| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 01/15/10 | Ken Sethney | Chair, Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners | General | The guidelines give local jurisdictions the freedom to develop localized solutions. | Developing localized solutions was one of the reasons for forming the citizens' advisory workgroups. More public input will be received through the adoption process at Planning Commission and City Council. |
| 2 | 03/05/10 | Jared | Citizen | Science | Please insist on science as the standard for the Shoreline Master Program update. We want an open and honest review of the science. | The City is utilizing current science to update the Shoreline Master Program, including two science summaries produced by consultants for the City (the *Science Addendum from Herrera*, 2011 and the Science Review from Battelle, 2003) The Environmental Technical Advisory Committee (ETAC) is reviewing the science as it applies to Bainbridge Island. The Public Participation Plan, created by citizens and approved by City Council, was adopted to ensure an open and transparent process. |
| 3 | 04/21/10 | Mary Phillips | Citizen | Designations | Requesting that the Conservancy designation be removed from her property | ETAC and staff have recommended a map change. |
| 4 | 04/21/10 | Peter O'Connor | Citizen | Designations | Requesting that the Conservancy designation be removed from his property | ETAC and staff have recommended a map change. |
| 5 | 05/06/10 | Phil Whitener | Citizen | Process | Be honest with shoreline owners about the probable impacts of the update. | The Public Participation Plan, created by citizens and approved by City Council, was adopted to ensure an open and transparent process. As recommendations on the Shoreline Master Program are forwarded to Planning Commission, staff will indicate where changes in regulation have occurred. |
| 6 | 07/12/10 | Paul & June Raker | Shoreline owners | General | No one has considered the destruction that is happening daily on the ecology of our tidelands from the wake of high-speed container ships | Ship wakes are not within the jurisdictional purview of the City. |
| 7 | 09/20/10 | Richard Nerf | Physicist | Science | Of the more than 20 possible regressions of ecological functions vs. stressors or | Comment noted. |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | controlling factors, only three are statistically-insignificant. The remaining regressions have F-statistics greater than 4, indicating a significant degree of correlation between stressors and ecological functions. | |
| 8 | 9/20/10 | Richard Nerf | Physicist | Science | I am not claiming that it represents direct man-made influence on the near-shore ecology. | Comment noted. |
| 9 | 9/21/10 | John Grinter | Boater; Coast Guard | III.G | We live on an island and should be encouraging our residents and especially our kids to get on the water. Please improve our access to the water and do this by improving our existing boat ramps. | Comment noted. |
| 10 | 9/21/10 | John Grinter | Boater; Coast Guard | V.D | The area to be leased for a waterfront marine use area is too shallow for any significant marine usage and may in fact violate shoreline use laws. The permitting would be extraordinary. | This site is no longer being considered for lease. |
| 11 | 9/21/10 | John Grinter | Boater; Coast Guard | V.D | As an island community we only have one viable public ramp for launching boats and that is not a good way to encourage boating. | Public access is an important component of the Shoreline Management Act and the Shoreline Master Program. |
| 12 | 9/21/10 | John Grinter | Boater; Coast Guard | V.D | Create another boat ramp at a north Island location. Several city-owned road ends on the northern end of the island would make decent ramps for boaters to use. | Policies to promote public access are included in the draft. Recommendations for specific public access improvements will be considered by the Planning Commission and City Council during the review of the update. |
| 13 | 9/21/10 | John Grinter | Boater; Coast Guard | V.D | Increase public moorings/dockage in the city pier area. | See response to comment #12. |
| 14 | 9/28/10 | Gary Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | Process | Who is writing the Shoreline Master Program Regulations working draft? | Staff is working with the citizen committees, drafting amendments to the goals, policies, and regulations based on input from the committees and an analysis of our program's |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | consistency with the State Shoreline Master Program Guidelines (Consistency Analysis). Staff will compile the citizen committee recommendations and provide the first draft Shoreline Master Program to the Planning Commission for review. |
| 15 | 10/04/10 | Gary Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | General | It seems that the Precautionary Principle would argue against "new" regulations that would remove existing homes and uses, and restrict or eliminate protections from erosion. | Comment noted. |
| 16 | 10/04/10 | Gary Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | General | There is no nexus between residential uses and decline in fish stocks. | WAC 173.26, state Shoreline Master Program guidelines, requires the City to regulate development in order to protect critical saltwater habitats, including fish and wildlife conservation areas |
| 17 | 01/14/11 | Carlton Anderson | Shoreline owner | II.B, III.L | The proposed setback has grown from 50' to 100' to 200' and will undoubtedly continue to increase until everybody is forced away, making more and more property nonconforming. | Buffer widths will be proposed by a technical consultant. ETAC and the workgroups will review the recommendations before buffer regulations become part of the draft document that will be submitted to Planning Commission and eventually City Council. |
| 18 | 01/14/11 | Carlton Anderson | Shoreline owner | III.A | Have the proponents considered the effect of their actions on the tax base? One of the houses near me has been designated for historical preservation. How will they handle such cases? | The RCW refers to economics but the requirements for economics are in terms of where future development is projected, the level of demand for public access, or where industry may be located. It does not require a large economic study of the region, but rather what does existing information reflect about demand. Policies and regulations regarding cultural and historic resources are included in the Shoreline Master Program. |
| 19 | 01/14/11 | Carlton Anderson | Shoreline owner | III.L | The proper name for waterfront property is "Waterfront Property", not a branding as "nonconforming property." | Comment noted. |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 20 | 01/14/11 | Carlton Anderson | Shoreline owner | V.D | Will public facilities such as parks and the ferry docks be subject to the same rules? What about marinas and waterfront restaurants? | The Shoreline Master Program applies to all uses within its jurisdiction, regardless of ownership. |
| 21 | 01/14/11 | Claes Hagstromer | Shoreline owner | III.L | Why don't we address the real problems instead of making the assumption that all harm comes from man-constructed development including bulkheads and docks without an attempt to provide OBJECTIVE scientific justification? | The purpose of the Shoreline Master Program is to address the impacts of human development and use of the shoreline. Other issues are addressed through a myriad programs and regulations, from restoration and enhancement projects to regulations controlling stormwater, public, commercial, and industrial activities. |
| 22 | 01/14/11 | Claes Hagstromer | Shoreline owner | Process | We have unfortunately found in the past that written comments have never changed any policies and have never been answered. | All comments are considered, posted on the web and provided to both the Planning Commission and City Council to be considered during their deliberation of the Shoreline Master Program Update. |
| 23 | 01/14/11 | Claes Hagstromer | Shoreline owner | V.K. | Define "no net loss" as providing planting of the same amount of new vegetation as was lost. | Replacement requirements will be part of the regulations, which are in the preliminary draft stage. |
| 24 | 01/14/11 | Claes Hagstromer | Shoreline owner | V.K. | We have never seen any proof that vegetation will enhance the fish population the way COBI has been interpreting this directive so far, which is to narrowly define native vegetation. | The City is utilizing current science to update the Shoreline Master Program, including two science summaries produced by consultants for the City (the *Science Addendum from Herrera*, 2011 and the Science Review from Battelle, 2003) The Vegetation Workgroup has recommended changes to vegetation/landscaping provisions in the Shoreline Master Program. |
| 25 | 01/14/11 | Claes Hagstromer | Shoreline owner | V.K. | Don Flora's study, Evidence of Near-Zero Habitat Harm from Nearshore Development, showed no correlation between residential development and measurable impacts on the nearshore habitat. It is clear that the attempt to limit | See response to comment #24. |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | shoreline development is mostly a politically correct sentiment instead of based on trying to fix a real problem. | |
| 26 | 01/14/11 | Claes Hagstromer | Shoreline owner | V.K. | If you were serious about improving the Puget Sound water quality you would put more emphasis on the bigger culprits of contaminating Puget Sound: storm runoff from roads and parking areas, industries, septic systems that are too close to the sound. | See response to comment #21. |
| 27 | 01/14/11 | Claes Hagstromer | Shoreline owner | V.K. | Preserving views from both the land and water conflicts with preserving vegetation in side yards. | Under the Shoreline Management Act, the city's Shoreline Master Program must recognize and protect private property rights consistent with the public interest. The Shoreline Master Program must accommodate appropriate uses, protect the shoreline environment, and protect public shoreline access, including visual. |
| 28 | 01/14/11 | Claes Hagstromer | Shoreline owner | V.K.12 | This policy V.K.12 will probably lead to even more draconian measures to prohibit retaining walls, bulkheads and other measures to stabilize development along the shorelines that can be done WHILE preserving/enhancing vegetation and even lead to more vegetation staying on the steep slopes. | This policy speaks to voluntary measures to improve ecological function. |
| 29 | 01/14/11 | Claes Hagstromer | Shoreline owner | V.K.8 | Where is the proof that building on steep slopes with today's low-impact building techniques will damage either the slope or fish and wildlife habitat? | Comment noted. |
| 30 | 01/14/11 | Douglas Ferguson | Shoreline owner | V.K. | Suggests that runoff and effluent issues be addressed. | The draft goals and policies in III.J, Water Quality, are intended to be consistent with and enhance Health Dept. and stormwater requirements in the shoreline jurisdiction... |
| 31 | 01/14/11 | John Nute | Shoreline owner | III.L | Many of these provisions and regulations | A policy goal for nonconforming |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | will immediately render existing properties as "non-conforming" without some "grandfather clause" which inclusively excepts them as "historically conforming" subject to other reasonable regulations such as eliminating open septic run-off, or requiring reasonable and progressive conformance to current code and regulations when developed properties are sold and their use converted or they are rebuilt (as opposed to "remodeled"). | development was recommended by the citizen committees. How nonconforming uses and structures will be regulated will be determined during the process of drafting regulations. |
| 32 | 01/14/11 | John Nute | Shoreline owner | V.K. | Modify the first sentence in paragraph 1 to end, "and the applicable provisions of the Shoreline Master Program." | Your comment will be taken into consideration when the draft is reviewed for consistency in the language used. |
| 33 | 01/14/11 | John Nute | Shoreline owner | V.K. | Delete all after the first sentence in paragraph 1: "While an individual… and all applicable provisions." This is unnecessary and incomplete elaboration which is adequately and inclusively addressed in the opening sentence and the ensuring circumstantial discussion in the next paragraph. | Comment noted |
| 34 | 01/14/11 | John Nute | Shoreline owner | V.K. | Modify paragraph 3 to read: Residential development is subject to Section III, General Policies and Regulations; Section IV, Environment Designations; Section VI, and BIMC 16.20, Environmentally Sensitive Areas. Same justification as above – unnecessary and incomplete | This paragraph will be replaced by a table. |
| 35 | 01/14/11 | John Nute | Shoreline owner | V.K. | Is the new residential development goal a necessary and coherent philosophical inclusion in this section, which one assumes purports to establish, not | The citizens' workgroups specifically chose the verb "promote" to strengthen the importance of residential use. |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | promote, policy and regulation? | |
| 36 | 01/14/11 | John Nute | Shoreline owner | V.K. | This title Residential Development and its treatment make little syntactic sense given the foregoing three paragraphs. | Comment noted. |
| 37 | 01/14/11 | John Nute | Shoreline owner | V.K. | "Promote residential development" seems to apply to future activities along a very small portion of the shoreline unless "redevelopment", including tear-down and rebuild actions, becomes "development" at the moment the last structural member falls. | Yes, development includes alteration and redevelopment. |
| 38 | 01/14/11 | John Nute | Shoreline owner | V.K. | This seems to suggest that single-family residential development, shoreline views, shoreline aesthetics, shoreline access, and other unspecified uses are all vaguely construed "priorities" among which SFR development has highest priority. Is this reasonable? Is this treatment suitably addressed in building codes and zoning regulations? | Single-family residential uses shall be preferred if they are consistent with the control of pollution and prevention of damage to the natural environment or dependant on upon the use of the shoreline. In those limited instances when authorized, alteration of the natural condition of the shoreline of the state shall be given priority for single family residences and their appurtenant structures. RCW 90.58.020 |
| 39 | 01/14/11 | John Nute | Shoreline owner | V.K. | Is the opening sentence in item #1 to infer that SFR has highest precedence among all other uses? (I suggest clarifying the intent or omitting this sentence entirely.) | See response to comment #38. |
| 40 | 01/14/11 | John Nute | Shoreline owner | V.K. | Elaborate on what is intended by the terms "circulation and access" or, if covered in another section, omit entirely. Clarify what is intended in the last bullet regarding side yards, open space, and views and resolve differences with provisions of paragraph 6, or eliminate this bullet entirely or clarify paragraph 6. | Further detail will be conferred in regulations pertaining to this section. |
| 41 | 02/25/11 | M.C. | Shoreline owner | General | The people who worked on this do not | There are waterfront property owners among |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Halvorsen | | | own waterfront property and do not have a nodding acquaintance with admiralty law. | the workgroup members, on the Planning Commission and in the Shoreline Master Program Policy Advisory Committee. The draft Shoreline Master Program will be based on state law and guidance. |
| 42 | 02/25/11 | M.C. Halvorsen | Shoreline owner | III. B.6 | In order for planting to grow they must be immediately upland of High Water Mark. | Comment noted. |
| 43 | 02/25/11 | M.C. Halvorsen | Shoreline owner | III. H.4.c | I agree there may be some areas where wildlife is nesting that would not be helped by public access but it should be spelled out. | Limitations on public access are determined by deed restrictions and the desires of individual property owners. |
| 44 | 02/25/11 | M.C. Halvorsen | Shoreline owner | III. J.1 | This is too vague and overbroad. Since it is so vague, I cannot tell which constitutional amendment it violates. | Comment noted. |
| 45 | 02/25/11 | M.C. Halvorsen | Shoreline owner | III.B | Where did the Vegetation Conservation and Management areas come from? | The Vegetation Workgroup developed the concept as an alternative to “native vegetation zones.” |
| 46 | 02/25/11 | M.C. Halvorsen | Shoreline owner | III.G.4 | Cramped road ends with no facilities and dubious- to dangerous-access to the water only creates hazardous situations. | Comment noted. |
| 47 | 02/25/11 | M.C. Halvorsen | Shoreline owner | III.G.5 | Walking/bicycling paths are an open invitation to commit crimes and will only lure criminals who would not otherwise be on the Island to come here. | Comment noted. |
| 48 | 02/25/11 | M.C. Halvorsen | Shoreline owner | III.G.6 | An open invitation to criminals and can interfere with business and private property. | Comment noted. |
| 49 | 02/25/11 | M.C. Halvorsen | Shoreline owner | III.G.7 | This is an unconstitutional taking of property without due process because the Supreme Court has said that a public easement cannot be a condition of granting a permit. | The draft Shoreline Master Program will go through numerous legal reviews, including the Dept. of Ecology approval process. |
| 50 | 02/25/11 | M.C. Halvorsen | Shoreline owner | III.G.9 | This is too restrictive. | Comment noted. |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 51 | 02/25/11 | M.C. Halvorsen | Shoreline owner | III.H.2 | This is too vague because all of the Island's shorelines have been altered. It would also be a taking of private property. | Comment noted. |
| 52 | 02/25/11 | M.C. Halvorsen | Shoreline owner | III.H.4 | Why should shoreline materials be left undisturbed? | Shoreline materials should be undisturbed to avoid disrupting ongoing ecological functions and processes. |
| 53 | 02/25/11 | M.C. Halvorsen | Shoreline owner | III.H.5 | Already covered in Section III | Comment noted. |
| 54 | 02/25/11 | M.C. Halvorsen | Shoreline owner | III.J. | Bulkheads can prevent erosion. | Agreed. |
| 55 | 02/25/11 | M.C. Halvorsen | Shoreline owner | III.K | This section is overbroad without a definition of benchmark as to what is to be accomplished. It is repetitive and should be deleted. | Comment noted. |
| 56 | 02/25/11 | M.C. Halvorsen | Shoreline owner | III.L | This whole section is unconstitutional as it is the taking of property without due process. | The draft Shoreline Master Program will go through numerous legal reviews, including the Dept. of Ecology approval process. |
| 57 | 02/25/11 | M.C. Halvorsen | Shoreline owner | Sec. III | This whole section is overkill (over-regulation). | Comment noted. |
| 58 | 02/25/11 | M.C. Halvorsen | Shoreline owner | V.D. 8 | Forcing marinas to incur liabilities of public access to privately owned boats on a privately operated marina is unconstitutional. | State law (Shoreline Management Act) requires Shoreline Master Programs to provide for public access, both physical and visual. Policies address separation of public and private access. |
| 59 | 02/25/11 | M.C. Halvorsen | Shoreline owner | V.D.11 | I can see limiting floating homes, but not prohibiting them. | The state guidelines prohibit floating homes. |
| 60 | 02/25/11 | M.C. Halvorsen | Shoreline owner | V.D.4 | This is overreaching and too broad. | Comment noted. |
| 61 | 02/25/11 | M.C. Halvorsen | Shoreline owner | V.D.7 | It would be unconstitutional for any facility or person to obstruct navigable waters. In such a situation, the Coast Guard would remedy it. | Protecting navigation is addressed in the proposed principles for public access and in use-specific policies. |
| 62 | 02/25/11 | M.C. Halvorsen | Shoreline owner | V.E.8 | Requiring public access in unconstitutional. | State law (Shoreline Management Act) requires Shoreline Master Programs to |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | provide for public access, both physical and visual. |
| 63 | 02/25/11 | M.C. Halvorsen | Shoreline owner | V.G. | I can see there won't be any logging on Bainbridge Island. | Logging is a commercial activity that is governed by the Dept. of Natural Resources. |
| 64 | 02/25/11 | M.C. Halvorsen | Shoreline owner | V.I. | In-water dredging is under the jurisdiction of the Army Corps of engineers and Bainbridge Island cannot prohibit it. | The city is required to regulate dredging under our Shoreline Master Program. |
| 65 | 02/25/11 | M.C. Halvorsen | Shoreline owner | V.J. | Generally, this section should be pared down as it acts as if Bainbridge has no parks and no access to water. | Comment noted. |
| 66 | 02/25/11 | M.C. Halvorsen | Shoreline owner | V.K.11 | What is the scientific evidence that native vegetation is superior to other vegetation? | Comment noted. |
| 67 | 02/25/11 | M.C. Halvorsen | Shoreline owner | V.K.6 | This is unconstitutional as it is a taking of property without due process of law. | The draft Shoreline Master Program will go through numerous legal reviews, including the Dept. of Ecology approval process. |
| 68 | 02/25/11 | M.C. Halvorsen | Shoreline owner | V.K.9 | This is unconstitutional as it is a taking of property without due process of law. | See response to comment #67. |
| 69 | 02/25/11 | M.C. Halvorsen | Shoreline owner | V.L.2 | Too restrictive. | Comment noted. |
| 70 | 02/25/11 | M.C. Halvorsen | Shoreline owner | V.L.3 | Access by trails and bicycle systems encourage crime and attracts criminals. | Comment noted. |
