



COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

Carolina Mejia  
District One

Gary Edwards  
District Two

Tye Menser  
District Three

**COMMUNITY PLANNING &  
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT**

*Creating Solutions for Our Future*

Joshua Cummings, Director

**MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** Planning Commission

**FROM:** Andrew Deffobis, Interim Senior Planner

**DATE:** **October 28, 2021**

**SUBJECT:** **Shoreline Master Program Public Hearing Follow-up**

Public Hearing Summary

On October 20, 2021, the Planning Commission held its public hearing on the Shoreline Master Program (SMP) update. The hearing had both virtual and in-person components. Twenty (20) people signed in on the physical sign-in sheets, and ten (10) testified in person during the hearing. One-hundred thirty-five (135) people registered to attend by Zoom, and approximately ninety (90) attended. Seventeen (17) of those testified via Zoom.

Written Public Comments

The written public comment period for the Planning Commission's public hearing draft was open from August 13 through October 22, 2021. During this time, 299 comments were received from the public and stakeholder groups, in addition to five (5) comments from public and private agencies. Three (3) written comments were submitted during verbal testimony.

All written public comments received during this public comment period are posted online at: <https://www.thurstoncountywa.gov/planning/Pages/shorelines-update-open-house.aspx>. A comment matrix is also posted on that site. To keep file sizes manageable, comments were broken up into volumes as follows for posting:

- Comments 1-68: Volume 1
- Comments 69-75: Volume 2
- Comments 76-106: Volume 3
- Comments 107-144: Volume 4
- Comments 145-185: Volume 5
- Comments 186-210: Volume 6
- Agency Comments 1-5: Volume 7

## Second Page Header

- Comments 211-235: Volume 8
- Comments 236-277: Volume 9
- Comments 278-302: Volume 10

Written and verbal comments covered a wide range of topics. Topics and themes discussed by the public include, but were not limited to:

- Questions about how the update would apply to specific properties or projects
- Support for specific buffer options in the draft
- Support for specific development standards in the draft
- Concerns about proposed shoreline environment designations (SEDs) for specific shoreline reaches, and requests to revisit these proposals
- SMP should ensure protection of natural systems
- Questions about how no net loss requirements are addressed in draft
- Comments on which activities should require permits, and how permits should be processed
- Questions on accuracy of maps depicting shoreline jurisdiction or SEDs
- Maintaining existing development on property should be allowed
- SMP should use an alternative term in place of “nonconforming”
- Questions about how the update affects property taxes or property values
- SMP should not be more restrictive than state requirements
- Companion educational pamphlet must be completed simultaneously with update
- Concerns about how the SMP update applies to agriculture
- Agricultural activities should be maintained and encouraged
- Concern about impacts posed by aquaculture operations and how they are regulated

### Next Steps

The Planning Commission will resume discussion of the SMP update at its November 3, 2021 meeting. At this meeting the Planning Commission should begin to identify specific sections of the draft they wish to revisit, based on the Planning Commission’s review of public comments. If necessary, this discussion may resume during the work session on November 17. Over the next several work sessions, staff will work with the Planning Commission to prepare the Planning Commission’s recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners.