

**From:** [Roz Lassoff](#) on behalf of [Council](#)  
**To:** [Kathy Cook](#); [Ryan Ericson](#); [Theresa Rice](#)  
**Subject:** FW: SMP Comments  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 08, 2013 3:58:27 PM

---

*Roz Lassoff*

Rosalind D. Lassoff, City Clerk  
City of Bainbridge Island  
280 Madison Avenue North  
Bainbridge Island, WA 98110  
(206) 780-8624

---

**From:** Marcia Lagerloef [mailto:[mlagerloef@seanet.com](mailto:mlagerloef@seanet.com)]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 08, 2013 3:42 PM  
**To:** Council  
**Subject:** SMP Comments

May 8, 2013

Members of the Bainbridge Island City Council

I am writing to support the existing language in the draft SMP which prohibits docks under certain conditions. The precise language under Section 6.3.4 Prohibited is:

2) Overwater Structures at locations where critical physical limitations exist, such as shallow sloping tidelands; areas of frequent high wind, wave, or current exposure as depicted by charts, isometric maps, or other technical sources; or areas with high levels of accretion, or geological hazardous areas located outside of harbors and/or feeder bluffs, except when specifically allowed in Section 4.2.4, Public Access or Section 5.3, Boating Facilities.

I was a member of the Shoreline Modifications work group that voted to put this provision into our SMP. Our reasoning was a straightforward combination of common sense from an environmental and personal safety perspective:

- not wanting docks or vessels to be damaged and drifting, along with their potential oil spills, from situations where they would take a beating from high currents, waves, and winds ( I don't know a boat owner who wants to expose their boat to this treatment)
- not wanting to inhibit feeder bluffs with the stabilization needed for a dock, as well as also being aware of safety hazards in geologically less stable areas
- not wanting docks in shallow sloping bottoms to extend great distances into public waterways to achieve necessary depths for vessel keels and therefore severely limiting other forms of recreation and enjoyment of that water body.

Wayne Daley has written to you of the ecological reasons to be conservative about the proliferation of docks along our shorelines. Namely, these shores are used as spawning areas for forage fish that are a critical food source of young salmon. Salmon juveniles hug the shoreline in their feeding and outward migration from the Sound. Breaking up that shoreline with docks, disrupts that migration pattern, forcing the salmon into deeper water, and exposing them to more predators. Construction and boat disturbance around docks impacts the suitability of the habitat for forage fish spawning. All of the Bainbridge shoreline is listed as critical habitat for the endangered Chinook salmon of Puget Sound.

**I ask you to retain the dock prohibition provision in its current form in light of the reasoning and work group intent that placed it there.**

One final comment. When I listened to Ryan Ericksen's graphic explanation at the last Council study session of what a property owner can do with their house and land under particular circumstances I was impressed there was as much flexibility as there is – native shrubs instead of trees, clustering of trees, removal of trees, expansion of house footprint into the buffer zone all allowed. As an advocate for the environment, I was dismayed. We have not created a highly restrictive SMP. Our buffer zone sizes are modest at best. We have made many concessions to the property rights advocates. **It is time to say "enough" before we become the weakest plan in the Sound, and move this current SMP on to Ecology for their review.**

Thank you for the exhaustive public comment that you have allowed as part of this process and for all of your personal time and energy in these deliberations. It has been a test for all of us. I hope that we can now move towards how we can all contribute best to the health of the Sound and the common good.

Marcia Lagerloef  
10426 NE South Beach