captured the sentiments of the LMD and me personally. On 05/14/2023 9:17 PM PDT FRANK AND HEIDI Hudik <hudik5@comcast.net> wrote: Attached are our comments to the DRAFT SMP. Frank and Heidi Hudik	
90	5/16/23	Adam	Faussett	I would like to show my support for the Planning Commission SMP Recommendation draft. I have attended many meetings over the past 5 years and appreciate the opportunity to see and be a part of the SMP proposal. The main concerns I have are keeping our homes classified as conforming as they were that way when built. Changing this classification separates the waterfront owners from everyone else and has been seen as a way to increase fees and taxes to those called out in a different manner in many places across the country. I'm not saying you would do this but future members could. As a Homeowner on Long Lake, we already have imposed taxes upon ourselves and pay by the number of feet of waterfront we own to keep the lake nice for everyone that enjoys it. I also would like for our committee to keep control of the funds so we can limit their use to Long Lake. The 50 foot water buffer has been in effect for years, changing this would make Holmes Island unlivable/unbuildable/unremodelable. We are boarded by the road and the lake and 50' is already barely possible. I know a bigger buffer could make sense in future development, but most of Long Lake and waterfront property in the county has already been developed.	Long Lake
91	5/15/23	Lori	Loveland	I had planned to be at the public hearing tomorrow night but now am unable to be there as my husband and I are in Eastern WA with his mom who is dying from cancer. I hope that my letter can convey what I want to say. We do not live at our cabin on Lake Lawrence. It is a family cabin that my grandparents built in 1942, passed on down to my dad and then passed on down to me. My hope is that I can pass it down to my children and grandchildren but I worry that the changes that the minority report wants to make to the SMP will make it too hard to maintain the cabin and the property around it. We have tried so hard as the years have gone by to update the old structures without disturbing the ecosystem. When tree limbs fell and ruined our dock we did not cut down the trees but we simply replaced what had been damaged without increasing the square footage and then insured the new dock in case it happened again. We have tried to update our cabin without changing the square footage and we have left trees and vegetation intact despite the physical work that it takes to maintain the property. If you make the changes in the minority report you will force us to pay more for permits and adding things we don't want or need and make the cost of maintaining our property too expensive for us. Please do not make changes that will force us either to let our property become an eyesore or force us to sell a family property that our family has had for 80 years. We want to insure that Lake Lawrence stays beautiful for many generations to come. Please do not pass the minority report of the SMP and make this too hard for us to do	Lake Lawrence
92	5/15/23	Don & Kari	Cole	Please consider these four points during your review of the proposed Shoreline Master Plan: Please approve the SMP as recommended by the Planning Commission without any amendments: Although we are not thrilled about the increased restrictions on existing shoreline properties that in actuality may provide little benefit to the environment, the proposed draft SMP seems like a reasonable compromise between shoreline management and the practical use of existing properties. The plan aspires to improve ecological function using an approach that is better aligned to our local residential shorelines, which consist predominantly of already developed lots. This draft SMP incorporates the new State requirements and includes local management decisions as was intended by the State. Similar to SMP's for other jurisdictions with developed residential shorelines, the Planning Commission's SMP made a local decision to establish a 50-foot buffer for Shoreline Residential and to increase the buffers in the Natural and Conservancy SEDs. The Planning Commission recognized that environmental impacts have already occurred at the built out residential shorelines, are already highly regulated, and that further regulation would have no appreciable impact on the environment. Furthermore, shoreline residents are often the first stewards of the shoreline with high self-interest in protecting it. For example, Long Lake residents E87regularly petition to pay a substantial self-imposed annual tax for the formation and operation of a Management District for the purposes of improving the environmental health of their districts with many residents participating in the management of their district. The work by these management districts has provided very effective environmental improvements when compared to the impacts of environmental work by others. Please disregard the Minority Report containing false information presented by Latecomers to the SMP process: Not appearing until late in the public process, the writers of the Minority Report did not have benefit of information discussed by the many participants throughout the multiyear SMP process. As they self-proclaim, this report was written by a minority group, which did not prevail in the Planning Commission's regular public process. Therefore, please do not give significant weight to their comments. It is my understanding that this is an unprecedented action, which I am pleased to hear because it unfairly circumvents the