

## Public Comments Received on 12/3/08 Preliminary Draft SMP

Expanded Comment Matrix

Topic	GMA #	Received From	Written (W) or Oral (O)	Comment Endorses PDSMP	Comment Summary	DCD Response	Changes to PDSMP	Notes
Beach Access Structures	2961-179	Neal, Thomas & Delores	W	N	300' separation between private beach stairs is unfair and denies safe/reasonable use of property. Proposal for neighbors to share joint use structures is unrealistic/unreasonable. Existing standards are ample for protecting bank stability.	<p><i>The purpose of regulating beach access structures such as stairways, stair towers and trams/cable lifts is that they are shoreline modifications that can have substantial adverse impacts on slope stability, shoreline vegetation, fish &amp; wildlife habitat, shoreline views and public access. The general principles of WAC 173-26-231 apply as do the PDSMP Article 3 Master Program Goals, and Article 6 General Policies &amp; Regulations. While such structures are popular with property owners and have been common in the past, there is no guaranteed right to construct such structures that modify the shoreline and affect the 'no net loss' standard both individually and cumulatively. Beach access structures do not qualify as 'reasonable economic use' so if there is another means of beach access available within a reasonable distance, it's fair to expect someone to use the existing rather than construct a new one. The 300 foot separation is based on best professional judgement and may not be the correct distance. Similarly, the preference for shared or joint-use structures</i></p>	<p>1. Is 300' the right number between structures?                  2. Should applicants post a bond to cover cost of damages?                  3. Are the dimensional standards reasonable and adequate?                  4. Should there be additional differentiation between stairs and trams?                  5. Should beach access structures serve as emergency egress?                  6. Consider specific text changes as per GMA# 2961-405 (Patterson)</p>	
Beach Access Structures	2961-215	Barns, Janet & Terence	W	N	All beach access should be public, not private. Landowners need stairs to beach to protect environment by picking up litter. Provided criteria for building safe stairways.			
Beach Access Structures	2961-270	Sako, Sam	W	N	Existing beach stairs don't cause any problem so don't restrict them.			
Beach Access Structures	2961-279	Williams, Diane	W	N	Proposed restriction on beach stairs is an unconstitutional limitation on the full use of my property.			
Beach Access Structures	2961-283	Dyer, Robert & Diane	W	N	Proposed restriction on beach stairs is unfair since public can access our beach and leave litter.			
Beach Access Structures	2961-287	Coburn, Jerry & Diana	W	N	Proposed restriction on beach stairs will deny owners access to their property. Existing regulations are already too restrictive and tedious.			
Beach Access Structures	2961-302	Leonardson, Weldon L & Pam	W	N	Conditional Use Permit for beach access is hard to understand.			
Beach Access Structures	2961-314	Stevens, Debbi	W	N	Proposal for neighbors to share joint use structures will negatively affect neighborly relations.			

## Public Comments Received on 12/3/08 Preliminary Draft SMP

Expanded Comment Matrix

Topic	GMA #	Received From	Written (W) or Oral (O)	Comment Endorses PDSMP	Comment Summary	DCD Response	Changes to PDSMP	Notes
Beach Access Structures	2961-316	Bergeron, Dick (For Joe & MaryAnn Moushey)	W	N	Proposed limits on beach stairs are overly restrictive			
Beach Access Structures	2961-321	Nasman, Dan	W	Y				
Beach Access Structures	2961-325	Bollinger, Richard K. and Alyce E.	W	N	Private beach access is more important than public beach access because property owners are more concerned with being good stewards. Existing regulations on beach stairs are already too onerous.			
Beach Access Structures	2961-332	Pearson, Pat (WSU Extension)	W	Y				
Beach Access Structures	2961-342	Scrivner, Richard	W	N	Every property owner should be allowed beach stairs if they can afford to build them. Beach stairs designed to minimize disturbance to slope/vegetation should only require administrative review/approval and possibly a landscape architect review. Beach stairs that would involve clearing/grading should require a CUP. Applicants should have to post a bond to cover any future damage. Proposal for neighbors to share joint use structures is unrealistic/unreasonable.			
Beach Access Structures	2961-356	Worden, Nik	W	Y	Add engineering standards			
Beach Access Structures	2961-368	Jacobsen, Karl	W	N	Proposed limits on beach stairs/trams are overly restrictive. Property owners have legal right to access all of their property.			