| 71 | 02/25/11 | M.C. Halvorsen | Shoreline owner | VI.A.7 | Too vague and, as written, unconstitutional. | See response to comment #67. |
| 72 | 02/25/11 | M.C. Halvorsen | Shoreline owner | VI.B policy #3 | Why would anyone discourage shoreline stabilization? | WAC 173-26-231 states that hardening of the shoreline is associated with the following adverse impacts to shoreline ecological functions: (1) beach starvation, (2) habitat degradation, (3) sediment impoundment, (4) exacerbation of erosion, (5) groundwater impacts, (6) hydraulic impacts, (7) loss of shoreline vegetation, (8) restriction of channel movement, and (9) creation of conditions that result in weakening the structure over time. |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 73 | 02/25/11 | M.C. Halvorsen | Shoreline owner | VI.B.1 | Why would anyone discourage shoreline stabilization? | See response to comment #72. |
| 74 | 02/25/11 | M.C. Halvorsen | Shoreline owner | VI.D | A simple statement that dredging will comply with the Corps rules and regulations should be substituted. | Comment noted. |
| 75 | 02/25/11 | M.C. Halvorsen | Shoreline owner | VI.F. | There is no scientific evidence that docks or overwater structures harm fish. | The City is utilizing current science to update the SMP, including two science summaries produced by consultants for the City (the *Science Addendum* [Herrera, 2011] and the Science Review [Battelle, 2003]). ETAC and the consultants are working diligently to ensure that the policies are based on the best scientific data that is currently available and relevant to Bainbridge Island. |
| 76 | 02/25/11 | M.C. Halvorsen | Shoreline owner | VI.F. policy #5 | This would create hazardous situations as road ends have neither parking facilities nor boat launching facilities. | Protecting the public's right to access and use the shoreline are goals of both the Shoreline Management Act and the Shoreline Master Program. |
| 77 | 02/25/11 | M.C. Halvorsen | Shoreline owner | VL.4 | I cannot see why this is indiscriminately required. | Comment noted. |
| 78 | 02/25/11 | M.C. Halvorsen | Shoreline owner | VL.7 | Access by trails and bicycle systems encourage crime and attracts criminals. | Comment noted. |
| 79 | 03/25/11 | Bruce Prout | Citizen | III.B | There is a repetitive, destructive phenomenon caused by scrub alder trees that grow tall very quickly on steep slopes and then get blown down in Winter storms. | This will be addressed in the regulations through the staff recommendation for bluff management plans for steep slopes. |
| 80 | 03/25/11 | Lois Bouberg | Shoreline homeowner | III.G | It is imperative that the City take steps to ensure that the rights of property owners are respected and maintain public beaches and associated parking lots. | See response to comment #76. |
| 81 | 03/25/11 | Robert Hershberg | Citizen | V.K.8 | Does the prohibition against expansion of existing, legally established overwater residences apply to houseboats? | A houseboat is not considered an "overwater structure" so the prohibition does not apply. |
| 82 | 03/28/11 | M.C. | Shoreline owner | General | The City of Bainbridge Island is doing | Comment noted. |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Halvorsen | | | more harm than good with its excessive, biased, and unscientific proposals. | |
| 83 | 03/28/11 | M.C. Halvorsen | Shoreline owner | VI.F | Requiring people to have shared docks is unconstitutional. | The draft Shoreline Master Program will go through numerous legal reviews, including the Dept. of Ecology approval process. |
| 84 | 03/28/11 | M.C. Halvorsen | Shoreline owner | VI.F.3 | Grated docks may harm fish. | Comment noted. |
| 85 | 03/28/11 | M.C. Halvorsen | Shoreline owner | VI.B | There has been no scientific evidence that bulkheads harm beaches. | WAC 173-26-231 states that hardening of the shoreline is associated with the following adverse impacts to shoreline ecological functions: (1) beach starvation, (2) habitat degradation, (3) sediment impoundment, (4) exacerbation of erosion, (5) groundwater impacts, (6) hydraulic impacts, (7) loss of shoreline vegetation, (8) restriction of channel movement, and (9) creation of conditions that result in weakening the structure over time. |
| 86 | 03/31/11 | A. G. Greiner | Shoreline owner | III.L | Making a legally built, existing home with its appurtenant structures nonconforming by rule changing leaves it subject to being eliminated in due course, at the whim of city staff, without due process or compensation. | Nonconforming means that the use or structure does not conform to the existing development standards. State law requires eventual conformance. However, the existing Shoreline Master Program allows 100% replacement of an existing nonconforming structure. How nonconforming uses and structures will be regulated will be determined during the process of drafting regulations. |
| 87 | 03/31/11 | A.G. Greiner | Shoreline owner | Definitions | I would define appurtenant structures to include garages, driveways, accessory dwelling units, garden sheds, boat houses, erosion control structures, retaining walls, hardscape structures, LID compliant stormwater control structures, and land alterations. | The Dept. of Ecology will provide guidance about what will be regulated as “appurtenant structures.” |
| 88 | 03/31/11 | A.G. Greiner | Shoreline owner | General | RCW 90.58.100 requires that | The RCW refers to considering economics |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | information from social sciences and economics be considered in the update process, yet there is only one economic reference and no social sciences references given. | and social sciences in respect to future development projections for the city and region, including the level of demand for public access and location of industry development anticipated in the shoreline area. As RCW 90.58.100.2(a) states, that a Shoreline Master Program will include the following: "an economic development element for the location and design of industries and projects of statewide significance, transportation facilities, port facilities, tourist facilities, commerce and other developments that are particularly dependent on their location or on use of the shorelines of the state." Again, the Shoreline Master Program is looking at broad-scale economics in terms of future demands. It does not require a large economic study of the region. |
| 89 | 03/31/11 | A.G. Greiner | Shoreline owner | General | The policy draft must include considerations of its (1) effects on citizens' finances, (2) effects of additional mental and physical stress on owners of nonconforming homes destroyed by some disaster, (3) effect on the city's overall economy, (4) effects on our society, and (5) effect of increasing permitting staff on the city's economy. | See response to comment #88. |
| 90 | 03/31/11 | A.G. Greiner | Shoreline owner | General | The current Shoreline Master Program combined with related regulatory frameworks have achieved not only no net loss of ecological functions, but has encouraged its improvement when combined with modest restoration projects and homeowner actions In light of this information, please list the | Under the State SMP Guidelines, the City must set a baseline measurement to assess cumulative impacts to the City's shoreline areas and how we are meeting the goal of no net loss of ecological functions. That baseline is from the date of our shoreline characterization (2009 data). |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | perceived deficiencies in the current Shoreline Master Program and point out how the draft policies address these deficiencies. | |
| 91 | 03/31/11 | A.G. Greiner | Shoreline owner | III.L | The best solution for meeting the no net loss from the time of enactment while avoiding the nonconforming issue is to not alter existing buffers, setbacks, vegetative zones and shoreline classifications for existing, legally built structures. | Under the State Shoreline Master Program Guidelines, the City must set a baseline measurement to assess cumulative impacts to the City's shoreline areas and how we are meeting the goal of no net loss of ecological functions. That baseline is from the date of our shoreline characterization (2009 data). The City is updating sections identified in the Consistency Analysis to meet the requirements of the 2003 Shoreline Master Program Guidelines. Policies needed for buffers and residential development are intended to both protect shoreline ecology and accommodate existing single-family residences on the shoreline. City Council will make the final decision on how nonconforming uses and structures will be regulated. |
| 92 | 03/31/11 | A.G. Greiner | Shoreline owner | V.B | RCW 90.58.100(6) states that "Each master program shall contain standards governing the protection of single family residences and appurtenant structures against damage or loss due to shoreline erosion." To categorically deny a homeowner the ability to reasonably, effectively, and timely protect one's property from nature's forces (and human generated erosive energies) under any circumstances is simply unconscionable. | The citizen workgroups are reviewing the current regulations. |
| 93 | 04/01/11 | M.C. | Shoreline owner | III.G | As the city gives access, it acquires the | Protecting the public's right to access and use |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Halvorsen | | | liability that goes with it. Most cities realize this and regulate the access through the parks where there are good facilities, good parking and safe access to the water. | the shoreline are goals of both the Shoreline Management Act and the Shoreline Master Program. |
| 94 | 04/01/11 | M.C. Halvorsen | Shoreline owner | III.G. | The City of Bainbridge Island cannot require easement for the general public access to building development, at least not without paying for it. | The draft Shoreline Master Program will go through numerous legal reviews, including the Dept. of Ecology approval process. |
| 95 | 04/01/11 | M.C. Halvorsen | Shoreline owner | V.B. | I am enclosing the summary of "Luhrs v. Whatcom County", a decision by the Washington State Court of Appeals, Division I, which I want to become part of the record. This concerns bulkheads and that Court decided that coastal homeowners have a right to protect their property by a bulkhead. | The summary is now part of the record. |
| 96 | 04/04/11 | Jon Quitslund | Citizen | General | My comments aim to improve the document's style rather than its substance; to clarify what I take to be the intended meaning and to point out some phrases and sentences that may be unnecessary or redundant and might be removed. | Comments incorporated as appropriate. |
| 97 | 04/04/11 | Jon Quitslund | Citizen | General | In general, I am pleased with the substance and scope of the policies. I wish to thank all of the workgroup participants for their diligence and patience. | Comment noted. |
| 98 | 04/04/11 | Jon Quitslund | Citizen | III.L | It would be useful to state explicitly that when a change in the Shoreline Master Program renders a structure or use nonconforming, it does not become illegal. | Nonconforming means that the use or structure does not conform to the existing development standards. The existing Shoreline Master Program allows 100% replacement of an existing nonconforming structure. City Council will make the final |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | decision on how nonconforming uses and structures will be regulated. |
| 99 | 04/04/11 | Jon Quitslund | Citizen | III.L | It could be stated explicitly that the Shoreline Master Program update pertains to all shoreline and near upland development and uses, but for those permitted prior to the effective date of this ordinance; the new regulations pertain primarily to modifications in structures and uses. Such modifications may render the nonconformity less significant; they may not increase it significantly. | The applicability section under nonconforming will address this issue. |
| 100 | 04/04/11 | Ken Sethney, on behalf of the Board of Directors | Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners | General | What is the cost of shoreline regulations? We believe that the economic impacts of regulations have not been considered in the current draft of goals and policies and that the SMA makes it clear that they must be. | RCW 90.58 refers to considering economics in respect to future development projections for the city and region, including the level of demand for public access and location of industry development anticipated in the shoreline area. It does not require a large economic study of the region. |
| 101 | 04/04/11 | Ken Sethney, on behalf of the Board of Directors | Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners | General | Regulations add expenses for homeowners and the community. We were referred to a study by Dr. Theo Eicher, at the University of Washington. Two messages are very clear – the cost of owning a home is dramatically affected by land use regulations AND if those regulations vary greatly from those of surrounding communities, they will reduce the value of homes by making them less attractive to prospective buyers. | Using the Shoreline Management Act, local jurisdictions must prepare and adopt a Shoreline Master Program that is based on state laws and rules, including the 2003 Shoreline Master Program Guidelines. All the 270 jurisdictions in Washington are in the process of updating their Shoreline Master Programs and all of the updates must meet the state guidelines and be approved by the Dept. of Ecology. Therefore, it is likely that the regulations in surrounding communities will be similar. |
| 102 | 04/04/11 | Ken Sethney, on behalf of the Board of | Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners | III.L. | Mortgage lenders don't like nonconforming homes. City staff passed along a recommendation to change the | WAC 173.27.080 recognizes existing legally-established structures which may not conform to current development standards, but are |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Directors | | | references to "nonconforming" to "pre-existing." It is unknown, but highly unlikely, that lenders will confuse the true meaning of the term. | allowed to remain and be maintained, repaired, and enlarged as long as the expansion does not increase the nonconformity. A policy goal for nonconforming development was recommended by the citizen committees. How nonconforming uses and structures will be regulated will be determined during the process of drafting regulations. |
| 103 | 04/04/11 | Ken Sethney, on behalf of the Board of Directors | Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners | Science | It is the position of the Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners that the requirements placed on homeowners under the updated Shoreline Master Program should be based on facts, not speculation, must show a rational connection to the issues involved, and should be designed to yield positive, measurable results. | The City is utilizing current science to update the SMP, including two science summaries produced by consultants for the City (the *Science Addendum* [Herrera, 2011] and the Science Review [Battelle, 2003]). ETAC and the consultants are working diligently to ensure that the policies are based on the best scientific data that is currently available and relevant to Bainbridge Island. |
| 104 | 04/05/11 | Richard Barbieri & Cara Lyn Tangen | Shoreline owner | Designations | This designation Island Conservancy Residential makes no sense as our property and those immediately north of us are fully bulkheaded and improved with residential structures well within the limits of development for this designation. In addition, our property is improved with a pier, ramp, floating dock, and mooring buoy. | Preliminary mapping has been done based on the criteria adopted by the Shoreline Master Program Task Force. The designation criteria and the designation map are currently in the draft phase and will be released to the public upon final recommendation of the Shoreline Master Program Task Force. |
| 105 | 04/07/11 | M.J. Sebastian | Citizen | III.L | Allow all existing waterfront homes and uses to remain legal and able to be replaced, if need be. A balance of private property rights with ecological protection needs to be maintained. | A policy goal for nonconforming development was recommended by the citizen committees. The Shoreline Master Program Policy Advisory Committee, consisting of both Planning Commissioners and Council Members, may provide policy guidance on nonconforming uses and structures, while the City Council will make the final decision on |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | how nonconforming uses and structures will be regulated. |
| 106 | 04/18/11 | W. Maier | Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowner | General, III.K | I would like to see a meaningful partnership between the many jurisdictions so that kelp beds could be addressed PRIOR to the suggested over-regulation. | The City is working with other entities to develop a restoration plan and ETAC is recommending a monitoring plan. |
| 107 | 04/20/11 | J. Westbrook-Gardner | Shoreline owner | Designations | I am greatly disturbed by the idea that my property on Rose Loop will be changed from a designation of Shoreline Residential to Shoreline Conservancy. | See response to comment #104. |
| 108 | 04/20/11 | L. Arthur | Shoreline owner | Designations | I strongly object to changing the designation of properties on the South shore of Eagle Harbor from residential to conservancy residential. | See response to comment #104. |
| 109 | 04/22/11 | S. Allen | Citizen | General | RCW 90.58.100(1) states that local governments must use a systematic interdisciplinary approach that integrates the natural and social sciences and the environmental design arts, and further requires local governments to assemble the most current and accurate information available. I do not believe the committees have done that. | The City is utilizing current science to update the Shoreline Master Program, including two science summaries produced by consultants for the City (the *Science Addendum* from Herrera, 2011 and the Science Review from Battelle, 2003). ETAC and the consultants are working diligently to ensure that the policies are based on the best scientific data that is currently available and relevant to Bainbridge Island. Existing regulations will be updated as part of the process. Both prescriptive and flexible options are being considered. |
| 110 | 04/22/11 | S. Allen | Citizen | General | The net effect of this policy draft is that only those with sufficient stamina and financial resources can afford to own waterfront property. | The purpose of the Shoreline Master Program is to address the impacts of human development and use of the shoreline, while protecting the shoreline ecology. |
| 111 | 04/22/11 | S. Allen | Citizen | III.B, III.L | Widespread increases in setbacks and buffer zones will likely render some private properties unbuildable, and will | Policies related to buffers and residential development are intended to both protect shoreline ecology and accommodate existing |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | almost certainly increase the hardships encountered by existing homeowners trying to maintain or improve their properties, far beyond the already stringent standards. | single-family residences on the shoreline. |
| 112 | 04/22/11 | S. Allen | Citizen | III.L | I encourage the Council to make the declaration that existing homes are conforming for all proposed designations. | Comment forwarded to City Council. |
| 113 | 04/22/11 | S. Allen | Citizen | Mapping | I am very disturbed by the enormous increase in both the amount of shoreline considered for "conservancy" designations, as well as the increased restrictions being considered in those designations. | Preliminary mapping has been done based on the criteria adopted by the SMP Task Force. The designation criteria and the designation map are still in the draft phase and have not yet been released. |
| 114 | 04/22/11 | S. Allen | Citizen | VI.A & B | There seems to be a bias towards allowing postponement of the installation of shoreline armoring until a property is so severely damaged as to make it dangerous, unlivable, and without value. | WAC 175-23-231(3)(a)(iii) specifies that new and replacements shoreline armoring is allowed only when it is documented that the principal structure is threatened. The three-year time period is specified in WAC 173-26-231(3)(a)(iii)(D). |
| 115 | 04/25/11 | A. Ferrin | Citizen | Designations | I've looked at the map and noticed that we are classified as Island Conservancy – Residential whereas near neighbors are Shoreline Residential. I didn't see any criteria in the policies for that designation nor did I see what the regulatory impacts would be. | Each shoreline designation includes a set of criteria and management policies specific to that designation. The designation criteria and the designation map are currently in the draft phase and will be released to the public upon final recommendation of the Shoreline Master Program Task Force. |
| 116 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | III. B.7 | Recall that single family residences is the first listed of the Washington priority uses in the SMA. Minimizing the number of allowable structures is inconsistent with this. | Single-family residential uses shall be preferred if they are consistent with the control of pollution and prevention of damage to the natural environment. In those limited instances when authorized, alteration of the natural condition of the shoreline of the state shall be given priority for single family |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | residences and their appurtenant structures. RCW 90.58.020 |
