

**From:** [valerierobz@gmail.com](mailto:valerierobz@gmail.com)  
**To:** [SMP](#)  
**Subject:** Incoming SMP Comment  
**Date:** Thursday, March 4, 2021 8:28:02 PM

---

**Your Name (Optional):** Rob Kirkwood and Valerie Hammett

**Your email address:** [valerierobz@gmail.com](mailto:valerierobz@gmail.com)

**Comment:** We have owned our property at 4424 65th Ave NE since 1989. During our 1989 short platting process, the Shoreline set back was established at 200' from OHW. At the time, we thought that was overly restrictive, but accepted it as part of the new environmental awareness. We have left the property much as we found it, other than a trail to the beach that is legally shared with the two upland properties and informally by other neighbors. We have sold our home on the upland parcel, 4426 65th Ave NE, and would now like to build a cabin closer to the beach. During the initial development investigation, we found that the shoreline set back had been increased to 250'. This renders about 2/3's of the property useless and sets our building site back far enough to substantially block any water or western view.

During a short shoreline boat cruise last fall we noted how many of our neighboring properties have bulkheads and they continue to clear cut trees and brush right down to the OHW. We realize that the shoreline structures were built prior to awareness of the environmental damage caused by building so close to the water.

We are not asking to build on the beach. Our bank has been little changed since we purchased the property so a bulkhead is not necessary. We would prefer the setback to be 150' with limbing up of major trees allowed while leaving the brush in place. We realize that the previous set back adjustments were made as an almost emergency reaction to the increasing development and environmental awareness. We hope that now with wisdom gathered over the last 30 years that the setbacks can be reduced to allow us to enjoy our property in a manner more similar to our neighbors.

---

Time: March 5, 2021 at 4:27 am

IP Address: 73.225.107.170

Contact Form URL: <https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-the-proposed-shoreline-code-update/>

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.

**From:** [Barry Halverson](#)  
**To:** [Andrew Deffobis](#)  
**Subject:** Fw: Lake Lawrence - Salmon  
**Date:** Monday, March 15, 2021 2:36:23 PM

---

Andrew, please see email below. We have talked about this before as we have discussed mapping issues with GEODATA that show things that are absolutely false, as in the case of Salmon/cutthroat being present in Lake Lawrence. As I have stated numerous times that is simply a false statement and any mention of it on GEODATA Maps and documents (such as the SMP) needs to be corrected before we have more property owners impacted. In your last email you commented that the situation with Lake Lawrence was unique. Well, there are now 2 specific unique mapping issues regarding just Lake Lawrence. The other, that I know exists is wetlands. Goat Island is not and has never been a wetland - it was upland until they built the canal through the upland area. YES, there are wetlands on the east side of Goat Island, but that's it. The 5 acres that comprise Goat Island are dry as dry can be. So how do we rectify this issue? I personally do not believe it effects just Lake Lawrence, but time and research will tell the tale.

Please ensure the Planning Commissioners receive a copy of this information.

Again, thank you  
Barry Halverson  
253-341-6059

---

**From:** Ross Jarvis <[ross.jarvis@scjalliance.com](mailto:ross.jarvis@scjalliance.com)>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 15, 2021 12:50 PM  
**To:** [halversonloma@hotmail.com](mailto:halversonloma@hotmail.com) <[halversonloma@hotmail.com](mailto:halversonloma@hotmail.com)>  
**Subject:** Lake Lawrence - Salmon

The County commented that their mapping indicated salmon were present in the lake. After several emails and phone calls, WDFW sent the attached email to Anne which closed the issue.

Please let know if we can do anything else to assist.

Thanks,

**Ross Jarvis, PE**  
**SCJ Alliance**  
*Principal*  
o. 360.352.1465, ext. 131  
m. 206.778.1636  
[www.scjalliance.com](http://www.scjalliance.com)

*immediately delete the message and any attachments without copying or disclosing the contents. Thank you.*

From: [Theresa K Nation](#) >

To: [golf137@yahoo.com](mailto:golf137@yahoo.com) >

Hide



## Lawrence Lake fish presence

Today at 12:42 PM

Hi Anne,

WDFW Fish Biologist Gabe Madel and I spoke by phone today. We are both in agreement that there are no anadromous fish in Lawrence Lake. That would include Chinook salmon and coastal cutthroat. The lake outlet structure prevents any fish from moving into the lake. Given the large population of warmwater fishes, we would prefer that it remain that way. Warmwater species prey on juvenile salmonids and could negatively impact the coho population.

Hope that helps. Let me know if you have any questions.

**Theresa Nation**

Area Habitat Biologist

Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife

[1111 Washington St. SE](#)

[Olympia, WA 98501](#)

[\(360\) 902-2562 office](tel:(360)902-2562)

[\(360\) 688-4745 cell](tel:(360)688-4745)