**Public Comments Received on 12/3/08 Preliminary Draft SMP**

*Expanded Comment Matrix*

Topic	GMA #	Received From	Written (W) or Oral (O)	Comment Endorses PDSMP	Comment Summary	DCD Response	Changes to PDSMP	Notes
Beach Access Structures	2961-387	Jenkins, David & Gail	W	N	Proposed limits on beach stairs promote dangerous alternatives. Shared joint-use structures should be encouraged.			
Beach Access Structures	2961-388	Garing, Dave	W	N	Proposed limits on beach stairs promote dangerous alternatives.			
Beach Access Structures	2961-395	LaRoche, Gabrielle (for Jefferson County Marine Resources Committee)	W	Y				
Beach Access Structures	2961-396	Farmasonis, Petros & Colleen	W	N	Proposed restriction on beach stairs is an unconstitutional limitation on the full use of my property.			
Beach Access Structures	2961-405	Patterson, Dean (for Futurewise)	W	Y	Revise wording on Article 7.1.C.3			
Beach Access Structures	2961-42	Bennett, Burt	W	N	I object to the proposed 300' separation between stairways and the 5' width dimensional standard. 100 or 150' would be better. People will still access the beach in an unsafe manner despite regulations. County can't/won't enforce existing regulations let alone any additional. Don't fix what's not broken.			
Beach Access Structures	2961-426	Furnia, Geraldine	W	N	Proposed regulations are arbitrary and will cost too much			
Beach Access Structures	2961-56	Brockman, Peter	W	N	See specific line-in/line-out text changes			
Beach Access Structures	2961-59	DeVries, Margo	W	N	Beach access structures should be allowed when required for escape from emergency situation (i.e. fire)			

**Public Comments Received on 12/3/08 Preliminary Draft SMP**

Expanded Comment Matrix

Topic	GMA #	Received From	Written (W) or Oral (O)	Comment Endorses PDSMP	Comment Summary	DCD Response	Changes to PDSMP	Notes
Beach Access Structures	2961-66	Brockman, Peter	W	N	See specific line-in/line-out text changes			
Beach Access Structures	2961-68	Farr, Gene	W	N	Proposed regulations are overly restrictive. People will still access the beach in an unsafe manner despite regulations. Trams/cablelifts are safer alternatives that cause fewer impacts.			
Beach Access Structures	2961-69	Reynolds, Dennis (For OSF)	W	N	"Adverse impacts" considered should only be "significant adverse impacts". Proposal for neighbors to share joint use structures is excellent. CUP not appropriate since stairs are a normal appurtenance to single family homes and permit control should be kept local not at Ecology. Policies unfairly burden property owners. Stairs should be allowed in Priority Aquatic SED since those areas are mostly privately owned. Private beach access is low intensity use and should be allowed outright. Eliminate the height restriction due to prevalence of steep slopes.			
Beach Access Structures	2961-72	Hoyt, Stephen	W	N	New regulations would mean we'd have to change our existing beach stairs.			
Beach Access Structures	2961-76	Knudson, Lyne	W	N	Proposed limitations will impact my property rights.			
Beach Access Structures	1-21-09 PC mtg Minutes	Brockman, Pete	O	N	Proposed limitations will prevent youth from learning about shoreline resources.			
Beach Access Structures	1-21-09 PC mtg Minutes	Farr, Gene	O	N	Proposed limitations are overly restrictive and don't differentiate between stairs and trams.			
	31							