| 117 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | III.1.c | Substitute "SSWS" for "shoreline". | Comment noted. |
| 118 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | III.B | Generic buffers are legally suspect. | Buffer widths will be proposed by a technical consultant. ETAC and the workgroups will review the recommendations before buffer regulations become part of the draft document that will be submitted to Planning Commission and eventually City Council. |
| 119 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | III.B. | I suggest encouraging permanent shoreline erosion control structures for the same reasons erosion control measures are required for soil disturbance work. | Comment noted. |
| 120 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | III.B. | Vegetation and Conservation zones are not required to be applied to existing, developed conditions to protect and enhance natural character, water quality, native plant communities and wildlife habitat when any of these conditions do not exist at the time of Shoreline Master Program enactment. | Comment noted. |
| 121 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | III.B. | Vegetative conservation may not legally include imposing a duty to restore vegetation to some unspecified condition. | Mitigation is required at the site-specific level to ensure that the goal of a no net loss of ecological functions is met at a project basis. The measurement of no net loss will be based on a site specific analysis of the existing baseline condition, proposed development, and proposed mitigation measures to offset any impacts. |
| 122 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | III.B. | Applying regulations only when "changes or alterations occur" allows coercion by permitting officials…based on nexus and proportionality in law. | Regulations may not be applied prior to a permit request. |
| 123 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | III.B.2-4 | Please show studies applicable to Puget | The City is utilizing current science to update |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Sound in general and Bainbridge Island in particular that native vegetation is any way superior to non-native vegetation carefully chosen for desired ecological functions. | the Shoreline Master Program, including two science summaries produced by consultants for the City (the *Science Addendum* from Herrera, 2011 and the Science Review from Battelle, 2003). ETAC and the consultants are working diligently to ensure that the policies are based on the best scientific data that is currently available and relevant to Bainbridge Island. |
| 124 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | III.B.5 | Specify the incentives. Are things like significant tax relief for providing a public benefit of a specific monetary worth included? | Your suggestions will be forwarded to the workgroups. |
| 125 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | III.B.6 | Existing local conditions must be considered in making any change from current use. To change any classification or zone to other than what now exists implies a forced restoration program, which is legally suspect. | Preliminary mapping has been done based on the criteria adopted by the Shoreline Master Program Task Force. The designation criteria and the designation map are currently in the draft phase and will be released to the public upon final recommendation of the Shoreline Master Program Task Force. |
| 126 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | III.B.9 | Remove the word “native” in the last sentence. | The workgroup specifically retained “native” in this provision. |
| 127 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | III.C.2 | Please predict how many staff and their probable costs it will require to appropriately “monitor and enforce” under this policy. | Staffing needs are within the purview of the City Manager and City Council and determined during the budget process. |
| 128 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | III.C.4 | Recognize that effects, particularly long term effects, may be positive or neutral as well as negative. Many of what are initially seen as detriments may turn out to be positive in the long term. | Comment noted. |
| 129 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | III.D. Goal | Remove “restore” from the first sentence and add “with the goal of island wide no net loss of ecological functions from conditions existing at the time of | Comment noted. |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | enactment of this Shoreline Master Program." | |
| 130 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | III.D.2 | Remove "restoration" from the first sentence as restoration is to be planned for, its funding identified, but it is not required to be performed. | Comment noted. |
| 131 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | III.D.4 | Add "consistent with RCW 90.58.100(6)" at the end of the first sentence. | Comment noted. |
| 132 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | III.D.7 | Predict how many additional staff will be required and their cost to complete this function. | Staffing needs are within the purview of the City Manager and City Council and determined during the budget process. |
| 133 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | III.G. 5 & 7 | Inquire as to the legality of requiring public access across private properties as a prerequisite to permitting a development. | WAC173-26-241(3)(d) specifies that public access should be required. |
| 134 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | III.G. and Goal | These sections of policy require public visual access to the water while we are told to expect untouchable native vegetation buffer zones along shorelines. The second prevents the first. | Views and vegetation are not mutually exclusive. |
| 135 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | III.G.1 | If the public wants more shoreline access than what now exists, it should acquire additional properties at public expense. | State law (Shoreline Management Act) requires Shoreline Master Programs to provide for public access, both physical and visual. |
| 136 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | III.G.10 | Delete the second sentence – its meaning is contained in the first. | Comment noted. |
| 137 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | III.G.2 | Change to read, "Protect the rights of navigation on all public waters and provide space necessary for water-dependent uses on public lands." | Comment noted. |
| 138 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | III.G.3 | Add after "views of the water" "without compromising the privacy of property owners or requiring changes in existing vegetation on private properties." | Comment noted. |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 139 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | III.G.3 | Inconsistencies exist between visual access requirements and vegetative buffer zone requirements. I'm unable to puzzle out the purpose of the fourth sentence. | Views and vegetation are not mutually exclusive. |
| 140 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | III.G.4 | There is nothing on privately owned shorelines that can interfere with the public's use of the water. This should be deleted entirely. | Comment noted. |
| 141 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | III.G.8 | Replace "minimize impacts" with "prevent impacts" before "private property." | Comment noted. |
| 142 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | III.H. Purpose | The first sentence needs editing for clarity. | Comment noted. |
| 143 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | III.H.1.b | Add "which affect SSWS" at the end of the first sentence. | Comment noted. |
| 144 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | III.H.2-6 | I suggest removing these sections as being meaningless because SSWS refers to those areas seaward of extreme low tide, not the shoreline. | Comment noted. |
| 145 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | III.J | The greatest stressors to Bainbridge Island shoreline water quality are properly under the control of the City: untreated storm water runoff from roadways and public developments, poorly treated sewage, and untreated storm water runoff from public areas and non-shoreline properties. | Stormwater is regulated by the Stormwater Ordinance and sewage is regulated by Health District regulations. The Shoreline Master Program must not conflict with those associated regulations. |
| 146 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | III.K | In general, I agree with the thrust of these policies. I would like to see some language specifying some clear and reasonable nexus and proportionality requirements for "incentives." | No nexus or proportionality is required for voluntary actions. |
| 147 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | III.L | Please change this title to "Legally Existing Development" | Comment noted. |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 148 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | III.L | A review of HPAs since 1996 indicates that there has been a net gain of shoreline ecological function from then to 2010, as measured by bulkhead length, restored tidelands, restored shorelines, number of creosoted pilings, application of fish mix on tidelands, and dock composition. Accordingly, it is difficult to justify any changes at all. If no changes are made, this section may be omitted. | Under the State Shoreline Master Program Guidelines, the City must set a baseline measurement to assess cumulative impacts to the City's shoreline areas and how we are meeting the goal of no net loss of ecological functions. That baseline is from the date of our shoreline characterization (2009 data). ETAC and the consultants are working diligently to ensure that the policies are based on the best scientific data that is currently available and relevant to Bainbridge Island. |
| 149 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | V.J. | It is economically and socially preferable to invite recreational development by zoning changes, easing regulatory barriers to their installation and use classification changes rather than government sponsored/supported facilities. | Providing public shoreline access (including public recreation) is one of the three basic policies of the Act. |
| 150 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | V.K | Please change this heading to "New Residential Development" and make appropriate word changes within the text to reflect this section applies only to new development. | These regulations also apply to the modification or expansion of existing residential development. |
| 151 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | V.K. Goal | Single family residential should not be demoted to a lesser status than view, access and aesthetics. | Residential use, view, and access are all priority uses under the Shoreline Management Act. |
| 152 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | V.K.2&4 | It makes little sense to regulate shoreline uses and structures to protect boaters' views. | Aesthetic values are a goal of the Shoreline Management Act. |
| 153 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | VI.A. | Please add language to the effect that policies shall comply with the provisions of RCW90.58.100. | The RCW refers to economics but the requirements for economics is in terms of where future development is projected, the level of demand for public access, or where industry may be located. It does not require a large economic study of the region, but rather |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | what does existing information reflect about demand. |
| 154 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | VI.A. | Effective and timely erosion protection is the right of every shoreline home owner, provided harmful effects are minimized. This in no way says that all harmful effects must be prevented. | Mitigation requirements are covered through the section's goal and policy #4. |
| 155 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | VI.A. | The current standard is that the primary structure must be considered to be endangered by erosion loss within three years before a permit may be issued. This is an unreasonable time period. | WAC 175-23-231(3)(a)(iii) specifies that new and replacement shoreline armoring is allowed only when it is documented that the principal structure is threatened. The three-year time period is specified in WAC 173-26-231(3)(a)(iii)(D). |
| 156 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | VI.A.1 | Add "and appurtenant structures" after "primary structure" to comply with RCW language. | The WAC guidelines will be followed. |
| 157 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | VI.A.2 | Add "consistent with the timeliness and effectiveness" language set forth in RCW. | Regulations will provide more detail. |
| 158 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | VI.A.3 | Add "and effective" after "appropriate." | Comment noted. |
| 159 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | VI.A.4 | Add language requiring any mitigation be proportional to the identified harmful impacts. | Mitigation will follow the mitigation sequence in Shoreline Master Program Guidelines (WAC 173-26-231(3)(a)(ii). |
| 160 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | VI.A.5 | This language allows permitting staff too much latitude to over-reach, demanding restoration as a condition of a permit. | Mitigation is required to meet the standard of no net loss of functions and shoreline processes; restoration is voluntary. |
| 161 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | VI.A.7 | This policy is appropriate for public property, not private residential property. After "projects" add "on public lands". | Comment noted. |
| 162 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | VI.B .Principles | In the paragraph describing structural methods, add, "Also, generally, the harder the construction method, the more effective it is in preventing erosion loss of property in high energy environments. To comply with the terms of RCW | The principle section is taken from the Shoreline Master Program Guidelines (WAC 173-26-231(3)(a)(ii). WAC 173-26-231 states that hardening of the shoreline is associated with the following adverse impacts to shoreline ecological functions: (1) beach |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | 90.58.100, the measure utilized must be both timely and effective." | starvation, (2) habitat degradation, (3) sediment impoundment, (4) exacerbation of erosion, (5) groundwater impacts, (6) hydraulic impacts, (7) loss of shoreline vegetation, (8) restriction of channel movement, and (9) creation of conditions that result in weakening the structure over time. |
| 163 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | VI.B. Principles | There simply is insufficient information available which is specific to Bainbridge Island shorelines to support the conclusions asserted in this Principles statement. | The principle section is taken from the Shoreline Master Program Guidelines (WAC 173-26-231(3)(a)(ii). ETAC and the consultants are working diligently to ensure that the policies are based on the best scientific data that is currently available and relevant to Bainbridge Island. |
| 164 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | VI.B. Principles | It is the habit of staff to ignore positive effects of human action, such as reforestation of the island's shoreline. Such positive effects as these have not been stated in any study of cumulative effects. Replace "typically" after Shoreline hardening with "might in some circumstances." | Comment noted. |
| 165 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | VI.B. Principles | Should city staff insist on the use of soft measures instead of the geotech-recommended hard measures, the city should be obligated to assume the fiscal and permitting responsibility to replace the failed structure with an effective one. | Comment noted |
| 166 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | VI.B.1 | Restate as "Discourage shoreline stabilization, particularly 'hard' structural stabilization when not in conflict with RCW 90.58.100 requirements for timeliness and effectiveness." | Regulations will provide more detail. |
| 167 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | VI.B.10 | Do not force property owners to provide | Comment noted. |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | restoration for public benefit at private expense. | |
| 168 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | VI.B.11 | Excellent! | No response necessary. |
| 169 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | VI.B.2 | Insert "and a site-specific" between "reach-specific" and "basis." Add another sentence: "Proportional mitigation for the site and reach is allowable to mitigate predictable effects from shoreline alterations." | Mitigation will follow the mitigation sequence in guidelines. |
| 170 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | VI.B.4 | In the first sentence, substitute "found by a Washington licensed Geo-Technical expert" for "demonstrated". Insert after "legally established structures" the words "and their appurtenant structures. Insert "effective" between "no" and "alternative" in the final sentence. | Regulations will provide more detail. |
| 171 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | VI.B.6 | Again, invoke the requirements of RCW 90.58.100 as to effectiveness and subsequent responsibility for correcting failures. | WAC 176-23-231 states that "New or enlarged structural shoreline stabilization measures for an existing primary structure, including residences, should not be allowed unless there is conclusive evidence, documented by a geotechnical analysis, that the structure is in danger from shoreline erosion caused by tidal action, currents, or waves. Normal sloughing, erosion of steep bluffs, or shoreline erosion itself, without a scientific or geotechnical analysis, is not demonstration of need." |
| 172 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | VI.B.8 | Add "consistent with provisions of RCW 90.58.100" at the end of the sentence. | Comment noted. |
| 173 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | VI.B.9 | Add "and its mitigation" and "shoreline stabilization." | Comment noted. |
| 174 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | VI.B5 | Restate to read: "It is allowable to repair or replace existing hard armoring structures so long as they are not sited | The draft language meets the requirements of the Shoreline Master Program Guidelines (WAC 173-26-231(3)(a)(iii)(C), to limit |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | seaward of their original location." | armoring due to adverse impacts. |
| 175 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | VI.D | Dredge projects very likely balance positive and negative ecological effects over time as they temporarily alter the habitat but effectively create beneficial habitat in time. | Comment noted. |
| 176 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | VI.E.1 | Add "vital public transportation uses" after "public access uses." | Comment noted. |
| 177 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | VI.E.3 | Add "over time" at the end of the sentence. | Comment noted. |
| 178 | 04/25/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline owner | VI.F | I suggest the city simply follow the Corps of Engineers permitting rules for overwater structures. | The City will ensure consistency with Army Corps of Engineers requirements for saltwater construction. |
| 179 | 04/25/11 | B. Eastman | Shoreline owner | General | These draft workgroup recommendations are far too restrictive and go far beyond the requirements of the State and Federal requirements. | The recommendations were drafted to comply with the consistency analysis, the Shoreline Management Act, and the 2003 guidelines. |
| 180 | 04/25/11 | B. Eastman | Shoreline owner | General | Will the City pay us for the value of this property that you are restricting our usage and enjoyment? | The purpose of the Shoreline Master Program is to address the impacts of human development and use of the shoreline, while protecting the shoreline ecology. |
| 181 | 04/25/11 | B. Eastman | Shoreline owner | III.B.6 | A vegetation management zone (buffer) larger than what is required in the current Shoreline Master Program is not necessary to ensure no net loss! | Policies related to buffers and residential development are intended to both protect shoreline ecology and accommodate existing single-family residences on the shoreline. City Council will make the final decision on how nonconforming uses and structures will be regulated. |
| 182 | 04/25/11 | B. Eastman | Shoreline owner | III.L. | The COBI Shoreline Master Program should adopt the approach of using the option of declaring the existing legally built homes "conforming." | Comment forwarded to City Council. |
| 183 | 04/25/11 | C. Smith | Citizen | General | Making legally built existing structures nonconforming is fundamentally wrong. It will lower home values and property | Comment noted. |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | tax revenues. It will also significantly increase litigation against the city, which we can ill afford. | |
| 184 | 04/25/11 | F. Scheffler | Shoreline Homeowner | General | The Wyckoff and Unocal sites present far greater threats to the shoreline marine habitat than legally constructed residences that pay a premium in real property taxes. | The purpose of the Shoreline Master Program is to address the impacts of human development and use of the shoreline. Other issues are addressed through myriad programs and regulations, from restoration and enhancement projects to regulations controlling stormwater, public, commercial, and industrial activities |