extensive deliberation of the full public process. This Minority Report contains false statements, which would have been challenged in the full public process. For example, it makes false statements that portions of the SMP "do not meet the WAC" or "would not be approved by Ecology", but these statements are often not cited with code sections or employ erroneous conclusions. Their opinion that shorter buffers would not be approved by Ecology is wrong. To the contrary, Ecology regularly approved reduced buffers at many jurisdictions and even includes such examples within their published literature, specifying reduced buffers at multiple jurisdictions. Such false statements would have been exposed within a full public process. Please be aware that increasing the Shoreline Residential buffer by an additional 25-feet as proposed by the Minority Report creates substantial hardship with negligible ecologic gain: Should the Commission decide to entertain some of the items within the Minority Report, please maintain the Planning Commission's recommended 50-foot buffer for Shoreline Residential and disregard the 75-foot buffer within the Minority Report. According to the Appendix of the Buffer document published by Ecology, increasing the buffer from 50 feet to 75 feet would only provide (Please refer to comment letter #92 to review the remainder of this comment.)	Long Lake

Thurston County BOCC Shoreline Master Program Public Hearing
Written Public Comments Matrix

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment Summary (View Individual Comment Letters For Full Text & Attachments)	Affiliation / Geo. Area
93	5/12/23	Darren & Debbie	Smith	<p>First, allow us to thank you for your service to our community. We recognize there are many important issues that you deal with daily often with competing interests. As 30+ year homeowners on Long Lake (specifically Holmes Island) we have been following the update to the Shoreline Master Plan and have significant concerns regarding the impact certain changes would mean for doing even simple projects to our 60 year old home and property. With that in mind we ask the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Accept and support the Planning Commission SMP Recommendation Draft. The PC has put in a tremendous amount of work and this is a reasonable path forward toward "no net loss" of ecological function while protecting homeowner rights and property use. 2. Keep Shoreline Residential SED buffers at 50-feet. If buffer widths are increased the new buffer, in most cases, will wrap right around our homes. For what purpose? Why is this necessary? How would this contribute to "no net loss" of ecological function? 3. Keep our homes classified as "conforming". The State of Washington recognizes that such structures are "conforming" in RCW 90.58.620. We will be attending the meeting on Tuesday and following closely. Thank you for supporting the hard work of the Planning Commission and residents on our waters. 	Long Lake
94	5/8/23	Mark & Karla	Bryant	<p>As we are unable to attend the hearing regarding the Shoreline management Plan (SMP) on the 16th, we wish to present our input. Updating this plan has been in the works by the Thurston County Planning Commission and has been thoughtfully and thoroughly developed to meet state requirements as well as concerns of property owners. We have been fulltime residents on Lake Lawrence for 20 years in a home built in 1989. As longtime lake owners, we are very cognizant and careful to be good stewards of our special and fragile environment. We are supportive of an updated shoreline management plan and believe the extensive work of the Planning Commission over the years has sufficiently addressed this. We have several concerns as Shoreline Residential Property owners</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Our lake properties are nearly fully built out and as such, human environmental impact due to further development is unlikely. Therefore, Shoreline Residential properties should not bear the brunt of the SMP's very restrictive regulations. 2. Maintaining the 50' buffer for lake properties has been established by Ecology as "within the realm of justifiable", has been in place since the 1990 SMP and therefore should be maintained 3. Legally built structures should be maintained as being "conforming". Extensive work done by the Planning Commission with conjunction with ecology agrees upon this point. The State of Washington recognizes that such structures are "conforming" in RCW 90.58.620. Therefore, we urge the acceptance of the Planning Commissions SMP Recommendation of August 3, 2022. This is a very reasonable path toward "no net loss" of ecological function while protecting homeowner rights and property use. 	Lake Lawrence