**Public Comments Received on 12/3/08 Preliminary Draft SMP**

Expanded Comment Matrix

Topic	GMA #	Received From	Written (W) or Oral (O)	Comment Endorses PDSMP	Comment Summary	DCD Response	Changes to PDSMP	Notes
Boathouses	2961-14	Stewart, Jeffree	W	N	Consider keeping the Conditional Use Permit requirement to allow careful scrutiny of impacts. Consider cumulative effects of allowing boathouses in the buffer as a water-dependent use. Consider potential for conversion of boathouse to dwelling unit.	<i>Prescriptive standards are included in PDSMP Article 6.1.E.3 Water-oriented Uses/Development to allow boathouses in the buffer as accessory to single family residential development without a shoreline variance. An administrative CUP is required. Cumulative effects are addressed programmatically via PDSMP Article 6.1.C and at the project level during permit review. PDSMP Article 8.8 Residential regulations prohibit boathouses overwater and in the Natural SED. Item iii(a) requires notice of title to prevent conversion to dwelling unit.</i>	1. Are the standards reasonable and adequate? 2. Is the administrative CUP appropriate?	
Boating Facilities	2961-118	Woodruff, David & Jeanette	W	N	Don't allow land-based buoy/vessel retrieval systems.	<i>Boating facilities include a variety of shoreline structures and uses that are considered shoreline modifications as per WAC 173-26-231. Numerous studies have documented the negative impacts of docks and piers on aquatic vegetation, fish migration, sediment transport, etc. Regulations that control proliferation are very consistent with WAC requirement for 'no net loss'. Docks accessory to single family residential are exempt from a Shoreline Substantial Development Permit as per RCW 90.58. Such statutory exemptions can not be changed by local jurisdictions. PDSMP Article 7.2.H.3 regulations require locating mooring buoys to avoid eelgrass and other valuable habitat to implement</i>	1. Are dimensional/design standards reasonable and adequate? 2. Are marina standards for 20% livaboards adequate to protect water quality? 3. Consider specific text revisions as per GMA# 2961-405 (Patterson)	
Boating Facilities	2961-14	Stewart, Jeffree	W	Y				
Boating Facilities	2961-222	Mitchell, Robert	W	Y	Don't prohibit liveaboards. Helical anchors are cost prohibitive.			
Boating Facilities	2961-226	Reynolds, Dennis (for Erin & Scott Dahlgren)	W	N	Proposed limits on proliferation of docks is not SMA-consistent since private/individual access is considered public access. Impacts from boating facility development are minimal and offset by the recreational access benefits. 60' dock length limit is overly restrictive.			
Boating Facilities	2961-231	Fessler, Elizabeth	W	Y				
Boating Facilities	2961-232	Fessler, Michael	W	Y				
Boating Facilities	2961-234	Gray, Barbara	W	Y				
Boating Facilities	2961-235	Molotsky, Daniel	W	Y				

**Public Comments Received on 12/3/08 Preliminary Draft SMP**

Expanded Comment Matrix

Topic	GMA #	Received From	Written (W) or Oral (O)	Comment Endorses PDSMP	Comment Summary	DCD Response	Changes to PDSMP	Notes
Boating Facilities	2961-242	Charkow, Allen	W	N	Considering vessel/mooring buoy 'shadow' effects on eelgrass is ridiculous.	<p><i>Policy A.2 that to not locate boating facilities where they will impact critical habitats. This is consistent with the WAC requirement for 'no net loss'.</i></p> <p><i>PDSMP Article 2 Definitions include water-oriented, -dependent, -related, and -enjoyment. Marina-related retail, etc. could be considered water-oriented. PDSMP Article 8.3 Commercial regulations allow water-oriented commercial development in the</i></p>		
Boating Facilities	2961-274	Pendergast, Betsy	W	Y				
Boating Facilities	2961-282	Kelso, Debaran	W	Y				
Boating Facilities	2961-298	Hirschi, Ron	W	Y				
Boating Facilities	2961-315	Fessler, Elizabeth	W	Y				
Boating Facilities	2961-326	Crockett, Larry (Port of PT)	W	Y				
Boating Facilities	2961-329	Rentz, Karen (for Sandy Mackie re: Pleasant Harbor Marina & Golf Resort)	W	N	Section on allowances for water-oriented use/development within shoreline buffer is confusing as to how it would apply to marina related office, retail space, food service etc. since only public access structures accessory to such a water-oriented use/development are allowed in the buffer area. As written the provisions would not allow the proposed mixed use development proposed at Pleasant Harbor for the Brinnon Master Planned Resort. These limitations discourage redevelopment that could result in restoration of shoreline resources.			
Boating Facilities	2961-332	Pearson, Pat (WSU Extension)	W	Y				
Boating Facilities	2961-340	Andrus, Phil	W	Y	SDP exemption for residential docks is troubling. Set absolute dock length limit not to be administratively changed.			
Boating Facilities	2961-351	Mitchell, Andrea	W	Y				
Boating Facilities	2961-352	Brenna, Elena	W	Y				