| 185 | 04/25/11 | F. Scheffler | Shoreline Homeowner | Process | We have had number of publicly funded and unqualified zealots at COBI…or "advising"… and I for one have no faith in their representations…their qualifications…and most importantly…even handedness. I have even less faith in those who were elected to represent the interest of ALL citizens and have been complicit by action or inaction in this assault. | Comment noted. |
| 186 | 04/25/11 | F. Scheffler | Shoreline Homeowner | Process | In 2011 the management of COBI has yet to address the real priorities of Island government…what taxes are paid for…yet there is still time and funds to pursue this vendetta against one class of property owners. | The update of the Shoreline Master Program is a mandate from state law. If the city does not adopt an update customized for the Island, the state will require us to adopt and implement regulations written by the state Department of Ecology |
| 187 | 04/25/11 | G. Pace | Shoreline owner | IV | If the stated goal is no net loss, then why are so many more miles of shoreline designated Conservancy in the new plan? | Preliminary mapping has been done based on the criteria adopted by the SMP Task Force. The designation criteria and the designation map are still in the draft phase and have not yet been released. |
| 188 | 04/25/11 | G. Pace | Shoreline owner | General | The citizen committees set up to come up with an "approved" draft were appointed by staff. Shoreline | Bainbridge Citizens, Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners, the Association of Bainbridge Communities, and the Bainbridge Alliance for |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | homeowners were represented, but totally outnumbered by other "stakeholders" who are not impacted by the resulting ordinance. | Puget Sound named a representative to each of the workgroups. The Shoreline Master Program Policy Advisory Committee, consisting of two council members and two planning commissioners and appointed by City Council, selected the remaining "at large" members for each workgroup. Each workgroup self-selected three members to participate in the Task Force. *Please see the 2011 Shoreline Master Program Update – Citizen Committees page for more information.* |
| 189 | 04/25/11 | G. Pace | Shoreline owner | III.B.6 | Leaving the buffer width at 50-feet in place will ensure no net loss. | Policies related to buffers and residential development are intended to both protect shoreline ecology and accommodate existing single-family residences on the shoreline. |
| 190 | 04/25/11 | G. Pace | Shoreline owner | III.L | Since "no net loss of ecological function" starts on the day the Shoreline Master Program update takes effect, existing structures – including bulkheads and docks – cannot cause a loss. | Under the State Shoreline Master Program Guidelines, the City must set a baseline measurement to assess cumulative impacts to the City's shoreline areas and how we are meeting the goal of no net loss of ecological functions. That baseline is from the date of our shoreline characterization (2009 data). |
| 191 | 04/25/11 | G. Pace | Shoreline owner | Process | Once again, it appears that COBI staff has determined the "desired" outcome in advance and proceeded to justify their position with selected studies based on pseudo science that is not applicable to our shorelines. | The goals and policies were modified and adopted by citizen advisory workgroups appointed by the Advisory Committee consisting of Planning Commissioners and councilmembers. The scientific references were chosen by consultants and approved by ETAC. |
| 192 | 04/25/11 | G. Pace | Shoreline owner | Science | The use of non-applicable science to justify pre-determined positions is unconscionable. Speculation is not science and should not be used as a basis for "taking" private property rights. | The City is utilizing current science to update the SMP, including two science summaries produced by consultants for the City (the *Science Addendum* [Herrera, 2011] and the Science Review [Battelle, 2003]). ETAC and |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | the consultants are working diligently to ensure that the policies are based on the best scientific data that is currently available and relevant to Bainbridge Island. |
| 193 | 04/25/11 | G. Pace | Shoreline owner | VI.B | Feeder bluffs may turn out to be a valid scientific concept, but the concept should pass the test of peer review by senior scientists with relevant experience before` it is used as the basis for land use regulations. | Littoral cells, drift cells, are defined lengths of shoreline within which the cycle of sediment erosion (bluffs, waterways), transportation and deposition is essentially self-contained. The City is utilizing current science to update the Shoreline Master Program, including two science summaries produced by consultants for the City (the *Science Addendum from Herrera*, 2011 and the Science Review from Battelle, 2003) |
| 194 | 04/25/11 | G. Pace | Shoreline owner | VI.F | Shoreline Master Program guidelines do not say that overwater structures should be prohibited but that they "shall be designed and constructed to avoid or, if that is not possible, to minimize and mitigate the impacts to ecological functions…" | Staff concurs. |
| 195 | 04/25/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | General | The draft policies do not balance private property rights and the common desire to protect the environment. | Comment forwarded to the workgroups and Shoreline Master Program Policy Advisory Committee. |
| 196 | 04/25/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | General | The draft policies generally attempt to turn residential shoreline into Open Space for public benefit at the expense of private property owners. | Comment noted. |
| 197 | 04/25/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | General, III.B, III.L, V.K | The City has failed in the draft Shoreline Master Program Policies process to involve meaningful notice and participation of the shoreline property owners… the City has a duty to send each property owner a notice that their homes are about to be made | Bainbridge Citizens, Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners, the Association of Bainbridge Communities, and the Bainbridge Alliance for Puget Sound named a representative to each of the workgroups. The Shoreline Master Program Policy Advisory Committee, consisting of two council members and two |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | nonconforming and their front yards are about to be converted into Open Space (Vegetation Management and Conservation Zones). | planning commissioners and appointed by City Council, selected the remaining "at large" members for each workgroup. Each workgroup self-selected three members to participate in the Task Force. *Please see the 2011 Shoreline Master Program Update – Citizen Committees page for more information.* |
| 198 | 04/25/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | III.B., III.L, V.K | The draft policies make normal residential uses such as recreation areas, lawns, decks, patios, and gardens nonconforming and illegal within 200 feet of the shoreline. | Policies needed for buffers and residential development are intended to both protect shoreline ecology and accommodate existing single-family residences on the shoreline. Use activities are currently regulated within the shoreline jurisdiction, including residential uses. Uses are restricted within required vegetative buffers. As part of the regulations, updated buffer widths will be proposed by a technical consultant. ETAC and the workgroups will review the recommendations before buffer regulations become part of the draft document that will be submitted to Planning Commission and eventually City Council. |
| 199 | 04/25/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | III.L. V.K | The draft policies make legally constructed and existing structures nonconforming and illegal. | Nonconforming means that the use or structure does not conform to the existing development standards. A legally existing structure which becomes nonconforming because of a rule change may legally remain. |
| 200 | 04/25/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | V.K | The draft does not promote or protect single-family homes as a <u>preferred</u> water-dependent use. | Single-family residences are not water-dependent. Single-family residential uses shall be preferred if they are consistent with the control of pollution and prevention of damage to the natural environment or dependant on upon the use of the shoreline. In those limited instances when authorized, |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | alteration of the natural condition of the shoreline of the state shall be given priority for single family residences and their appurtenant structures. RCW 90.58.020 |
| 201 | 04/25/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | V.K. | The draft policies would place restrictions on the exempt activity of maintenance and repair of single-family homes. | WAC 173.27.080 recognizes existing legally-established structures which may not conform to current development standards, but are allowed to remain and be maintained, repaired, and enlarged as long as the expansion does not increase the nonconformity. |
| 202 | 04/25/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | VI.A & B | The draft policies would place restrictions on the exempt activity of constructing a "normal protective bulkhead." | WAC 176-23-231 states that "New or enlarged structural shoreline stabilization measures for an existing primary structure, including residences, should not be allowed unless there is conclusive evidence, documented by a geotechnical analysis, that the structure is in danger from shoreline erosion caused by tidal action, currents, or waves. Normal sloughing, erosion of steep bluffs, or shoreline erosion itself, without a scientific or geotechnical analysis, is not demonstration of need." |
| 203 | 04/25/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | VI.A & F | The draft policies unreasonably restrict the right of shoreline property owners to construct a residential dock to access the water. | The policies regarding docks developed by the workgroups and any regulations which are currently under review by the workgroups will be reviewed by both Planning Commission and City Council prior to adoption. |
| 204 | 04/25/11 | J. Sansbury | Shoreline owner | III.B, III.L., V.K | We hope that the rumors we are hearing of proposed regulations which would make our property nonconforming, due to the establishment of native vegetation buffer zones, are not true. | The workgroups adopted policies that would establish a vegetation zone and the associated regulations (such as width) are still in the preliminary draft stage. |
| 205 | 04/25/11 | J. Sweeney | Citizen | III.B., III.L, | I'm told you are contemplating the | The citizen committees will make |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | V.K | establishment of a "Shoreline Vegetation Conservation and Management Zone which would make every existing shoreline use a nonconforming usage. Is that correct? Why | recommendations on regulations for vegetation buffer sizes and how existing structures will be addressed. Those recommendations will be included in the draft Shoreline Master Program submitted to the Planning Commission and City Council. City Council will make the final policy decisions to be forwarded to the Department of Ecology for approval. |
| 206 | 04/25/11 | M. McLauchlan | Citizen | General | It is education that is needed and cooperation between the residents and the City, not more seemingly "mean spirited" taking of land and laying down of more arbitrary rules. | A series of educational presentations was provided as the first step in following the Public Participation Plan. (*Note: There are links to those presentations in the project chronology on the city's website.)* Public information and education opportunities will continue during the Shoreline Master Program Update process. |
| 207 | 04/25/11 | N. Page | Shoreline owner | General | Proposed regulations simply invite lawsuits that will take years to fight and will use government funds that are badly needed elsewhere. | The draft SMP will go through numerous legal reviews, including the Department of Ecology approval process. |
| 208 | 04/25/11 | R. Drury | Citizen | General | Balanced concern for ecosystem integrity and the rights of current residents and property owners should be the goal. | This is a goal of the Shoreline Management Act. |
| 209 | 04/25/11 | R. Young | Citizen | General | Pursuing adventures like this is unwise, costly to all and results in a less enjoyable Bainbridge for its citizens to enjoy. | Comment noted. |
| 210 | 04/25/11 | T. Sultan | Shoreline owner | General | What we on the Island don't need is another messy and drawn-out battle like the one we had a few years back on the same issue. | See response to comment #207. |
| 211 | 04/25/11 | Unknown | Shoreline owner | III.L, V.K. | Someone wants to regulate parts or all of my property and zone it nonconforming. They are certainly welcome to purchase | WAC 173.27.080 recognizes existing legally-established structures which may not conform to current development standards, but are |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | those rights to it. | allowed to remain and be maintained, repaired, and enlarged as long as the expansion does not increase the nonconformity. |
| 212 | 04/26/11 | B. Hanson | FASLA principal | General | All of the Island's residents will benefit from an approach to managing all of the Island's ecosystems to benefit the health of Puget Sound. | Comment noted. |
| 213 | 04/26/11 | B. Hanson | FASLA principal | III.B.6 | It is difficult to understand the logic behind the distribution and proposed extent of vegetation "buffers." Where has allowance been made for the protection of high-bank native vegetation? | Vegetative buffers are intended to protect ecological functions provided by shoreline vegetation. Buffer widths will be proposed by a technical consultant. Both prescriptive and flexible options are being proposed. ETAC and the workgroups will review the recommendations before buffer regulations become part of the draft document that will be submitted to Planning Commission and eventually City Council. |
| 214 | 04/26/11 | B. Hanson | FASLA principal | III.L | The proposed policies for the Island pre-suppose that residential uses have a negative impact on the ecology of the shoreline and the intertidal zone. | The purpose of the Shoreline Master Program is to address the impacts of human development and use of the shoreline. Other issues are addressed through myriad programs and regulations, from restoration and enhancement projects to regulations controlling stormwater, public, commercial, and industrial activities |
| 215 | 04/26/11 | B. Hanson | FASLA principal | IV | Shoreline Residential Conservancy sets some excellent goals. To protect the shoreline's marine life requires our sensitive use, development, and conservation of all of the island's watersheds. | Comment noted. |
| 216 | 04/26/11 | B. Hanson | FASLA principal | Science | State law did not intend that we make Bainbridge Island a natural science laboratory experiment to test various | The State Shoreline Master Program Guidelines require that the City use the most current, accurate, and complete scientific and |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | hypotheses. | technical information available. WAC 173-26-201(2)(a) |
| 217 | 04/26/11 | B. Hanson | FASLA principal | VI.B | We have not seen any scientific studies that provide support for the theory that bulkheads, which prevent erosion of the adjacent shoreline, provide a net loss in ecological functions. | WAC 176-23-231 states that hardening of the shoreline is associated with the following adverse impacts to shoreline ecological functions: (1) beach starvation, (2) habitat degradation, (3) sediment impoundment, (4) exacerbation of erosion, (5) groundwater impacts, (6) hydraulic impacts, (7) loss shoreline vegetation, (8) restriction of channel movement, and (9) creation of conditions that result in weakening the structure over time. |
| 218 | 04/26/11 | B. Hanson | FASLA principal | VI.F | There is absolutely no science that demonstrates that overwater structures cause a net loss of ecological function. | The City is utilizing current science to update the SMP, including two science summaries produced by consultants for the City (the *Science Addendum* [Herrera, 2011] and the Science Review [Battelle, 2003]). ETAC and the consultants are working diligently to ensure that the policies are based on the best scientific data that is currently available and relevant to Bainbridge Island. |
| 219 | 04/26/11 | B. Mennucci | Shoreline owner | Designations | As a home owner along the South side of Eagle Harbor, I must object to the designation change for residential to conservancy residential for properties along our shoreline. | Preliminary mapping has been done based on the criteria adopted by the Shoreline Master Program Task Force. The designation criteria and the designation map are currently in the draft phase and will be released to the public upon final recommendation of the Shoreline Master Program Task Force. |
| 220 | 04/26/11 | B. Peters | Councilmember | General | It seems appropriate to state that single-family residential is a preferred use of the shoreline and ensure that the policies are consistent with such a preferred use. | Single-family residential uses shall be preferred if they are consistent with the control of pollution and prevention of damage to the natural environment. In those limited instances when authorized, alteration of the natural condition of the shoreline of the state shall be given priority for single family |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | residences and their appurtenant structures. RCW 90.58.020 |
| 221 | 04/26/11 | B. Peters | Councilmember | General | I want to echo a citizen comment that requests that the Shoreline Master Program update rely more extensively on incentives rather than command and control prohibitions. | Comment noted. |
| 222 | 04/26/11 | B. Peters | Councilmember | III.B | I've had occasion to see some summaries of science that present rationales for policies such as buffers, vegetation zones and rules limiting bulkheads and docks. But I've also seen scientific papers (such as those of island resident Don Flora) that present statistics showing little or no statistical correlation between the presence of buffers or bulkheads on stretches of Bainbridge shoreline and the health of the adjacent shoreline ecology. | The State Shoreline Master Program Guidelines require that the City use the most current, accurate, and complete scientific and technical information available. WAC 173-26-201(2)(a). The City is utilizing current science to update the Shoreline Master Program, including two science summaries produced by consultants for the City (the *Science Addendum* from Herrera, 2011 and the Science Review from Battelle, 2003). WAC 173-26-231 states that hardening of the shoreline is associated with the following adverse impacts to shoreline ecological functions: (1) beach starvation, (2) habitat degradation, (3) sediment impoundment, (4) exacerbation of erosion, (5) groundwater impacts, (6) hydraulic impacts, (7) loss of shoreline vegetation, (8) restriction of channel movement, and (9) creation of conditions that result in weakening the structure over time. |
| 223 | 04/26/11 | B. Peters | Councilmember | III.L | Eliminate the goal of "phasing out uses." | Comment noted. |
| 224 | 04/26/11 | B. Peters | Councilmember | IV | What is the scientific evidence for re-classifying so many shoreline reaches as Shoreline Conservancy, where they are currently used as residential and currently designated either "urban" or "semi-rural" or "rural"? | Shoreline designations are established based on the existing ecological characteristics of the shoreline area and anticipated land use. Criteria for each designation must be established. |
| 225 | 04/26/11 | B. Peters | Councilmember | Mitigation | Please state more clearly in the policies | Comment noted. The measurement of "no net |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | that whether a property owner's proposed action on his or her property imposes a "net loss" is to be measured after taking account of any offsetting mitigation. | loss" will be based on a site specific analysis of the existing baseline conditions, proposed development, and proposed mitigation measures to offset any impacts. |
| 226 | 04/26/11 | B. Peters | Councilmember | Parkland | I want to echo two comments that were presented by the board of the Bainbridge Island Metropolitan Park District, which is our Island's largest single owner of waterfront property. | Comment noted. |
| 227 | 04/26/11 | Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners | Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners | III.L | Of the six BIG problems we have identified with the update, this [nonconforming development provisions] is the most important to the largest number of shoreline homeowners. | Nonconforming means that the use or structure does not conform to the existing development standards. The existing Shoreline Master Program allows 100% replacement of an existing nonconforming structure. City Council will make the final decision on how nonconforming uses and structures will be regulated. |
| 228 | 04/26/11 | Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners | Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners | III.L | Local jurisdictions have the express authority to declare existing, lawfully built structures as "conforming". This section should be deleted or rewritten to conform to the legislative intent of SB5451. | See response to comment #227. |
| 229 | 04/26/11 | C. Lenard | Shoreline owner | General | A better definition of the term "no net loss" and "best available science" used in the draft needs to be provided. | Comment noted. |
| 230 | 04/26/11 | C. Lenard | Shoreline owner | General | Any scientific studies relied upon should be peer-reviewed and widely accepted. | The City is utilizing current science to update the Shoreline Master Program, including two science summaries produced by consultants for the City (the *Science Addendum* from Herrera, 2011 and the Science Review from Battelle, 2003). ETAC and the consultants are working diligently to ensure that the policies are based on the best scientific data that is |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | currently available and relevant to Bainbridge Island. |
| 231 | 04/26/11 | C. Lenard | Shoreline owner | III.B | I object to the application of generic buffers to large areas of shoreline without specific evaluation of the environmental impacts and individual property rights affected. | Policies related to buffers and residential development are intended to both protect shoreline ecology and accommodate existing single-family residences on the shoreline. |
| 232 | 04/26/11 | C. Lenard | Shoreline owner | III.K | As the statement stands, it sets a lower bound on shoreline functionality and ecosystems without making it clear what, if any, upper bound there is. | WAC 173.26, state Shoreline Master Program guidelines, requires the City to regulate development in order to protect critical saltwater habitats, including fish and wildlife conservation areas. |
| 233 | 04/26/11 | C. Lenard | Shoreline owner | III.L | If I have a legally constructed structure that does not comply with the new standards, how and at what time will I be required to bring it into conformance with the new standards? | WAC 173.27.080 recognizes existing legally-established structures which may not conform to current development standards, but are allowed to remain and be maintained, repaired, and enlarged as long as the expansion does not increase the nonconformity. City Council will make the final decision on how nonconforming uses and structures will be regulated. |
| 234 | 04/26/11 | C. Lenard | Shoreline owner | III.L | I strongly oppose any plan that would either now or later declare homes built in accordance with regulations at time of construction to be non-conforming. | See response to comment #233. |
| 235 | 04/26/11 | C. Lenard | Shoreline owner | IV | The drastic increase in the amount of shoreline classified in the conservancy category does not seem reasonable. | Preliminary mapping has been done based on the criteria adopted by the Shoreline Master Program Task Force. The designation criteria and the designation map are currently in the draft phase and will be released to the public upon final recommendation of the Shoreline Master Program Task Force. |
| 236 | 04/26/11 | C. Lenard | Shoreline owner | VI.B | Shoreline armoring is necessary to secure homes that are In danger due to erosion. More restrictive barriers in | From Department of Ecology “Frequently Asked Questions: Marine Shoreline Armoring and Puget Sound”: |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | placement of bulkheads interferes with a homeowner's right to protect his/her home. | By armoring our areas where upland and marine vegetation meet, the negative impacts can be extensive. Bulkheads can:<br>• Reduce the natural delivery of sand and gravel to our shorelines.<br>• Bury the upper beach and reduce the amount of large woody debris deposited on the beach, which results in habitat loss<br>• Isolate once interconnected land and aquatic habitats, resulting in habitat loss and altering the abundance and density of associated invertebrates, a major food source for fish ,birds and other wildlife species.<br>Impacts from site disturbance during the voluntary restoration action are temporary and will subside when the ecosystem has reached equilibrium. |
| 237 | 04/26/11 | C. March | Shoreline owner | III.B.6 | I have a serious problem with the nebulous and potentially capricious language regarding the creation of zones immediately upland of the OHWM. | Shoreline designations are a required component of the SMP, as stipulated in WAC 173-26-21. Preliminary mapping has been done based on the criteria adopted by the Shoreline Master Program Task Force. The designation criteria and the designation map are still in the draft phase and have not yet been released. |
| 238 | 04/26/11 | C. March | Shoreline owner | III.L | This section would appear to be nothing other than a direct violation of RCW 90.58.100, where it is stated that there needs to be balance of private property rights with ecological protection. | WAC 173.27.080 recognizes existing legally-established structures which may not conform to current development standards, but are allowed to remain and be maintained, repaired, and enlarged as long as the expansion does not increase the nonconformity. |
| 239 | 04/26/11 | C. March | Shoreline owner | Science | As a scientist by training and being an | The State Shoreline Master Program |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | author on numerous peer reviewed publications, my opinion is that "any reliable sources of science" must, by definition, be limited to peer reviewed scientific publications which have met the rigorous academic standards that are part and parcel of the peer review process. | Guidelines require that the City use the most current, accurate, and complete scientific information available. WAC 173-26-201(2)(a) ETAC and the consultants are working diligently to ensure that the policies are based on the best scientific data that is currently available and relevant to Bainbridge Island. |
| 240 | 04/26/11 | C. March | Shoreline owner | VI.B | While not referencing any hard science to support your policies, you appear to shift the burden to each property owner to justify the maintenance of their existing armoring. | WAC 176-23-231 states that "New or enlarged structural shoreline stabilization measures for an existing primary structure, including residences, should not be allowed unless there is conclusive evidence, documented by a geotechnical analysis, that the structure is in danger from shoreline erosion caused by tidal action, currents, or waves. Normal sloughing, erosion of steep bluffs, or shoreline erosion itself, without a scientific or geotechnical analysis, is not demonstration of need." |
| 241 | 04/26/11 | D. Flora | Citizen | III.L | Purging shoreline homes through some non-replacement extermination program, principally in the pursuit of aesthetics, and without compensation, is a heinous matter. | A policy goal for nonconforming development was recommended by the citizen committees. City Council will make the final decision on how nonconforming uses and structures will be regulated. |
| 242 | 04/26/11 | D. Flora | Citizen | Definitions | At what point will users of these rules be told the meaning of "ecological functions", "ecosystem-wide processes", and "natural character"? | The Shoreline Master Program update, including definitions, will be available for public comment prior to Planning Commission review. |
| 243 | 04/26/11 | D. Flora | Citizen | General | At a policy level, we obviously need to know what changes we are trying to forestall, if only because there are various ways of getting there. | Comment noted. |
| 244 | 04/26/11 | D. Flora | Citizen | III.B | At the policy level we should consider the current status of shoreline biota and | The City is utilizing current science to update the SMP, including two science summaries |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | whether habitats are really in flux. | produced by consultants for the City (the *Science Addendum* [Herrera, 2011] and the Science Review [Battelle, 2003]). ETAC and the consultants are working diligently to ensure that the policies are based on the best scientific data that is currently available and relevant to Bainbridge Island. |
| 245 | 04/26/11 | D. Flora | Citizen | III.B | It seems prudent to stay with the buffering dimensions that we understand, leaving the door open for options whose efficacy can be supported by applicants or further study. | Vegetative buffers are intended to protect ecological functions provided by shoreline vegetation. Buffer widths will be proposed by a technical consultant. Both prescriptive and flexible options are being proposed. ETAC and the workgroups will review the recommendations before buffer regulations become part of the draft document that will be submitted to Planning Commission and eventually City Council. |
| 246 | 04/26/11 | D. Flora | Citizen | III.B | It seems wholly prudent to leave vegetation decisions up to owners, landscapers, garden experts, entomologists and pathologists. | See response to comment #245. |
| 247 | 04/26/11 | D. Flora | Citizen | III.B | Conservancy designations appear to be rooted in dogma more than science. Imposing extra constraints are not based on special problems nor unique resource values. | Preliminary mapping has been done based on the criteria adopted by the Shoreline Master Program Task Force. The designation criteria and the designation map are currently in the draft phase and will be released to the public upon final recommendation of the Shoreline Master Program Task Force. |
| 248 | 04/26/11 | D. Flora | Citizen | III.B | Imposing view corridors on residences is an incredible intrusion. | See response to comment #245. |
| 249 | 04/26/11 | D. Flora | Citizen | III.B | Structural functions do not depend on species nativeness. | See response to comment #245. |
| 250 | 04/26/11 | D. Flora | Citizen | VI.B | After 150 years of shore protection, with half the island's beaches now bulkheaded, and harm now unfound in | WAC 173-26-231 states that hardening of the shoreline is associated with the following adverse impacts to shoreline ecological |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | valid studies, the badness of bulkheads hardly cries out for control. | functions: (1) beach starvation, (2) habitat degradation, (3) sediment impoundment, (4) exacerbation of erosion, (5) groundwater impacts, (6) hydraulic impacts, (7) loss of shoreline vegetation, (8) restriction of channel movement, and (9) creation of conditions that result in weakening the structure over time. |
| 251 | 04/26/11 | D. Rodocker | Shoreline owner | VI.B | The removal of the bulkheads or any other existing shoreline structures would be highly disruptive and destructive to the existing wildlife, ecosystems, and real property. | From Department of Ecology "Frequently Asked Questions: Marine Shoreline Armoring and the Puget Sound"<br>By armoring our areas where upland and marine vegetation meet, the negative impacts can be extensive. Bulkheads can:<br>• Reduce the natural delivery of sand and gravel to our shorelines.<br>• Bury the upper beach and reduce the amount of large woody debris deposited on the beach, which results in habitat loss.<br>• Isolate once interconnected land and aquatic habitats, resulting in habitat loss and altering the abundance and density of associated invertebrates, a major food source for fish, birds and other wildlife species.<br>Impacts from site disturbance during the voluntary restoration action are temporary and will subside when the ecosystem has reached equilibrium. |
| 252 | 04/26/11 | D. Spencer | Shoreline owner | Designations | The idea of changing the designation of properties on the South Side of Eagle Harbor to Shoreline Residential Conservancy has not taken into account the financial burden it places on property owners or the need for and ecological | Preliminary mapping has been done based on the criteria adopted by the Shoreline Master Program Task Force. The designation criteria and the designation map are currently in the draft phase and will be released to the public upon final recommendation of the Shoreline |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | benefits of bulkheads. | Master Program Task Force. The Shoreline Master Program is looking at broad-scale economics in terms of future demands for shoreline uses. It does not require a large economic study of the region, but rather what does existing information reflect about demand. |
| 253 | 04/26/11 | E. Dailey | Citizen | General | Please do whatever you can to ensure the Shoreline Master Program language acknowledges the Island's unique particularities. | Under the Shoreline Management Act, the City's Shoreline Master Program must be based on state laws and rules, including the 2003 Shoreline Master Program Guidelines, but can be tailored to the specific geographic, economic and environmental needs of the community. |
| 254 | 04/26/11 | E. Dailey | Citizen | General | To be successful, our Shoreline Master Program should embrace the principals of sustainability: people, profit, planet and should be a plan we can live with, manage and embrace. | Comment noted. |
| 255 | 04/26/11 | E. Dailey | Citizen | III.B | Oppose an increase in setbacks and buffers. | Buffer widths will be proposed by a technical consultant. ETAC and the workgroups will review the recommendations before buffer regulations become part of the draft document that will be submitted to Planning Commission and eventually City Council. |
| 256 | 04/26/11 | E. Dailey | Citizen | III.L | I urge you to declare existing, lawfully-built homes and their appurtenant structures conforming in the new Shoreline Master Program. | Comment forwarded to City Council. |
| 257 | 04/26/11 | E. Dailey | Citizen | Science | I am concerned that the City is not relying on the best available science in developing the Shoreline Master Program as recommended in the guidelines. | The City is utilizing current science to update the SMP, including two science summaries produced by consultants for the City (the *Science Addendum* [Herrera, 2011] and the Science Review [Battelle, 2003]). ETAC and the consultants are working diligently to |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | ensure that the policies are based on the best scientific data that is currently available and relevant to Bainbridge Island. |
| 258 | 04/26/11 | E. Dailey | Citizen | VI.B | Existing language in the draft Shoreline Master Program bars or unreasonably hinders the smooth permitting process and installation of effective shoreline armoring. | WAC 176-23-231 states that ”New or enlarged structural shoreline stabilization measures for an existing primary structure, including residences, should not be allowed unless there is conclusive evidence, documented by a geotechnical analysis, that the structure is in danger from shoreline erosion caused by tidal action, currents, or waves. Normal sloughing, erosion of steep bluffs, or shoreline erosion itself, without a scientific or geotechnical analysis, is not demonstration of need.” |
| 259 | 04/26/11 | E. Wright | Workgroup member | Designations | Please educate and explain to shoreline property owners the true effects of the designations contemplated. | Public information and education opportunities will continue during the Shoreline Master Program Update process. |
| 260 | 04/26/11 | E. Wright | Workgroup member | General | In the Vegetation Management Workgroup in which we are both participants, Mr. Tripp has successfully insisted on the modification of many of the policies he now decries. | Comment noted. |
| 261 | 04/26/11 | E. Wright | Workgroup member | General | I find it particularly sad that the most vocal opponents of shoreline regulation fail to recognize that with the privilege of shoreline ownership comes the responsibility of stewardship | Comment noted. |
| 262 | 04/26/11 | E. Wright | Workgroup member | General | Please be certain that no more misinformation is disseminated by those who apparently joined the Shoreline Master Program update without realizing that the goal of the Shoreline Master Program is to maintain, if not improve, the health of Puget Sound. | Comment noted. |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 263 | 04/26/11 | E. Wright | Workgroup member | III.B | Please maintain or strengthen the Native Vegetation Management/ Conservation zones. | Comment noted. |
| 264 | 04/26/11 | E. Wright | Workgroup member | Process | As participants in the process since the beginning of the Shoreline Master Program update, both gentlemen have been quite insistent that they are representing the 1700 property owners Mr. Tripp now professes have not been notified. | Comment noted. |
| 265 | 04/26/11 | F. Gace | Shoreline owner | General | I agree with others that the city has a duty not to just place notices on their web site and in the local papers, which reaches only a fraction of the shoreline property owners, but to properly inform those most affected. | The notice process and procedures are laid out in the Public Participation Plan which was developed through a public process. |
| 266 | 04/26/11 | F. Gace | Shoreline owner | General | The Draft Shoreline Master Program does not balance private property rights with the common desire to protect the environment, and thus generally attempts to turn residential shoreline into public open space at the expense of private property owners. | Comment noted. |
| 267 | 04/26/11 | F. Gace | Shoreline owner | III.B, III.L | The designation of a "vegetation zone" will make these properties, homes and residential uses "nonconforming" and this will make the property more difficult and expensive to insure and refinance, as well as less valuable… could very likely lead to "unjust taking" by the City. | The Shoreline Master Program Policy Advisory Committee, consisting of Planning Commissioners and councilmembers, will provide guidance on what constitutes a nonconforming use or structure and the City Council will make the final decision on this issue. |
| 268 | 04/26/11 | F. Guion | Shoreline owner | III.B. | Fifty feet of my property has already been usurped to enhance sea water creatures that are dear to me. But any more land should not be needed unless there are hard facts from scientific | The City is utilizing current science to update the Shoreline Master Program, including two science summaries produced by consultants for the City (the *Science Addendum* from Herrera, 2011 and the Science Review from |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | studies to prove that added property and vegetation are needed for survival of sea life. | Battelle, 2003). ETAC and the technical consultants are working diligently to ensure that the policies are based on the best scientific data that is currently available and relevant to Bainbridge Island. |
| 269 | 04/26/11 | G. Rees | Citizen | Designations | If the stated goal is no net loss, then why are so many more miles of shoreline designated Conservancy in the new plan? | Preliminary mapping has been done based on the criteria adopted by the SMP Task Force. The designation criteria and the designation map are still in the draft phase and have not yet been released. |
| 270 | 04/26/11 | G. Rees | Citizen | General | Unfortunately, the interpretation of scientific and technical information is up to volunteers, staff, planning commissioners, and elected council members. | ETAC and the technical consultants are working diligently to ensure that the policies are based on the best scientific data that is currently available and relevant to Bainbridge Island. ETAC consists of professional scientists. (*See the ETAC web page for credentials.*) |
| 271 | 04/26/11 | G. Rees | Citizen | III.B.6 | The Shoreline Master Program should not establish a vegetation management zone (buffer) on already developed properties that is larger than the 50-foot buffer in the current Shoreline Master Program. | Buffer widths will be proposed by a technical consultant. ETAC and the workgroups will review the recommendations before buffer regulations will become part of the draft document that will be submitted to Planning Commission and eventually City Council. |
| 272 | 04/26/11 | G. Rees | Citizen | III.L.Goal | The SMA does not say that existing, lawfully built homes should or must be declared Non-conforming and phased out over time. | Nonconforming means that the use or structure does not conform to the existing development standards. The existing Shoreline Master Program allows 100% replacement of an existing nonconforming structure. City Council will make the final decision on how nonconforming uses and structures will be regulated. |
| 273 | 04/26/11 | G. Rees | Citizen | VI.B | What's wrong with bulkheads? Because bulkheads protect the uplands from erosion, and erosion feeds the beach. | Comment noted. |
| 274 | 04/26/11 | H. & P. Cook | Shoreline owner | Various | Copy of Gace comment | See responses to Gace comments. |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 275 | 04/26/11 | I. Morris | Citizen | III.L | I believe that helping residents to protect their homes and property is a fundamental purpose of city government and I believe the goal stated in this section is contradictory to that purpose. | See response to comment #272. |
| 276 | 04/26/11 | I. Morris | Citizen | III.L.4 | I object to any restrictions that would hinder a homeowner in rapidly rebuilding their home or other structure in the event that it was destroyed by fire or other disaster. | The Shoreline Master Program Policy Advisory Committee, consisting of both Planning Commissioners and Council members, may provide policy guidance on nonconforming uses and structures, while the City Council will make the final decision on how nonconforming uses and structures will be regulated. |
| 277 | 04/26/11 | J. & K. Wright | Shoreline owner | General | We object to the rewrite of the Shoreline Master Program in such a way that is exceeds and oversteps the mandate of the Shoreline Management Act. | Under the Shoreline Management Act, the City must prepare and adopt a Shoreline Master Program that is based on state laws and rules, including the 2003 Shoreline Master Program Guidelines, but is tailored to the specific geographic, economic and environmental needs of the community. Regulations are a required part of the Shoreline Master Program. The draft Shoreline Master Program will go through numerous legal reviews, including the Department of Ecology approval process. |
| 278 | 04/26/11 | J. & K. Wright | Shoreline owner | General | Looking at the overall goals of the revised Shoreline Master Program, we find it a very myopic and discriminatory revision which fails to weigh the rights of individual landowners, their health, safety and welfare against dominimus improvement to the shoreline. | Comment noted. |
| 279 | 04/26/11 | J. & K. Wright | Shoreline owner | III.B | It is inappropriate to establish a vegetation management buffer on already developed property, larger than | See response to comment #271. |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | the 50 foot buffer of the current Shoreline Master Program. | |
| 280 | 04/26/11 | J. & K. Wright | Shoreline owner | III.K | If these bulkheads were necessary and legally installed to establish the need to protect the bank from further erosion at the base, protect the homes at the top of the banks, why should they now be declared non-conforming? | WAC 176-23-231 states that hardening of the shoreline is associated with the following adverse impacts to shoreline ecological functions: (1) beach starvation, (2) habitat degradation, (3) sediment impoundment, (4) exacerbation of erosion, (5) groundwater impacts, (6) hydraulic impacts, (7) loss of shoreline vegetation, (8) restriction of channel movement, and (9) creation of conditions that result in weakening the structure over time. |
| 281 | 04/26/11 | J. & K. Wright | Shoreline owner | III.L | It makes no sense to take legally zoned and permitted homes which are compliant with the law and create policies to make them all non-conforming. | Nonconforming means that the use or structure does not conform to the existing development standards. The existing Shoreline Master Program allows 100% replacement of an existing nonconforming structure. City Council will make the final decision on how nonconforming uses and structures will be regulated. |
| 282 | 04/26/11 | J. & K. Wright | Shoreline owner | III.L.3 | Subsection L.3 is inappropriate because it states that legally non-conforming structures are to be phased out over time. | See response to comment #231. |
| 283 | 04/26/11 | J. & K. Wright | Shoreline owner | IV | The creation of Shoreline Residential Conservancy and other proposed designations are not in the state act and therefore in violation of the law. | Shoreline designations must meet the State's Shoreline Master Program Guidelines and consider three principles: existing development pattern, biological and physical character of the shoreline, and goals and aspirations of the community as expressed in the comprehensive plan (WAC 173-26-211(2)(a)). Preliminary mapping has been done based on the criteria developed by the Shoreline Master Program Task Force. The designation criteria and the designation map are in the preliminary draft phase and will be |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | released soon. There will be opportunities for direct public input during Planning Commission and City Council review. |
| 284 | 04/26/11 | J. & K. Wright | Shoreline owner | IV.C | In general, we object to the changes of the shoreline master program, creating new designations like Island Conservancy – Residential, covering more than 40%+ of the island. It is overreaching with no persuasive scientific justification. | See response to comment #281. |
| 285 | 04/26/11 | J. & K. Wright | Shoreline owner | VI.B | There is no real showing of necessity by peer review science for the removal of bulkheading. | WAC 176-23-231 states that ”New or enlarged structural shoreline stabilization measures for an existing primary structure, including residences, should not be allowed unless there is conclusive evidence, documented by a geotechnical analysis, that the structure is in danger from shoreline erosion caused by tidal action, currents, or waves. Normal sloughing, erosion of steep bluffs, or shoreline erosion itself, without a scientific or geotechnical analysis, is not demonstration of need.” |
| 286 | 04/26/11 | J. Armitage | Shoreline owner | Designations | I object to the designation of my property and my neighbors from shoreline residential to conservancy residential. | Preliminary mapping has been done based on the criteria adopted by the SMP Task Force. The designation criteria and the designation map are still in the draft phase and have not yet been released. |
| 287 | 04/26/11 | J. Armitage | Shoreline owner | Science | I am dismayed at the lack of “proven” science research used in the preparation of this document. | The City is utilizing current science to update the SMP, including two science summaries produced by consultants for the City (the *Science Addendum* [Herrera, 2011] and the Science Review [Battelle, 2003]). ETAC and the consultants are working diligently to ensure that the policies are based on the best scientific data that is currently available and |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | relevant to Bainbridge Island. |
| 288 | 04/26/11 | J. Greiner | Shoreline owner | Various | Copy of comments submitted by A. Greiner. | See responses to comments from A. Greiner on the same date. |
| 289 | 04/26/11 | J. Greiner | Shoreline owner | General | I agree fully with the Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners' commentary on the six big problems with the Shoreline Master Program update. | Comment noted. |
| 290 | 04/26/11 | J. Grundman | Shoreline owner | General | It is our expectation that the provision of no net loss of ecological functions ensures that the existing 50 foot buffer will not be increased. | Comment forwarded to City Council. |
| 291 | 04/26/11 | J. Grundman | Shoreline owner | General | We strongly encourage the City to adopt the intent of House Bill 1307 ("the agency must use peer-reviewed science") to ensure the integrity of the science upon which Shoreline Master Programs impose certain restrictions. | See response to comment #287. |
| 292 | 04/26/11 | J. Grundman | Shoreline owner | III.B.7 | It is probable that legislation and court reviews will ignore the land use patterns in deference to some proposal that there is a conflicting "environmental function." | Comment noted. |
| 293 | 04/26/11 | J. Grundman | Shoreline owner | III.B.9 | "Should" creates no legally binding obligation; either strike the provision in its entirety or replace the "should" with "must." | Comment noted. |
| 294 | 04/26/11 | J. Grundman | Shoreline owner | III.L | Any formal classification of a property developed and/or constructed in accordance with the prevailing laws of the time as "non-conforming" is an unacceptable retrospective application of law. | Nonconforming means that the use or structure does not conform to the existing development standards. The existing Shoreline Master Program allows 100% replacement of an existing nonconforming structure. City Council will make the final decision on this issue. |
| 295 | 04/26/11 | J. Grundman | Shoreline owner | III.L | At its most simple interpretation, this provision makes the eventual | The Shoreline Master Program Policy Advisory Committee, consisting of both |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | confiscation of our property without any compensation the stated goal of this program. | Planning Commissioners and Council Members, may provide policy guidance on nonconforming uses and structures, while the City Council will make the final decision on how nonconforming uses and structures will be regulated. |
| 296 | 04/26/11 | J. Grundman | Shoreline owner | III.L.2 | Define "discontinued" in relation to re-establishing a nonconforming use. | Existing regulations indicate that "discontinued" means that a nonconforming use is not operated for a period of twelve (12) consecutive months or more. (City's Shoreline Master Program, page 124, Section VII.K.1.b) |
| 297 | 04/26/11 | J. Grundman | Shoreline owner | III.L.3 | Object to the statement that the intent is to phase out non-conforming uses and structures over time. | See response to comment #295. |
| 298 | 04/26/11 | J. Grundman | Shoreline owner | III.L.4 | The sentence requiring mitigation and providing a two-year window should be deleted. | Existing Shoreline Master Program provides a two (2) year period of time to re-establish a destroyed structure. (City's Shoreline Master Program page 124, Section VII.K.2.c) |
| 299 | 04/26/11 | J. Grundman | Shoreline owner | III.L.5 | Revise as follows: "Provisions for reconstruction of a damaged legally established residential house shall allow expansions of the structure unless it can be demonstrated that the expansion will result in adverse impacts to shoreline ecological functions and shoreline processes that cannot be mitigated or restored." | See response to comment #295. |
| 300 | 04/26/11 | J. Grundman | Shoreline owner | VI.A.5 | The concept of incorporating "all feasible measures" to protect ecological shoreline functions suggests that there is no limit to the number and cost of environmental protective measures that are to be taken for shoreline modifications. This is an unreasonable | Regulations will define the measures necessary to meet the policy. |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | provision since it is unachievable. | |
| 301 | 04/26/11 | J. Grundman | Shoreline owner | VI.B.5 | The limitation of "a demonstrated need to protect principal uses or structures from erosion" is an unacceptable provision because it reaches beyond "no net loss" and it subjects property owners to a burden of proof without any clear criteria. | WAC 176-23-23(a)(3)(iii) states that "New or enlarged structural shoreline stabilization measures for an existing primary structure, including residences, should not be allowed unless there is conclusive evidence, documented by a geotechnical analysis, that the structure is in danger from shoreline erosion caused by tidal action, currents, or waves. Normal sloughing, erosion of steep bluffs, or shoreline erosion itself, without a scientific or geotechnical analysis, is not demonstration of need." |
| 302 | 04/26/11 | J. Hanson | Homeowner | General | A single study is not adequate to represent a valid scientific concept peer reviewed by more than a single scientist with relevant experience. | The City is utilizing current science to update the SMP, including two science summaries produced by consultants for the City (the *Science Addendum* [Herrera, 2011] and the Science Review [Battelle, 2003]). ETAC and the consultants are working diligently to ensure that the policies are based on the best scientific data that is currently available and relevant to Bainbridge Island. |
| 303 | 04/26/11 | J. Hanson | Homeowner | III.B.6 | It is inappropriate to establish a vegetation management buffer on already developed property that is larger than the 50 foot buffer in the current Shoreline Master Program. | Buffer widths will be proposed by a technical consultant. ETAC and the workgroups will review the recommendations before buffer regulations become part of the draft document that will be submitted to Planning Commission and eventually City Council. |
| 304 | 04/26/11 | J. Hanson | Homeowner | III.L | Having the conforming status of my property changed is a violation of my federal and state property rights. | Nonconforming means that the use or structure does not conform to the existing development standards. The existing Shoreline Master Program allows 100% replacement of an existing nonconforming structure. City Council will make the final decision on how nonconforming uses and |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | structures will be regulated. |
| 305 | 04/26/11 | J. Hanson | Homeowner | VI.B | There has not been appropriate scientific evidence established that feeder bluffs represent a habitat that is required for successful marine life. | Littoral cells, drift cells, are defined lengths of shoreline within which the cycle of sediment erosion (bluffs, waterways), transportation and deposition is essentially self-contained. |
| 306 | 04/26/11 | K. Bayne-Rodocker | Shoreline owner | VI.B | The removal of the bulkheads or any other existing shoreline structures would be highly disruptive and destructive to the existing wildlife, ecosystems, and real property. | From Department of Ecology "Frequently Asked Questions: Marine Shoreline Armoring and the Puget Sound"<br>By armoring our areas where upland and marine vegetation meet, the negative impacts can be extensive. Bulkheads can:<br>• Reduce the natural delivery of sand and gravel to our shorelines.<br>• Bury the upper beach and reduce the amount of large woody debris deposited on the beach, which results in habitat loss.<br>• Isolate once interconnected land and aquatic habitats, resulting in habitat loss and altering the abundance and density of associated invertebrates, a major food source for fish, birds and other wildlife species.<br>Impacts from site disturbance during the voluntary restoration action are temporary and will subside when the ecosystem has reached equilibrium. |
| 307 | 04/26/11 | K. Hamilton | Shoreline owner | Designations | A prime example is the wrongful designation of a small patch of the Rose Loop and shoreline in Eagle Harbor being changed from Residential to Residential Conservancy. | Preliminary mapping has been done based on the criteria adopted by the SMP Task Force. The designation criteria and the designation map are still in the draft phase and have not yet been released. |
| 308 | 04/26/11 | K. Hamilton | Shoreline owner | General | One key element which has blatantly been overlooked with the city's draft is the impact to personal property | The purpose of the Shoreline Master Program is to address the impacts of human development and use of the shoreline, while |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | ownership, devaluation of personal property values and subsequent "taking of personal property" which will induce, impose and incur direct financial losses to private citizens owning waterfront property. | protecting the shoreline ecology. The draft Shoreline Master Program will go through numerous legal reviews, including the Department of Ecology approval process. |
| 309 | 04/26/11 | K. Hamilton | Shoreline owner | V.K | This request is specifically targeting that COBI accepts the option to approve all existing waterfront structures is to be recognized as conforming and grandfathered as such. | Comment forwarded to City Council, who will make the final decision on how to address SB 5421 in the City's Shoreline Master Program. |
| 310 | 04/26/11 | K. Hamilton | Shoreline owner | VI.B | As I understand you have stated, the City's ultimate goal is the eventual removal of the bulkheads which presently safeguard owner's personal property and homes. | WAC 176-23-231 states that "New or enlarged structural shoreline stabilization measures for an existing primary structure, including residences, should not be allowed unless there is conclusive evidence, documented by a geotechnical analysis, that the structure is in danger from shoreline erosion caused by tidal action, currents, or waves. Normal sloughing, erosion of steep bluffs, or shoreline erosion itself, without a scientific or geotechnical analysis, is not demonstration of need." |
| 311 | 04/26/11 | K. Marshall | Shoreline owner | Science | Negative wave action in the harbor is a nearly 100% creation of the backwash from the ferries. | Comment noted. |
| 312 | 04/26/11 | K. Marshall | Shoreline owner | General | I would not allow my 2nd and 3rd grade students to accept the "scientific evidence" as the COBI has so gleefully done that does not live up to scrutiny on the Island's shorelines. | See response to comment #302. |
| 313 | 04/26/11 | K. Marshall | Shoreline owner | III.B | The movement to change the setback as a buffer zone denies me the right to use of my property as is appropriate for the type of soil on the property. | Policies related to buffers and residential development are intended to both protect shoreline ecology and accommodate existing single-family residences on the shoreline. |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 314 | 04/26/11 | K. Marshall | Shoreline owner | III.H | There is no eelgrass in Eagle Harbor, there is no evidence in modern times of there ever having been eel grass in the harbor, and that is not a valid issue. | There is an eelgrass bed at the mouth of Eagle Harbor according to Battelle's Nearshore Assessment. |
| 315 | 04/26/11 | K. Marshall | Shoreline owner | III.L | How do you feel you have the right to ignore Senate Bill 5451 that gives local jurisdictions the legal right to classify "appurtenant structures" as "conforming" structures? | The Shoreline Master Program Policy Advisory Committee, consisting of both Planning Commissioners and Council Members, may provide policy guidance on nonconforming uses and structures, while the City Council will make the final decision on how nonconforming uses and structures will be regulated. |
| 316 | 04/26/11 | K. Struzzieri | Shoreline owner | Designations | Please remove your proposed designation of residential conservancy from ours and adjacent Eagle Harbor south side properties. | Preliminary mapping has been done based on the criteria adopted by the SMP Task Force. The designation criteria and the designation map are still in the draft phase and have not yet been released. |
| 317 | 04/26/11 | K. Struzzieri | Shoreline owner | III.L | Please accept the state legislature's "conforming" option to approve all existing waterfront structures as recognized as Conforming and Grandfathered. | Comment forwarded to City Council. |
| 318 | 04/26/11 | K. von Kreisler | Shoreline owner | Designations | Our shoreline residential conservancy designation is inconsistent with much of the language in the Shoreline Master Program update draft. | See response to comment #316. |
| 319 | 04/26/11 | K. Wirthlin | Shoreline owner | IV | Object to a dramatic increase in Conservancy designation | See response to comment #316. |
| 320 | 04/26/11 | K. Wirthlin | Shoreline owner | General | There is no reproducible research supporting the regulators' theories. | The City is utilizing current science to update the Shoreline Master Program, including two science summaries produced by consultants for the City (the *Science Addendum* from Herrera, 2011 and the Science Review from Battelle, 2003). ETAC and the consultants are working diligently to ensure that the |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | policies are based on the best scientific data that is currently available and relevant to Bainbridge Island. |
| 321 | 04/26/11 | K. Wirthlin | Shoreline owner | III.B | Can you imagine a 150 or 200 foot Native Vegetation Zone where you can't walk or garden and your kids can't play? | Under the State SMP Guidelines, the City must set a baseline measurement to assess cumulative impacts to the City's shoreline areas and how we are meeting the goal of no net loss of ecological functions. That baseline is from the date of our shoreline characterization (2009 data). |
| 322 | 04/26/11 | K. Wirthlin | Shoreline owner | III.L | Any regulation that prohibits you from rebuilding or expanding your house devalues your house and property. | The existing Shoreline Master Program allows 100% replacement of nonconforming structures. Draft regulations under consideration may, under some circumstances, allow replacement and/or expansion that is mitigated so as to ensure no net loss of ecological function. |
| 323 | 04/26/11 | K. Wirthlin | Shoreline owner | VI.F | If you don't have the right to protect your property and front yard from erosion then you no right of ownership and use. | The purpose of the SMP is to address the impacts of human development and use of the shoreline. A balance between concern for ecosystem integrity and the rights of property owners is a primary goal of the Shoreline Management Act and the Shoreline Master Program. |
| 324 | 04/26/11 | Kacy Struzzieri | Shoreline owner | Various | Copy of K. Struzzieri comment | See responses to comments from K. Struzzieri. |
| 325 | 04/26/11 | L. Richards | Shoreline owner | Designations | I am greatly disturbed by the idea that my property will be changed from a designation of Shoreline Residential to Shoreline Conservancy. | See response to comment #316. |
| 326 | 04/26/11 | M. Curtis | Shoreline owner | Process | Clearly there is much in the proposed draft that needs healthy debate to find common ground. | Public input opportunities will continue to be provided throughout the Planning Commission and City Council review and adoption. The Department of Ecology will also hold a public hearing and accept |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | comments. |
| 327 | 04/26/11 | M. Julian | Shoreline owner | Designations | I am particularly referring to the length of Rose Loop Road on the south shore of Eagle Harbor. These properties should be designated Shoreline Residential, not Island Conservancy. | See response to comment #316. |
| 328 | 04/26/11 | M. Julian | Shoreline owner | III.L | Take advantage of the option approved by the State Legislature and designate all existing waterfront structures as "conforming uses". | Comment forwarded to City Council. |
| 329 | 04/26/11 | M. Sebastian | Shoreline owner | General | I object to the draft policies because they go against the SMA. | Comment noted. |