95	5/4/23	Phyllis	Farrell	<p>Greetings Commissioners, I look forward to meeting with you next week. I have submitted written comments/suggestions via the SMP website, but am including below the comments to you directly... hoping you will see them before our meetings. I commend the staff and Planning Commission for the extensive research and work in developing the draft. I have followed the process for several years and it has been arduous! Overall, I think the draft has many good provisions and improvements, but there are some areas that need to be addressed.</p> <p>Vegetation Buffers:</p> <p>The Minority Report states the proposed provisions are not protective enough to meet Shoreline Management Act (SMA) policy goals and prevent net loss. The Planning Commission recommended Option A to decrease Shoreline Environmental Designation buffers. They also recommended buffers for Rural Conservancy designations to be reduced by 50% or 125 feet. The Minority Report states these recommendations do not "reflect the policy goals of the act" (WAC 173.26.186) Thurston County SMP buffers need to reflect best available science. Option B had more protective buffers, especially in marine shorelines (85' Marine Shoreline Residential and 250' in Urban Conservancy, Rural Conservancy and Natural). Buffers are important for maintaining ecological function! Projected sea level rise might shorten buffers. Reducing buffers will make mitigation and restoration efforts more expensive and complicated. Gwen Lentes, WDFW, shared in an e mail 10.19.20, WDFW recommends designating riparian buffers as critical areas and using the larger buffer option to more closely align with recent best available science.</p> <p>The riparian wetlands guidance for fish and aquatic species recommends prioritization of the "pollution removal function when appropriate;" and adoption of Site-Potential Tree Height (SPTH), based on potential tree height at 200 years, as "a scientifically supported approach if the goal is to protect and maintain full function of the riparian ecosystem." The Department of Ecology recommends a Riparian Habitat Area width of 250 feet for Type "S" (Shorelines of the State) and all fish (Type "F") streams regardless of whether they are currently or just potentially used, and whether they flow all year or not. The Draft SMP matches the Ecology guideline of 250 feet only for Type S streams and other streams greater than 20 feet wide. The range of protection for other fish streams is 150 to 200 feet. The more protective buffer width of 250' for both Type S and F streams is needed to ensure NNL and account for climate changes in stream temperatures.</p> <p>Vegetation requirements should be for mitigation purposes should be native vegetation; the non native vegetation allowance in the Planning Commission recommendations should be removed. No Net Loss can only be achieved with restoration of vegetation in buffers.</p> <p>Critical Areas: Critical areas are an essential tool of the GMA for preventing loss of environmental function.</p> <p>(Please refer to comment letter #95 to review the remainder of this comment.)</p>	
96	5/19/23	Alex	Nielsen	<p>This is Alex Nielsen with Nielsen Pacific, Ltd. I testified at the SMP public hearing on Tuesday, May 16. I understand that a Work Session is scheduled for May 24 and wanted to follow up on our request for the data to be available in the public record relating to the establishment of the flood stage elevation monument (NS08) located at the intersection of Old Pacific Highway Rd SE & Durgen Rd SE. If there's any additional information other than the aerial photography that's available online, could you please direct me to that?</p>	Nisqually Valley
97	5/16/23	James	Biehl	<p>Well done ,Frank.You captured the sentiments of the LMD and me personally. On 05/14/2023 9:17 PM PDT FRANK AND HEIDI Hudik <hudik5@comcast.net> wrote:</p> <p>Attached are our comments to the DRAFT SMP.</p> <p>Frank and Heidi Hudik</p>	Lake Lawrence

Thurston County BOCC Shoreline Master Program Public Hearing
Written Public Comments Matrix

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment Summary (View Individual Comment Letters For Full Text & Attachments)	Affiliation / Geo. Area
98	5/17/23	Heesoon	Jun	<p>Dear Commissioner, Menser, Commissioner, Mejia, and Commissioner Edwards:</p> <p>Thank you so much for giving me an opportunity to speak for two minutest at the Hearing last night (5/16/2023). You must be exhausted since you listened to everyone so attentively.</p> <p>My name is Heesoon Jun and my address is 3100 Sunset Beach Dr. NW. I requested my property should remain conservancy (Rural Conservancy). What I was not able to address yesterday was the fact that we (3 homeowners in the south side of Green Cove and 3 homeowners in the north side of Green Cove) were not notified by Andrew or his staff even though two Planning Commissioners addressed the importance of notifying property owners whose properties are impacted by SED change at the 3/16/2022 Planning Commission Meeting. One Commissioner requested Andrew to do so and he indicated he would.</p> <p>The other issue at the Planning Commission Meeting on 3/16/22 was the relation of the "citizen" who requested SED "Natural"; one commissioner explored the possibility of the "citizen" being one of us; I believe Andrew said he didn't know. The "citizen" stated in her comment she lives in Eld Inlet, but one of us (6 property owners) emailed the group. He wrote, "I was able to identify the comment that caused the change for MEL 29-30. Unless I am mistaken, it appears to have come from Kirsten Harma. When looking at her name on Thurston County Assessor page, her owned property appears in the City of Olympia, not anywhere along the Eld." Kirsten made the statement based on no site visits, no input from us, and no consideration of constitutional rights of property owners. I am troubled by the fact that her comment was one of the major factors of the SED change while property owners were left in the dark. What was the purpose of keeping us in the dark when two Planning Commissioners addressed the importance of informing us? What had happened to 6 of us seem to go not only against Thurston County Core Values but also neglecting SMP's efforts to keep "harmony between the needs of the Thurston County homeowners, public access to beaches clean water, salmon,..."</p>	Staff Note: This comment was submitted as an image via e-mail.
