

Polly Stoker

From: John Woodford <jwoodford.aia@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, April 17, 2020 1:53 PM
To: Jennifer Davis; Polly Stoker; Andrew Deffobis
Subject: April 15, 2020, virtual Planning Commission meeting

Ms. Davis, Ms. Stoker, Mr. Deffobis and Commissioners,

As a non-participating observer of last Wednesday's meeting I would like to add my comments. First, please do not make virtual meetings the "new normal" for the long term...for the short term-okay. Return to live meetings in Room 152 when the governor and BoCC say we're ready. And, please do not ever consider holding Open Houses or Public Hearings in a virtual format; the public has to be able to participate in person.

Now...the things that I liked and appreciated with the virtual format. I could see all of you participants very well. And I could actually HEAR all of your comments...something that is most often very "iffy" in a live meeting. The visual material presented by Shannon Shula and Andrew Deffobis was vastly more visible and useful than images projected on the screen in Room 152. And, I could sit at home at my desk, spread out my notes/my copy of Ch 19.600 and easily make new notes.

One thing missing from the virtual meeting, that I would have liked hearing, was the Public Comments/Communication. I know that you received five written comments and that they are already posted on your web page, but I would have liked to hear at least a very brief summary of the subject matter of each comment during the meeting.

Now, Andy, I would like to raise some SMP items that were not discussed Wednesday evening.

1) Why were Water Oriented Industrial Uses in Shoreline Residential SEDs changed from "Prohibited" to "Conditional Use Permit"? See Table 19.600.105...the Matrix, 19.600.150.A.2 and 19.600.150.B.3.a. Where in a Thurston County Shoreline Residential SED could you find a place where any industrial use would be compatible with residential use? Everyone, please take a close look at the SED map. Other than the Boston Harbor area and a sizable portion the west coast of Eld Inlet (Steamboat Island), all other marine water Shoreline Residential stretches are very limited. The vast majority of Shoreline Residential properties are adjacent the County's fresh water lakes. Allowing any industrial use in an existing residential neighborhood seems counter to any reasonable planning standards.

2) These comments deal with 19.600.160 Mooring Structures and Activities.

a) 19.600.160.C.1.p and f plus 19.600.160.C.5.e through h deal with covers and grating requirements for boat houses, piers and floats. While this has been discussed in the past, it did not come up on Wednesday. None of this applies to the fresh water lakes of Thurston County.

b) 19.600.160.C.4.c states, "Piers shall have a north-south orientation..." And it goes on to say that the pier height must be raised for every degree that the pier departs from this n-s orientation. I assume that this has something to do with salmon/juvenile salmonids; the requirement should not apply to lakes...where most of the residential properties occur. I live on Long Lake which has a predominately north-south bearing. Therefore, for most Long Lake residents to have a pier perpendicular to their shoreline (an east-west orientation), they would have to raise it far above the water level.

c) 19.600.160.C.4.d states, "New or replacement piers must be oriented in a straight line." Does this prohibit an L or T or even a curved configuration? If so, why?

3) On your web site the SMP Draft-Chapter-19.700-update-Strike-thru-WM.pdf that appears on the Meeting Agenda for April 15, 2020, contains no strikes-through or change of any kind. This is exactly the same Chapter 19.700 that was first presented to the Planning Commission in the late summer of 2017. Or, am I missing something here? Will 19.700 be on the agenda for the next Planning Commission meeting?

Thank you all for your efforts during these difficult times.

Stay Safe,

John Woodford, AIA,
Chair

Thurston County Shoreline Stakeholder Coalition

MLR comments 6.3.20

7600 Redstart Dr. SE
Olympia, WA 98513

June 2, 2020

Maya Teeple, Senior Planner
Thurston County Planning
2000 Lakeridge Dr. SE
Olympia, WA 98502

Re: Mineral Lands Review

Dear Ms. Teeple,

Once again, I am double booked for meetings June 3rd at 6:30. I will try switch from another meeting in order to make a public comments at the beginning of the Planning Commission meeting, but in case I can't, I am submitting comments and questions regarding the Mineral Lands Review materials in the Planning Commission meeting notice May 29th.

I am referencing the May 20th materials "Presentation of MLR Options" ([Presentation MRL 05202020 Options Follow Up Discussion.pdf](#)), in the Summary of Decision Points and Options for the D and E options, there are "Considerations" columns of Ease of Implementation and Flexibility to the Industry. May I suggest for the Planning Commission members that columns be added to include Environmental and Property Owners/Residential? These are important considerations and impacts for each option.

Thank you for your work and service on this challenging project. I appreciate your patience and assistance!

Regards,

Phyllis Farrell

Polly Stoker

From: Bob Jensen <rvmijensen@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 03, 2020 9:14 PM
To: Andrew Deffobis
Cc: pmrlowe@comcast.net; mcbeehler@outlook.com
Subject: Thurston County Shoreline Master Program Amendments -- Toxic Blue-Green Algae Blooms

Dear Andrew,

I just watched on Zoom, the Thurston County Planning Commission discussion, and your presentation regarding proposed amendments to the County Shoreline Master Program (SMP). It was not open to public discussion. Therefore, subsequently, I left you a voicemail message on your office phone.

My name is Robert (Bob) Jensen. I am deeply concerned about the increasing occurrence of toxic blue-green algae blooms on Pattison and other shoreline lakes in the County.

I have an extensive history in the administration and adjudication of activities on the shorelines of the State. I believe I have detailed this to the County in previous written comments. Please advise me if you need elaboration of this.

The toxic algae blooms are primarily caused by leaking phosphorous into lakes. This accumulation is due to the continual of phosphorous into the lakes from septic systems. Absent requiring sewers, which is unlikely to happen any time soon; the only practical control currently available is the limitation of the outflow of phosphorous from residential septic systems into the lakes. For this reason, I advocate mandatory monitoring and maintenance of the existing systems. In addition, the problem is grave enough to consider a moratorium on new residential development on shoreline lakes; until the toxic blue-green algae blooms end on the lakes.

Unfortunately, the County Commission, approximately three years ago, rejected a proposed ordinance, which would have required a fee; which would have been used by the County Health Department, to regulate septic systems on lakes subject to increasing residential use.

As a result of this failure, and as a complement to the authority of the County Health Commission, the Shoreline Master Program must be the primary tool to control these toxic algae blooms.

I know how critical the placement of sewers is to controlling the blooms. I lived in Seattle, as a youth, when many beaches on Lake Washington were closed due to such blooms. Once the residential development around the lake was protected by sewers, the toxic blooms

stopped. Once again, the beaches were open both to the public, and private use.

I later saw this same situation occur on Eastern Washington lakes in the mid 1970's. Studies then proved toxic blue green algae blooms were occurring due to the over-loading of phosphorous. In fact, in 1976, a major toxic algae bloom occurred during this time on Lake Spokane, below Spokane on the Spokane (Columbia) River. It caused a major fish kill, as well as adverse physical and psychological effects on many of the residents of that lake. The source of the phosphorous loading in that incidence, was a temporary planned bypass of Spokane's sewage treatment plant, during the period when the upgraded plant was connected to the sewer, which discharged into the river.

Please advise me how and when I can present my proposal to the Planning Commission, prior to approval of the proposed amendments to the SMP.

My telephone number is: 360-259-2736; my email address is: rwmjensen@hotmail.com.

Thank you kindly for your attention.

Respectfully yours,

Bob Jensen