| 330 | 04/26/11 | M. Sebastian | Shoreline owner | General | The draft policies do not consider private property rights and the economic results from a common desire to protect the environment. | Under the Shoreline Management Act, the city's Shoreline Master Program must recognize and protect private property rights consistent with the public interest. The Shoreline Master Program must accommodate appropriate uses, protect the shoreline environment, and protect the public's right to access, including visual. |
| 331 | 04/26/11 | M. Sebastian | Shoreline owner | V.K | I object to the draft policies because they do not protect single-family residences as a preferred, water-dependent use. | Single-family residential uses shall be preferred if they are consistent with the control of pollution and prevention of damage to the natural environment or dependant on upon the use of the shoreline. In those limited instances when authorized, alteration of the natural condition of the shoreline of the state shall be given priority for single family residences and their appurtenant structures. RCW 90.58.020 |
| 332 | 04/26/11 | M. Sebastian | Shoreline owner | V.K | Existing uses should continue being conforming. | The Shoreline Master Program Policy Advisory Committee, consisting of both Planning Commissioners and Council |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | Members, may provide policy guidance on nonconforming uses and structures, while the City Council will make the final decision on how nonconforming uses and structures will be regulated. |
| 333 | 04/26/11 | M. Sebastian | Shoreline owner | V.K. | The current 50-foot setback should be maintained. | Buffer widths will be proposed by a technical consultant. ETAC and the workgroups will review the recommendations before buffer regulations become part of the draft document that will be submitted to Planning Commission and eventually City Council. |
| 334 | 04/26/11 | N. Marshall | Shoreline owner | Designations | The bluffs along the south side of Eagle Harbor do not provide additional material to the shoreline because they are clay which sloughs into large slabs. | This is a site-specific issue. ETAC is discussing feeder bluff issues. |
| 335 | 04/26/11 | N. Marshall | Shoreline owner | General, III.B | The buffer zone is not a rational decision based upon a 40-year-old generalized report that was not supported by any other valid scientific community or scientist. | The City is utilizing current science to update the Shoreline Master Program, including two science summaries produced by consultants for the City (the *Science Addendum* from Herrera, 2011 and the Science Review from Battelle, 2003). Buffer widths will be proposed by a technical consultant. ETAC and the workgroups will review the recommendations before buffer regulations become part of the draft document that will be submitted to Planning Commission and eventually City Council. |
| 336 | 04/26/11 | N. Marshall | Shoreline owner | III.B | The requirement to plant only native plants along the shoreline is invalid as there is no evidence that it is more effective in maintaining the health of bluffs and shoreline. | See response to comment #335. |
| 337 | 04/26/11 | N. Marshall | Shoreline owner | III.L | A conforming structure should retain its conforming status under conditions such as adding a second story or slightly | The Shoreline Master Program Policy Advisory Committee, consisting of both Planning Commissioners and Council |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | enlarging the non-water side of the home by a few feet. | Members, may provide policy guidance on nonconforming uses and structures, while the City Council will make the final decision on how nonconforming uses and structures will be regulated. |
| 338 | 04/26/11 | N. Marshall | Shoreline owner | VI.B | The placement of a bulkhead still allows natural runoff to occur bringing with it a degree of soil or clay to filter onto the shoreline. | Comment noted. |
| 339 | 04/26/11 | N. Marshall | Shoreline owner | VI.F | There seems to be no valid research that non-grated docks are harmful to the marine environment. | See response to comment #335. |
| 340 | 04/26/11 | R. Devening | Shoreline owner | General | This approach is blatantly unconstitutional as you will learn. | The Shoreline Master Program will go through a series of legal reviews, including the final Department of Ecology approval process. |
| 341 | 04/26/11 | R. Devening | Shoreline owner | Process | You have not given proper notice to shoreline homeowners millions in reduced property values and destroy the viability of BI. | The notice process and procedures are laid out in the Public Participation Plan which was developed through a public process and approved by the City Council in May, 2010. |
| 342 | 04/26/11 | R. Keating | Citizen | General | I find it interesting and alarming that you are making these unilateral policy decisions without any comment to those of that will be affected by your decision. | These policies have not been formally adopted; we are asking for public comment at this time. |
| 343 | 04/26/11 | S. Kerrigan | Shoreline owner | III.B, III.L, V.K | I oppose the regulations being set for what would put our home in nonconformance and therefore decrease not only the property value but more importantly our basic American right to enjoy our property. | See response to comment #337. |
| 344 | 04/26/11 | T. Hamilton | Shoreline owner | Designations | Please remove your proposed designation of residential conservancy from ours and adjacent Eagle Harbor south side properties. | Preliminary mapping has been done based on the criteria adopted by the SMP Task Force. The designation criteria and the designation map are still in the draft phase and have not yet been released. |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 345 | 04/26/11 | T. Hamilton | Shoreline owner | III.L | Please accept the state legislature's "conforming" option to approve all existing waterfront structures as recognized as Conforming and Grandfathered. | Comment forwarded to City Council. |
| 346 | 04/26/11 | V. Chesterley | Citizen | General | Please think carefully about the impact to humans as well as sea creatures. | Comment noted. |
| 347 | 04/26/11 | V. Chesterley | Citizen | III.B.6 | Since the standard is "no net loss" from the date of adoption of the updated Shoreline Master Program, leaving the current 50' buffer in place ensures "no net loss." | The no net loss standard is derived from the City's baseline as determined through our shoreline assessment and characterization report (2009 data). Buffer widths will be proposed by a technical consultant. ETAC and the workgroups will review the recommendations before buffer regulations become part of the draft document that will be submitted to Planning Commission and eventually City Council. |
| 348 | 04/26/11 | V. Chesterley | Citizen | III.L | All existing homes and appurtenant structures should be excluded from this and future Shoreline Master Program updates. | Nonconforming means that the use or structure does not conform to the existing development standards. The existing Shoreline Master Program allows 100% replacement of an existing nonconforming structure. City Council will make the final decision on how nonconforming uses and structures will be regulated. |
| 349 | 04/26/11 | V. Chesterley | Citizen | IV. | On what basis was these conservancy designations made? | The purpose of the Shoreline Residential Conservancy designation is to protect, conserve, and restore ecological functions of open space, floodplain and other sensitive lands; to conserve and manage valuable historic and cultural resources where they exist and to accommodate compatible residential uses. The purpose of Island Conservancy designation is to protect, conserve, and restore ecological functions of |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | open space, floodplain and other sensitive lands, to conserve and manage valuable historic and cultural resources to accommodate a variety of compatible public or private recreational uses . |
| 350 | 04/26/11 | V. Chesterley | Citizen | IV.B | Property owners who already have bulkheads in place should be allowed to repair them to their former state. | Regulations specific to bulkheads have not yet been developed. WAC 173-26-231 states that hardening of the shoreline is associated with the following adverse impacts to shoreline ecological functions: (1) beach starvation, (2) habitat degradation, (3) sediment impoundment, (4) exacerbation of erosion, (5) groundwater impacts, (6) hydraulic impacts, (7) loss of shoreline vegetation, (8) restriction of channel movement, and (9) creation of conditions that result in weakening the structure over time. |
| 351 | 04/26/11 | V. Chesterley | Citizen | Science | The Shoreline Master Program should be based on peer reviewed science. Anything less is apt to promote policies based on unintended misunderstandings or incorrect interpretations. | The City is utilizing current science to update the SMP, including two science summaries produced by consultants for the City (the *Science Addendum* [Herrera, 2011] and the Science Review [Battelle, 2003]). ETAC and the consultants are working diligently to ensure that the policies are based on the best scientific data that is currently available and relevant to Bainbridge Island. |
| 352 | 04/26/11 | W. Harper | Shoreline owner | Designations | As an individual shoreline property owner I'm very concerned about new designations and classification of my property that could negatively impact its value and use. | Preliminary mapping has been done based on the criteria adopted by the Shoreline Master Program Task Force. The designation criteria and the designation map are currently in the draft phase and will be released to the public upon final recommendation of the Shoreline Master Program Task Force.<br>The Shoreline Master Program is looking at broad-scale economics in terms of future |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | demands for shoreline uses. It does not require a large economic study of the region, but rather what does existing information reflect about demand. |
| 353 | 04/26/11 | W. Harper | Shoreline owner | General | As an active member of our broader community, I'm concerned that some of the proposed goals and policies will create a deeply contentious and litigious atmosphere and risk impeding progress toward shared environmental goals. | Comment noted. |
| 354 | 04/26/11 | W. Harper | Shoreline owner | III.B.6 | Extending the vegetative buffer beyond the current 50 foot buffer would cause my home to become non-conforming. | Policies related to buffers and residential development are intended to both protect shoreline ecology and accommodate existing single-family residences on the shoreline. |
| 355 | 04/26/11 | W. Harper | Shoreline owner | III.B.6 | Declaring my property as a shoreline conservancy will impact its value negatively and will make it permanently non-conforming. | See response to comment #352. |
| 356 | 04/26/11 | W. Harper | Shoreline owner | VI.B | Existing bulkheads should be able to be maintained without excessive regulation and permitting cost. | WAC 176-23-231 states that "New or enlarged structural shoreline stabilization measures for an existing primary structure, including residences, should not be allowed unless there is conclusive evidence, documented by a geotechnical analysis, that the structure is in danger from shoreline erosion caused by tidal action, currents, or waves. Normal sloughing, erosion of steep bluffs, or shoreline erosion itself, without a scientific or geotechnical analysis, is not demonstration of need." |
| 357 | 04/26/11 | E. Daley | Citizen | General | I hope the concept of Bainbridge as a unique community weighs fully in your deliberations and recommendations. There is no reason to base our SMP on a cook-cutter model as we are not a | Developing localized solutions was one of the reasons for forming the citizens' advisory workgroups. More public input will be received through the adoption process at Planning Commission and City Council. |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | cookie-cutter community. | |
| 358 | 04/26/11 | E. Daley | Citizen | III.B | The generic, cookie-cutter approach to setbacks and buffers appear to result in widespread increases and the potential to render many existing private properties unbuildable. | Policies related to buffers and residential development are intended to both protect shoreline ecology and accommodate existing single-family residences on the shoreline. The SMP Policy Advisory Committee, consisting of both Planning Commissioners and Council Members, may provide policy guidance on nonconforming uses and structures, while the City Council will make the final decision on how nonconforming uses and structures will be regulated. |
| 359 | 04/26/11 | E. Daley | Citizen | III.L | RCW 90.58.100 states that shoreline modification is to be expected, that a balance is required between private property rights and ecological protection and that single-family residences with their appurtenant structures is the first of the State's priority uses for our shorelines. | Single-family residential uses shall be preferred if they are consistent with the control of pollution and prevention of damage to the natural environment or dependant on upon the use of the shoreline. In those limited instances when authorized, alteration of the natural condition of the shoreline of the state shall be given priority for single family residences and their appurtenant structures. RCW 90.58.020 |
| 360 | 04/26/11 | E. Daley | Citizen | VI.B | I am concerned that existing language in the draft SMP bars or unreasonably hinders the smooth permitting process and installation of effective shoreline armoring. | The draft language meets the requirements of the Shoreline Master Program Guidelines (WAC 173-26-231(3)(a)(iii)(C). |
| 361 | 04/26/11 | E. Daley | Citizen | Science | I am concerned that the City is not relying on the best available science in developing the SMP as recommended in the guidelines. | The City is utilizing current science to update the SMP, including two science summaries produced by consultants for the City (the *Science Addendum* [Herrera, 2011] and the Science Review [Battelle, 2003]). ETAC and the consultants are working diligently to |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | ensure that the policies are based on the best scientific data that is currently available and relevant to Bainbridge Island. |
| 362 | 04/27/11 | Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners | Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners | General | It is clear that existing policies are more than adequate to mitigate loss and provide substantial gains. | Comment noted. |
| 363 | 04/27/11 | Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners | Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners | III.B.6 | Add another subsection stating that shoreline regulations in the current Shoreline Master Program will apply unless peer-reviewed science that indicates a more restrictive standard will need to be applied in order to achieve no net loss. | As stipulated in WAC 173-26-201(2), the City is utilizing current science to update the Shoreline Master Program, including two science summaries produced by consultants for the City (the *Science Addendum from Herrera*, 2011 and the Science Review from Battelle, 2003). ETAC and the consultants are working diligently to ensure that the policies are based on the best scientific data that is currently available and relevant to Bainbridge Island. |
| 364 | 04/27/11 | Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners | Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners | III.B6 | Leave the current 50 foot buffer in place in the update. There is no peer-reviewed scientific evidence that shows by simply requiring a larger buffer, shoreline function will improve. | See response to comment #361. |
| 365 | 04/27/11 | Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners | Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners | VI.B | Use only peer-reviewed science to substantiate the need for the restriction on shoreline stabilization. | The State Shoreline Master Program Guidelines require that the City use the most current, accurate, and complete scientific and technical information available. WAC 173-26-201(2)(a) The City is utilizing current science to update the Shoreline Master Program, including two science summaries produced by consultants for the City (the *Science Addendum from Herrera*, 2011 and the Science Review from Battelle, 2003). ETAC and the consultants are working diligently to ensure that the policies are based on the best scientific data that is currently |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | available and relevant to Bainbridge Island. |
| 366 | 04/27/11 | Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners | Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners | VI.F | Identify those ecological functions that are at risk in Blakely Harbor and other specific locations where strict limitations are contemplated and base regulations on ways to minimize or mitigate the impacts rather than what amounts to an exclusion of this use for property owners in this area. | Comment noted. |
| 367 | 04/27/11 | K. Hale | Shoreline owner | III.B, III.L | We do not believe that a buffer larger than that on already developed property should be changed to something larger. If you increase the buffer, existing, legally-built homes and their appurtenant structures will become non-conforming. | Policies related to buffers and residential development are intended to both protect shoreline ecology and accommodate existing single-family residences on the shoreline. |
| 368 | 04/27/11 | K. Hale | Shoreline owner | Science | Peer-reviewed science should be demonstrated before passing a new Shoreline Master Program. | The State Shoreline Master Program Guidelines require that the City use the most current, accurate, and complete scientific and technical information available. WAC 173-26-201(2)(a) The City is utilizing current science to update the Shoreline Master Program, including two science summaries produced by consultants for the City (the *Science Addendum from Herrera*, 2011 and the Science Review from Battelle, 2003) ETAC and the consultants are working diligently to ensure that the policies are based on the best scientific data that is currently available and relevant to Bainbridge Island. |
| 369 | 04/27/11 | R. Holmgren | Shoreline owner | III.L | I am once again appalled at the proposed shoreline plan that you are considering, particularly the concept of making most of our waterfront homes "non-conforming." | Nonconforming means that the use or structure does not conform to the existing development standards. The existing Shoreline Master Program allows 100% replacement of an existing nonconforming structure. City Council will make the final |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | decision on how nonconforming uses and structures will be regulated. |
| 370 | 04/27/11 | R. Holmgren | Shoreline owner | Notice | This has all been done without informing us owners of the details, and without seeking our input. | Bainbridge Citizens, Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners, the Association of Bainbridge Communities, and the Bainbridge Alliance for Puget Sound named a representative to each of the workgroups. The Shoreline Master Program Policy Advisory Committee, consisting of two council members and two planning commissioners and appointed by City Council, selected the remaining "at large" members for each workgroup. Each workgroup self-selected three members to participate in the Task Force. *Please see the 2011 Shoreline Master Program Update – Citizen Committees page for more information.)* The Public Participation Plan, created by citizens and approved by City Council, was adopted to ensure an open and transparent process |
| 371 | 04/28/11 | C. Hagstromer | Shoreline owner | General | All the issues that are affecting the shore/Puget Sound environment should be called out and compared as to effect. | The purpose of the Shoreline Master Program is to address the impacts of human development and use of the shoreline. Other issues are addressed through a myriad programs and regulations, from restoration and enhancement projects to regulations controlling stormwater, public, commercial, and industrial activities |
| 372 | 04/28/11 | C. Hagstromer | Shoreline owner | III.B.6 | No science has been presented that justifies changing the vegetative buffer. | The City is utilizing current science to update the Shoreline Master Program, including two science summaries produced by consultants for the City (the *Science Addendum from Herrera*, 2011 and the Science Review from Battelle, 2003). ETAC and the consultants are working diligently to ensure that the policies |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | are based on the best scientific data that is currently available and relevant to Bainbridge Island. |
| 373 | 04/28/11 | C. Hagstromer | Shoreline owner | III.B.6 | A clear definition of the no net loss concept is needed in the new Shoreline Master Program to make it clear how much additional vegetation etc. you need for a minor building permit to install a generator, deck, etc. | Comment noted. Analysis will be needed to determine whether proposed development will meet the no net loss standard. |
| 374 | 04/28/11 | C. Hagstromer | Shoreline owner | III.L | The word "non-conforming" should be eliminated from the COBI Shoreline Master Program since both SMA and the new SB 5451 clearly states the intent of the state not to call these structures non-conforming. | Comment forwarded to City Council |
| 375 | 04/28/11 | C. Hagstromer | Shoreline owner | Process | The only way COBI can convince most shoreline owners that they are being heard is to mail/email the comment summary on the web site to all 1700 shoreline property owners with the response column filled out and with an updated draft showing how these comments have changed the draft. | The notice process and procedures are laid out in the Public Participation Plan which developed through a public process. |