99	5/17/23	Virginia	Gunderson	<p>I attended the meeting last night and was pleased to have had an opportunity to voice my concerns. I came away with two main ideas.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The citizens of Thurston County are concerned about the waterfront and are in approval of the SMP proposal for the most part. 2. I heard over and over again that changing the rules is unacceptable. For homeowners who have complied with the current laws and permits the homes should be designated as COMPLIANT. The homes which have met the current requirements are COMPLIANT. From the issuance of the new SMP the new builds should be subject to the new buffer rules. It is similar to changing the rules in the middle of the game. Not acceptable. The existing homes should be grandfathered in. <p>Thank you for the chance to comment. I hope you listto the citizens and act accordingly. We don't feel we have been heard.</p>	Long Lake
100	5/8/23	Michael	Fischer	<p>Thank you each for your time, energy and effort invested in the affairs of our community. I am writing voice my strong support for all points made exceptionally clear in the attached letter from John Woodford, Chair of our Thurston County Shoreline Stakeholders Coalition on or about May 8,2023. I, and my Dad, Tom Fischer before me, have been shoreline residents on Lawrence Lake for over 30 years. During that time we have, at our own cost in time and money, worked very hard to maintain our property, protecting the shoreline and the water quality near us from deterioration and toxic chemicals.</p> <p>We have voluntarily invested countless hours in maintaining the lake itself - initially through community stewardship projects and once it came into being, as sitting members of the Lawrence Lake Management District. When the developer who clear cut the south end of Lawrence Lake, in clear violation of the legal stipulations for maintaining a certain number of trees on the 40 acres affected, ignoring the then legal requirement to leave a minimum of 200' from the high water point untouched and scoffing at the disruption to then present Eagle nesting areas (which at the time were still a protected species), we were the ones crying out to the county to enforce the rules and laws that were being ignored. Unfortunately, the county did nothing.</p> <p>Whenever there has been a call for volunteers to protect safe use of the lake for residents and non residents alike - whether it was clearing the 'floating islands' to ensure safe boating, removing toxic invasive species (such as Yellow Flag Iris) or leading community education efforts to minimize the use of fertilizer etc that contribute to our ongoing battle with toxic algae, we have been there. Every time. And now after all of these years of effort to do the right thing, I am angered to understand that you are considering decisions that amount to punishing us both financially and in terms of what we can do with property, property that mind you we have been caring for for longer than most of these people have been working for the county or their activist organizations.</p> <p>I hope you would understand my sentiment should you take the time to put the "shoe on your own foot" that we will be forced to accept by the overly restrictive, exceptionally poorly thought out suggestions make included in:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the PC Minority Report dated August 8, 2022 by a group whose timing and lack of participation in any shape or form up until that point clearly indicates no vested interest or consideration of the rights of a place and people they are not even a part of 2. The 68 items that make up the SMP Update - BoCC Decision Matrix - the questionable intent of which is wholly disappointing in that it wasn't even presented to our Planning Commission. What would motivate them take that course of action? 3. And from the 5 Major Decision Points companion documents to the above Item 3, Matrix...) the Planning staff's clear miss on Points #1 and 4 <p>Please, on May 16, accept the Planning Commission SMP recommendation dated August 3, 2022 which represents the most reasonable path forward towards balancing the need for protecting</p> <p>(Please refer to comment letter #100 to review attachments.)</p>	Lawrence Lake

Thurston County BOCC Shoreline Master Program Public Hearing
Written Public Comments Matrix

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment Summary (View Individual Comment Letters For Full Text & Attachments)	Affiliation / Geo. Area
101	5/24/23	Howard	Glastetter	<p>I'm responding to a request you made on May 24, 2023, for further comments on the Thurston County SMP. I submitted a comment on May 5, 2023, about the need for a Thurston County response when outside jurisdictions, contiguous to Thurston County, make changes that will impact SMP assets in Thurston County.</p> <p>I've done a bit more research about the Thurston County Delta, where my wife and I own property and two homes we enjoy. I came across the following document that was produced by the Nisqually Tribe.</p> <p>https://geo.nwifc.org/sow2020/SOW2020_Report/Nisqually.pdf</p> <p>This 2020 document analyzes the current condition of this beautiful valley and gives some noble ideas of how it can be improved and seriously restored. It also talks about urban growth areas in the valley (page 2) replacing I-5 and restoring sediment delivery in the delta (page 3). It doesn't mention the Thurston County 1992 Sub-Area Plan that has preserved the rural character of the lower valley (at a sacrifice to some large Thurston County property owners here).</p> <p>So, the 13-page document has some good ideas and is worth a read. However, there is a bit of vagueness. Page 4 touches on delivery mechanisms for sediment, preparing for "FERC relicensing of the Tacoma projects ...".</p> <p>I'll translate this one. FERC is the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. The elephant-in-the-room for Nisqually Valley is the Tacoma Power Utility's (TPU) Alder Lake Dam. It's not mentioned by name in the document. TPU has no flood mitigation responsibility in their license. Most valley flooding is caused by attempting to top off the reservoir during dangerous winter storms. This could be reversed at no cost by building safety rules into the FERC license. A hand full of words could do it.</p> <p>The reservoir also has its own "Delta" (sediment buildup behind the dam). An expensive modification to the dam might be built to allow this sediment to naturally flow in measured amounts down river.</p> <p>There is also no mention of mitigation or compensation to property owners who live or do business in Thurston County's upper half of the Nisqually Delta (above I-5). Thurston County should take a lead in this. I'd be happy to volunteer to have a part.</p>	Nisqually Valley
102	5/25/23	Brian & Nancy	Muirhead	<p>I sent you the message below on Tuesday 5/23/23. I looked at your package and listened in on the BoCC Working Meeting today (5/24). I looked through your package and didn't see my formal inputs to you, or any reference to my comments at the Public Hearing. I've included (below and as an attachment) my full set of intended comments to the BoCC at the 5/16 Public Hearing, most of which I was able to cover in the 2 min limit.</p> <p>From today's meeting I understand there are 5 cases of SED issues and that they are expected to be addressed at the 6/14 meeting. I also heard that commissioner Menser will be looking at them. I assume that our case is part of that package. Please confirm.</p> <p>Have you reviewed our package and do you have a position on it. If you fee a need to interact with our expert, Lisa Palazz, I'd be willing to try and set up a meeting. I've copied Joshua on this communication since I saw he was actively engaged in helping the commissioners work the various issues associated with completing the SMP review and approval process.</p> <p>Brian 5/23/23 message Andrew,</p> <p>I understand that the BoCC will be addressing the various SMP issues at a 5/24 and 6/14 meetings. I'd like to know if my request for a review by staff (i.e. I assume by you) of our issue and proposed solution will be addressed at one of these meetings. Is there anything more I can do to be sure our issue is addressed.</p> <p>(Please refer to comment letter #102 to review attachments.)</p>	Pattison Lake
103	5/26/23	Bonnie	Blessing	<p>Hello</p> <p>What an enormous task to write a SMP! I am concerned about the language used fir SH 21.6 on page 43 of 572) the 28march2023 SMP. The language is: prevent introduction of sediment in eutrophic lakes from wetland encroachment and shoreline erosion which accelerates aging of these lakes, ... causes degradation of shoreline ecological function.. My response. Could this be rewritten to say 'prevent erosion of shorelines of lakes, as this can degrade ecological function and lower recreational opportunities' Wetlands form naturally on the margins of lakes, trapping sediment and muck, that if eroded, lowers recreational values.</p>	
104	5/26/23	Bonnie	Blessing	<p>I understand the concerns over lake 'aging' and 'wetland 'encroachment'. But our lakes are becoming almost unusable when we most want to swim. Some lakes are drinking water. We all enjoy lakes so have built homes on them. Aging of lakes tends to increase organic soil, increase vegetation and tannins. Phosphorus is stored in these in a form not terribly available to harmful algae. See Ketuta /ris 2018 Phosphorus storage and resorption in riparian tree species. See Claire P. Muerdltler 2019. Impact of vegetation selection on nitrogen and phosphorus. (See any soil report of muck soils). They are high in phosphorus. Thats because these soils hold onto phosphorus. We want phosphorus in the muck or in the shoreline vegetaion, not dissolved where microcystis, anabaena or aphanizomen can access phosphorus in a dissolved state. And kill our dogs who may go into the lake! Perhaps be informed by research from Wisconsin where many still drink from Lake Michigan! Its not smeary like Lake Erie. Please let us keep our riparian vegetation and prevent soil erosion on shorelines so we can continue to swim in our lakes in summer.</p>	
105	5/26/23	Bonnie	Blessing	<p>I am concerned about the SMP language on page 43 and 56 and the maintenance of 'irrigation structures' See the following comments:</p> <p>page 43. Can this be written to say that wetland encroachment on a lake is not necessarily bad for shoreline ecological functions?</p> <p>page 56. I am concerned that the SMP alone will guide development and vegetation management in shorelines of the state. Does the SMP incorporate the guidelines of the HCP? It says it does on the early sections of the SMP. Its unclear how or whether maintenance of drainage ditches benefits a stillwater species by increasing flow.</p> <p>https://s3.us-west-2.amazonaws.com/thurstoncountywa.gov.if-us-west-2/s3fs-public/2023-03/cped-cp-SMP-STRIKETHROUGH-BOCC-Public-Hearing-Draft.pdf</p> <p>Maintenance of irrigation structures. Do you mean 'drainage ditches' rather than 'irrigation structures'.</p> <p>https://s3.us-west-2.amazonaws.com/thurstoncountywa.gov.if-us-west-2/s3fs-public/2023-01/cped-cp-docs-SMP-FAQ-11-Ag.pdf</p>	

Thurston County BOCC Shoreline Master Program Public Hearing
Written Public Comments Matrix

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment Summary (View Individual Comment Letters For Full Text & Attachments)	Affiliation / Geo. Area
106	5/28/23	Bob	Zych	<p>I'm writing to encourage acceptance of the Shoreline Master Program (SMP) as submitted by the Thurston County Planning Commission. The Commission worked diligently for years crafting the proposed draft and incorporated appropriate changes to update the existing SMP. The Planning Commission's SMP Recommendation Draft represents countless hours of research, informed discussion, and debate. Although well intended, the Minority Report and the County Staff Matrix lack the benefit of the context gained during the development of the Planning Commission draft. The Minority report and Staff Matrix add very little practical value to the Planning Commission Recommendation Draft, and if incorporated, impose onerous restrictive regulations.</p> <p>The most significant issues include:</p> <p>Accept and support the Planning Commission SMP Recommendation Draft.</p> <p>Keep Shoreline Residential SED buffers at 50-feet.</p> <p>Keep existing structures classified as 'conforming'.</p> <p>Respect the fact that individual shoreline residents are the first stewards of their properties and adjacent shorelines and waters, with self interest in protecting them for future generations.</p> <p>Thank you for your interest and acceptance of public comments.</p>	Long Lake
107	5/28/23	Phyllis	Farrell	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide further comments re the SMP. Previously I have advocated for more protective buffers, provisions to reduce armoring and single family docks, and require "soft" armoring and pervious docks.</p> <p>I believe it is important that the SMP encourage ample riparian buffers, especially on salmon bearing streams along with compensation for property owners (especially farmers) for conservation efforts.</p> <p>Industrial aquaculture has taken over Thurston County shorelines, converting public waters into factory farms affecting eel grass, forage fish habitat and public access. Counties can regulate aquaculture practices. I am hoping Thurston Co. could take the lead in regulating industrial aquaculture, phasing out the use of plastics, more sustainable harvesting practices, and requiring metrics of NNL on aquaculture permits.</p> <p>The SMP also should include provisions (funding would be needed...perhaps from aquaculture permits?) for more rigorous monitoring and enforcement of aquaculture permit requirements. The County should report these activities.</p> <p>It is imperative that metrics to measure No Net Loss are employed...descriptive provisions/permitting that should accomplish NNL are not acceptable. I would hope monitoring of vegetation buffers, amount of impervious armoring, water quality and biodiversity would be employed.</p> <p>Thank you for all your hard work on this important document.</p>	