## Public Comments Received on 12/3/08 Preliminary Draft SMP

Expanded Comment Matrix

Topic	GMA #	Received From	Written (W) or Oral (O)	Comment Endorses PDSMP	Comment Summary	DCD Response	Changes to PDSMP	Notes
Boating Facilities	2961-357	Best, Phil (for Hood Canal Environmental Council)	W	Y				
Boating Facilities	2961-361	Boroughs, Brad	W	Y	No permit should be required for launching small non-motorized watercraft.			
Boating Facilities	2961-362	Peck, Craig (re: Pleasant Harbor Marina & Golf Course)	W	N	Proposed limits on marina re-development would affect the Brinnon MPR project			
Boating Facilities	2961-389	Brinnon Group	W	Y				
Boating Facilities	2961-390	Rubin, Judith	W	Y				
Boating Facilities	2961-394	Hunter, Eve	W	Y				
Boating Facilities	2961-395	LaRoche, Gabrielle (for Jefferson County Marine Resources Committee)	W	Y				
Boating Facilities	2961-401	Cook, Cyrilla (for People For Puget Sound)	W	Y				
Boating Facilities	2961-405	Patterson, Dean (for Futurewise)	W	Y	See specific line-in/line-out text changes			
Boating Facilities	2961-412	Milliken, Sue & Kelly Dodson	W	Y				
Boating Facilities	2961-42	Bennett, Burt	W	Y	The preference for mooring buoys over docks seems like common sense.			
Boating Facilities	2961-44	Rogge, David	W	Y				
Boating Facilities	2961-45	Pendergast, Betsy	W	Y				
Boating Facilities	2961-47	Sikes, Ron	W	Y				
Boating Facilities	2961-50	Rudolph, Joyce & Alan	W	Y				
Boating Facilities	2961-59	DeVries, Margo	W	Y				
Boating Facilities	2961-69	Reynolds, Dennis (For OSF)	W	N	Better define 'excessive' over water length. Proposed limits on proliferation of docks is not SMA-consistent since private/individual access is considered public access. Impacts from boating facility development are minimal and offset by the recreational access benefits. 60' dock length limit is overly restrictive. CUP forfeits local permitting control to Ecology. County can't require restoration for marinas.			

**Public Comments Received on 12/3/08 Preliminary Draft SMP**

*Expanded Comment Matrix*

Topic	GMA #	Received From	Written (W) or Oral (O)	Comment Endorses PDSMP	Comment Summary	DCD Response	Changes to PDSMP	Notes
Boating Facilities	2961-70	Matthiesen, John	W	Y	No permit should be required for hand-launching small non-motorized watercraft.			
Boating Facilities	2961-71	Peck, Craig (BMPR)	W	N	Proposed marina redevelopment at Pleasant Harbor would not comply.			
Boating Facilities	2961-83	Rehm-Lorber, Jora	W	Y				
Boating Facilities	1-21-09 PC mtg Minutes	Peck, Craig	O	N	Proposed marina redevelopment at Pleasant Harbor would not comply.			