108	5/28/23	Patrick	Townsend	<p>In support of the Planning Commission minority report, these are our comments on the aquaculture components of the proposed SMP:</p> <p>Monitoring, Inspections and Enforcement</p> <p>Current and historical practices have demonstrated a lack of adequate inspection, monitoring and enforcement of aquaculture permits. New procedures and practices are required to minimize environmental impacts. Every site should be inspected at the time of planting, when structural changes occur, such as with removal of nets, and when harvesting occurs. There must be a mechanism for reporting permit violations by county personnel and citizens and a response by the county.</p> <p>No use of plastics</p> <p>Polyvinyl Chloride (PVC) and High Density Polyethylene (HDPE) plastics are used extensively in aquaculture. They are toxic during their manufacture and use in the marine environment. The toxic elements include mercury, asbestos and/or polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS). There is no safe level of PFAS chemicals for humans. The use of these plastics for aquaculture must be eliminated and sustainable practices required.</p> <p>Non-disruptive harvesting</p> <p>Current geoduck harvesting techniques involve the liquification of the tidelands to a depth of three feet. This damages the benthic environment and reduces biodiversity. Because sites are continuously replanted after each harvest, there is no time for recovery. This form of harvesting should be prohibited in favor of sustainable techniques. Additionally, intensive oyster bag cultivation covers large sections of tideland disrupting naturally occurring flora and fauna. Spacing and buffers based on available science with adaptable management practices should be put in place to protect the tideland environment.</p> <p>Adaptive Management</p> <p>The principle of Adaptive Management should be applied to aquaculture. This should include a formal means of observing and reporting information about industry practices and impacts on the environment, as well as a formal process to revise regulations as new information emerges.</p> <p>Individual permits (not consolidated)</p> <p>Because aquaculture sites can vary greatly even when in close proximity, each site must be evaluated for environmental impacts. The consolidation of multiple adjacent parcels into one permit application prevents proper environmental evaluation and should be prohibited.</p> <p>No net loss</p> <p>(Refer to comment letter #108 to view remainder of comment.)</p>	Budd Inlet

Thurston County BOCC Shoreline Master Program Public Hearing
Written Public Comments Matrix

Tracking #	Date	First Name	Last Name	Comment Summary (View Individual Comment Letters For Full Text & Attachments)	Affiliation / Geo. Area
109	5/29/23	Carol Jo	Hargreaves	<p>I appreciate all of the work and time that has gone into clarifying codes and regulations, allowing more flexibility when property owners rebuild structures on existing footprints, creating a more streamlined permitting process and, most of all, prioritizing healthy and safe shorelines for people, fish, and wildlife.</p> <p>I am opposed, however, to use of the terms “nonconforming” and “legally existing nonconforming.” These connote that the identified structure appears to be “illegal (but grudgingly accepted)” where, in fact, it was lawfully established, conforming to the standard of the Codes/Ordinances at the time it was constructed. The majority of properties currently designated Shoreline Residential are permanently in place, cannot be relocated and their owners should not need to be concerned in the future about whether or not they are “legal.”</p> <p>The above rationale (majority of Shoreline Residential properties are permanently in place) also applies to the idea of increasing the width of buffers.</p> <p>I have two questions: (1) My home is on Long Lake. I wonder why some Shoreline Residential properties on Long Lake are also designated Aquatic but most are not. Is there someone who can explain this to me?</p> <p>(2) Is it possible to develop two separate SMPs - one for Lakes and Rivers and the other for Marine properties? Although I agree that protecting the shoreline environment is an essential statewide policy goal, shorelines vary from one water source to another and lumping them together as one seems to cause confusion and dissension. I understand that writing (and later revising) an SMP is a long and tedious process but it does not seem equitable to lump together such widely disparate types of properties with different problems and needs.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my input.</p>	
110	5/30/23	Meredith & Donovan	Rafferty	<p>Thank you for the extended deadline to comment on the draft SMP.</p> <p>We are neighbors in the Boston Harbor community along the northerly shore facing Zangle Cove. Our homes along this densely developed shoreline existed before the enactment of the Shoreline Management Act of 1971 and the Shoreline Master Program has been a constant in regulating our use of our properties all these years.</p> <p>We actively participated in the SMP update led by the Planning Commission and have many comments on record. We now ask your approval of the draft SMP as recommended by the Planning Commission.</p> <p>This includes approval of the recommended buffers for salt water residential shorelands. Specifically, for our homes under a Shoreline Residential designation, the proposed buffer combined with the more stringent regulations of this SMP update will continue to provide protection.</p> <p>We also ask that you support wording of a “conforming” rather than “nonconforming” status for legal development that occurred before SMA requirements, as addressed by the 2011 Legislature.</p>	Budd Inlet
111	5/30/23	Ron	Smith	<p>Please accept the attached letter concerning the revision of the Shoreline Master Program.</p> <p>I represent the non-profit organization Protect Henderson Inlet and write for my constituents.</p> <p>I would appreciate a confirmation that you received my letter.</p> <p>(Please refer to comment letter #111 to review attachments.)</p>	Henderson Inlet
112	5/30/23	Bonnie	Blessing	<p>Please see the attached letter showing pictures of an elderly man improving a shoreline by installing biochar in a ditch that runs to the lake from near his septic outfall, planting deeprooted perennials and asparagus>30 feet from end of septic outfall, picking up litter and picking seedheads of invasive weeds.</p> <p>Perhaps these could be done for Stream Team activities while learning about lake ecology and native shoreline plants.</p> <p>(Please refer to comment letter #112 to review attachments.)</p>	
113	5/30/23	John	Woodford	<p>Attached is the Coalition’s May 30, 2023 SMP letter for your consideration. We are looking forward to your June 14th SMP Work Session.</p> <p>(Please refer to comment letter #113 to review attachments.)</p>	Long Lake
114	5/31/23	Alex	Nielsen	<p>Thank you for the opportunity for further public comment. The decisions to be made on the proposed SMP Update should be made on sound and verifiable data. The SMP Update will alter the Zoning Classification on over 700 parcels and we believe a portion of the new Zoning Classification will be made in error. Based on the information that is currently publicly available (pending an additional records request submitted 5/23/23 through the County Website and records request made at SMP public hearing on 5/16/23), we have come to understand that a portion of the proposed SMP’s mapping for “Frequently Flooded Areas” in the Nisqually Valley, specifically near 828 Old Pacific Highway Southeast, Olympia, Washington 98513 is beyond the minimum requirements set forth in WAC 173-22-040 and is not accurate based upon the Tetra Tech Report (2013) adopted by the County.</p> <p>We are requesting that either this mapping for “Frequently Flooded Areas” in the Nisqually Valley be amended to be consistent with Tetra Tech Report (2013) or the data the County is now relying upon with regard to Monument NS08 (Flood Elevation) must be made available in the public record for review by the public prior to any decision by the Commissioners.</p> <p>The County Records Division is indicating that the requested information will not likely be made available (in accordance with a public records request) until June 23. We understand from Andrew Deffobis that if the Commissioners would ask for the data directly (i.e., field notes and other documentation), the County Planners would make it available promptly. We are confused why we (the public) must wait longer until June 23 to receive any such data in accordance with a public records request.</p> <p>Attached is a Technical Memorandum prepared by our engineers (Sitts & Hill Engineers, Inc.) based upon available information in the public domain. As noted in the Memorandum, in 2013, the County engaged Tetra Tech, an experienced engineering firm, to prepare a Hazard Mitigation Plan. Their Report (also attached), which was formally adopted by the County, mapped the extents and limits of the 1996 Flood, which does not extend as far south as the County’s designation of the “1996 Flood of Record”. Tetra Tech’s Report was prepared from County data as noted in the attached Memorandum. Tetra Tech’s Report is in direct conflict with the County’s “Monument NS08”.</p> <p>Tetra Tech’s Report as to the extent (elevation of the 1996 Flood) (supported by County data) is consistent with the public testimony and is in conflict with proposed SMP mapping which must be resolved prior to any decision on an update to the SMP.</p> <p>We appreciate you taking the time to review the attached Memorandum, Tetra Tech Report, and information. The County’s decision should be made on sound and not conflicting data.</p> <p>(Please refer to comment letter #114 to view attachments.)</p>	Nisqually Valley

Thurston County BOCC Shoreline Master Program Public Hearing
Written Public Comments Matrix

[illegible]