| 376 | 04/28/11 | C. Hagstromer | Shoreline owner | Regulations | Clearer rules for what human activity is permitted in the vegetation zone is needed and should be reasonable since there is NO connection between these uses and damage to the environment. | Comment noted. Amendments to the regulations are currently under review by the citizen committees. |
| 377 | 04/28/11 | C. Hagstromer | Shoreline owner | Science | What is needed for each changed paragraph from the previous Shoreline Master Program is a referral to the scientific study page number to support the specific change. | A list of supporting scientific references will be provided to the Department of Ecology. (*Please see the* Science References by Type *page on the City's web site for additional information.)* |
| 378 | 04/28/11 | C. Hagstromer | Shoreline owner | VI.B | This language is inflammatory and unnecessary when it is clear per previous | WAC 176-23-231 states that "New or enlarged structural shoreline stabilization |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | section that property owners have the right to protect their structures. | measures for an existing primary structure, including residences, should not be allowed unless there is conclusive evidence, documented by a geotechnical analysis, that the structure is in danger from shoreline erosion caused by tidal action, currents, or waves. Normal sloughing, erosion of steep bluffs, or shoreline erosion itself, without a scientific or geotechnical analysis, is not demonstration of need." |
| 379 | 05/18/11 | D. & S. Lindsey | Citizen | III.B.6 | It is difficult to understand the logic behind the distribution and proposed extent of vegetation buffers. | Buffer widths will be proposed by a technical consultant. ETAC and the workgroups will review the recommendations before buffer regulations become part of the draft document that will be submitted to Planning Commission and eventually City Council. |
| 380 | 05/18/11 | D. & S. Lindsey | Citizen | III.B.6 | We understand that there has been discussion stating that vegetation along shore edges provides invertebrate food sources or shade to marine species. Walking along Rockaway Beach, and in fact most beaches, would suggest otherwise as there is no vegetation overhanging the water. | The City is utilizing current science to update the Shoreline Master Program, including two science summaries produced by consultants for this City (the *Science Addendum* Herrerra, 2011 and the Science Review from Battelle, 2003) This science indicates that overhanging vegetation contributes to nearshore habitat functions. |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 381 | 05/18/11 | D. & S. Lindsey | Citizen | III.L | Revising the Shoreline Master Program for Bainbridge Island in such a manner as to make residential or other human use of the lands adjacent to the shoreline nonconforming uses is not supported by the SMA. | WAC 173.27.080 recognizes existing legally-established structures which may not conform to current development standards, but are allowed to remain and be maintained, repaired, and enlarged as long as the expansion does not increase the nonconformity. A policy goal for nonconforming development was recommended by the citizen committees. How nonconforming uses and structures will be regulated will be determined during the process of drafting regulations. |
| 382 | 05/18/11 | D. & S. Lindsey | Citizen | IV | The types of changes being proposed are not reasonable and should be abandoned. | See response to comment #240. |
| 383 | 05/18/11 | D. & S. Lindsey | Citizen | Process | We cannot afford the pursuit of planning policies that are detrimental to shoreline homeowners' property values on Bainbridge Island. | The purpose of the Shoreline Master Program is to address the impacts of human development and use of the shoreline. Other issues are addressed through myriad programs and regulations, from restoration and enhancement projects to regulations controlling stormwater, public, commercial, and industrial activities |
| 384 | 05/18/11 | D. & S. Lindsey | Citizen | Science | The draft Shoreline Master Program is based on social aspiration, aesthetic preferences, and unproven hypothesis. State law did not intend we make Bainbridge Island a natural science laboratory experiment to test various hypotheses. | The City is utilizing current science to update the Shoreline Master Program, including two science summaries produced by consultants for this City (the *Science Addendum* Herrerra, 2011 and the Science Review from Battelle, 2003) ETAC and the consultants are working diligently to ensure that the policies are based on the best scientific data that is currently available and relevant to Bainbridge Island. |
| 385 | 05/18/11 | D. & S. Lindsey | Citizen | VI.B | Simply said, there does not appear to be any reason to support the theory that | The draft language meets the requirements of the Shoreline Master Program Guidelines |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | bulkheads are bad. | (WAC 173-26-231(3)(a)(iii)(C).<br>WAC 173-26-231 states that hardening of the shoreline is associated with the following adverse impacts to shoreline ecological functions: (1) beach starvation, (2) habitat degradation, (3) sediment impoundment, (4) exacerbation of erosion, (5) groundwater impacts, (6) hydraulic impacts, (7) loss of shoreline vegetation, (8) restriction of channel movement, and (9) creation of conditions that result in weakening the structure over time. |
| 386 | 05/18/11 | D. & S. Lindsey | Citizen | VI.F | There are no facts supporting the belief that overwater structures cause a new loss of ecological function. | The draft language meets the requirements of the Shoreline Master Program Guidelines (WAC 173-26-231(3)(b). The regulations associated with overwater structures are in the preliminary draft phase. |
| 387 | 05/23/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | VI.B | WAC 173-26-231 says bulkheads are allowed to protect "primary structure or a legally existing shoreline use that is in danger of loss or substantial damage." I believe "uses" would include recreation areas, patios, decks, gardens, and other structures. I think the Question and Answer page should be updated to reflect protection for uses. | Comment noted. |
| 388 | 05/23/11 | R. Stevenson | Citizen | IV | The development process (inner portion of Blakely Harbor) that was previously undertaken in this area created environmental protections which surpass what was legally required at that time. Additional conditions should not and cannot be imposed in this situation. | Preliminary mapping has been done based on the criteria adopted by the SMP Task Force. The designation criteria and the designation map are still in the draft phase and have not yet been released. |
| 389 | 05/24/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline Homeowner | General | Who is properly to set policy for our city, its staff serving state agencies or elected councilors serving all the | Under the Shoreline Management Act, the City's Shoreline Master Program must be based on state laws and rules, including the |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | citizens? | 2003 Shoreline Master Program Guidelines, but can be tailored to the specific geographic, economic and environmental needs of the community. The revised policies were developed through the citizen workgroups appointed by the Shoreline Master Program Policy Advisory Committee and the City Council will make the policy decisions that will be submitted to the Department of Ecology for review. |
| 390 | 05/24/11 | A. Greiner | Shoreline Homeowner | III.B, III.L, V.K | The policy draft points to ever more onerous treatment of shoreline property owners with the openly stated goal of eventually eliminating all buildings located within whatever buffer widths are finally chosen. | Policies related to buffers and residential development are intended to both protect shoreline ecology and accommodate existing single-family residences on the shoreline. The Shoreline Master Program Policy Advisory Committee, consisting of both Planning Commissioners and Council Members, may provide policy guidance on nonconforming uses and structures, while the City Council will make the final decision on how nonconforming uses and structures will be regulated. |
| 391 | 05/24/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | III.L | No buffer science has even yet been presented, no public meetings have been held and already staff has determined that waterfront homes shall be declared NONCONFORMING and be forced to move (over time) to 150 feet from the waterfront. | Buffer widths will be proposed by a technical consultant. ETAC and the workgroups will review the recommendations before buffer regulations become part of the draft document that will be submitted to Planning Commission and eventually City Council.WAC 173.27.080 recognizes existing legally-established structures which may not conform to current development standards, but are allowed to remain and be maintained, repaired, and enlarged as long as the expansion does not increase the nonconformity. A policy goal for nonconforming development was |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | recommended by the citizen committees. How nonconforming uses and structures will be regulated will be determined during the process of drafting regulations. |
| 392 | 05/24/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | Process | The city staff is driving the Shoreline Master Program process, setting the agenda and writing the proposed regulations. | The revised policies were developed through the citizen workgroups appointed by the Shoreline Master Program Ad Hoc Committee and the draft policies are serving as the basis for proposed revisions to the regulations. After the workgroups have completed their work, the full draft SMP will be reviewed and amended by the Planning Commission and the Planning Commission's recommendations will be forwarded to the City Council for consideration. The City Council makes the final decisions submitted to the Dept. of Ecology for review and approval. |
| 393 | 05/24/11 | M. Leese | Shoreline property owner | III.L | Please do not allow the Shoreline Master Program to declare our homes nonconforming. | The Shoreline Master Program Policy Advisory Committee, consisting of Planning Commissioners and councilmembers, will provide guidance on what constitutes a nonconforming use or structure and the City Council will make the final decision on this issue. |
| 394 | 06/07/11 | S. Neff | Citizen | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | The draft SMP includes goals and policies to protect critical areas within the shoreline jurisdiction. Regulations for implementing those policies are currently being drafted by the citizen committees. |
| 395 | 06/07/11 | S. Neff | Citizen | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | Policies related to buffers and residential development are intended to both protect shoreline ecology and accommodate existing single-family residences on the shoreline. |
| 396 | 06/07/11 | S. Neff | Citizen | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public | Protecting the public's right to access and use |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | the shoreline are goals of both the Shoreline Management Act and the Shoreline Master Program. |
| 397 | 06/07/11 | S. Neff | Citizen | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | Under the Shoreline Management Act, the city's SMP must recognize and protect private property rights consistent with the public interest. The SMP must accommodate appropriate uses that require a shoreline location, protect the shoreline environmental resources and protect the public's right to access and use the shoreline. |
| 398 | 06/08/11 | M. Dawson | Workgroup member | Process | Whatever discomfort our community will suffer as a result of the clash between those whose values lean towards property rights and those who are more concerned about our shared environment will only be prolonged and perhaps even increased by adding many months to the update process. | The City Council has approved a review process that adopts an update to the Shoreline Master Program by the end of 2011. |
| 399 | 06/15/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | Science | The science has not been completed and the science has not been reviewed or commented on by the City Council or the public. | Notice of each completed science document was sent to the listserv and each document is posted on the web. ETAC has completed its review of each of those documents. Many opportunities for public involvement remain the process as the Planning Commission and City Council review . |
| 400 | 06/15/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | Process | Even before the science is finished or considered, the SMP policies have been drafted and staff has written the regulations without any citizen input. | Science specific to Bainbridge Island was compiled in 2003 and recently updated by the city's consultant, Herrera. Regulations were drafted in accordance with the policy direction from the citizen workgroups, who are now reviewing the draft regulations. Planning Commission and City Council review has not yet begun. |
| 401 | 06/15/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge | Process | The SMP update deadline must be | See response to comment #398. |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Citizens | | moved to 2012 to allow proper public participation and consideration by the City Council. | |
| 402 | 06/17/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | Process | Shoreline property owners are due the highest consideration in the SMP process because it is their property, livelihood, or right to use their property that will be "directly" impacted by the SMP. Proper consideration has not been afforded the shoreline property owners. | The Public Participation Plan, created by citizens and approved by City Council, was adopted to ensure an open and transparent process. In addition to the other outreach efforts, a postcard was recently mailed to all shoreline property owners. |
| 403 | 06/17/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | Process | Process has been controlled by staff. Staff rigged all votes so that the shoreline property owners were outnumbered and outvoted. | The members of the citizens' advisory workgroups were selected by the SMP Update Policy Advisory Committee without input from staff. Votes were taken on those occasional issues for which there did not seem to be a consensus. |
| 404 | 06/17/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | III.B | Vegetation Conservation Area and new setback requirements provisions shall be applied only to new shoreline developments with existing native vegetation. | Policies related to buffers and residential development are intended to both protect shoreline ecology and accommodate existing single-family residences on the shoreline. The regulations are still being drafted through the citizen workgroups. |
| 405 | 06/17/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | III.L | Existing developments and land uses may remain and may be redeveloped provided the redevelopment does not cause a net loss of ecological function. | Existing legally-established structures and uses which may not conform to current development standards, are allowed to remain and be maintained, repaired, and enlarged as long as the expansion does not increase the nonconformity and meets the standard of no net loss of ecological function. |
| 406 | 06/17/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | VI.F | Docks and floats shall be allowed on the outside of the island provided they meet environmental regulations. | The policies regarding docks developed by the workgroups and any regulations which are currently under review by the workgroups will be reviewed by both Planning Commission and City Council prior to adoption. |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 407 | 06/17/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | VI.B | Bulkheads shall be allowed to protect both land and buildings from erosion. | WAC 176-23-231 states that ”New or enlarged structural shoreline stabilization measures for an existing primary structure, including residences, should not be allowed unless there is conclusive evidence, documented by a geotechnical analysis, that the structure is in danger from shoreline erosion caused by tidal action, currents, or waves. Normal sloughing, erosion of steep bluffs, or shoreline erosion itself, without a scientific or geotechnical analysis, is not demonstration of need.” |
| 408 | 06/20/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | III.L | The Washington legislature passed SB 5451 to make sure cities, like Bainbridge, knew they were in no way forced to make existing development nonconforming. | The City Council will make the final decision on how to address nonconforming structures and uses. |
| 409 | 06/20/11 | P. Whitener | Bainbridge Citizens | General | Staff off my property! | Comment noted. |
| 410 | 06/20/11 | K. Scott | Citizen | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | Policies related to buffers and residential development are intended to both protect shoreline ecology and accommodate existing single-family residences on the shoreline. |
| 411 | 06/20/11 | K. Scott | Citizen | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | The draft SMP includes goals and policies to protect critical areas within the shoreline jurisdiction. Regulations for implementing those policies are currently being drafted by the citizen committees. |
| 412 | 06/20/11 | K. Scott | Citizen | III.G. | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | Protecting the public’s right to access and use the shoreline are goals of both the Shoreline Management Act and the Shoreline Master Program. |
| 413 | 06/20/11 | K. Scott | Citizen | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new commercial development and other development of protect ecological function and public | Under the Shoreline Management Act, the city’s SMP must recognize and protect private property rights consistent with the public |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | access and safety. | interest. The SMP must accommodate appropriate uses that require a shoreline location, protect the shoreline environmental resources and protect the public's right to access and use the shoreline. |
| 414 | 06/20/11 | N. Keegel | Citizen | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | See response to comment #410. |
| 415 | 06/20/11 | N. Keegel | Citizen | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | See response to comment #411. |
| 416 | 06/20/11 | N. Keegel | Citizen | III.G. | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | See response to comment #412. |
| 417 | 06/20/11 | N. Keegel | Citizen | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new commercial development and other development of protect ecological function and public access and safety. | See response to comment #413. |
| 418 | 06/20/11 | C. Pardy | Citizen | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | See response to comment #410. |
| 419 | 06/20/11 | C. Pardy | Citizen | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | See response to comment #411. |
| 420 | 06/20/11 | C. Pardy | Citizen | III.G. | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | See response to comment #412. |
| 421 | 06/20/11 | C. Pardy | Citizen | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new commercial development and other development of protect ecological function and public access and safety. | See response to comment #413. |
| 422 | 06/20/11 | B. Trafton | Citizen | General | I urge you to remember that the SMP serves far more than just the citizens of Bainbridge Island. | Comment noted. |
| 423 | 06/20/11 | B. Trafton | Citizen | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | See response to comment #410. |
| 424 | 06/20/11 | B. Trafton | Citizen | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and | See response to comment #411. |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 425 | 06/20/11 | B. Trafton | Citizen | III.G. | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | See response to comment #412. |
| 426 | 06/20/11 | B. Trafton | Citizen | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new commercial development and other development of protect ecological function and public access and safety. | See response to comment #413. |
| 427 | 06/20/11 | E. Wright | Citizen | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | See response to comment #410. |
| 428 | 06/20/11 | E. Wright | Citizen | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | See response to comment #411. |
| 429 | 06/20/11 | E. Wright | Citizen | III.G. | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | See response to comment #412. |
| 430 | 06/20/11 | E. Wright | Citizen | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new commercial development and other development of protect ecological function and public access and safety. | See response to comment #413. |
| 431 | 06/20/11 | J. Runyan | Citizen | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | Policies related to buffers and residential development are intended to both protect shoreline ecology and accommodate existing single-family residences on the shoreline. |
| 432 | 06/20/11 | J. Runyan | Citizen | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | The draft SMP includes goals and policies to protect critical areas within the shoreline jurisdiction. Regulations for implementing those policies are currently being drafted by the citizen committees. |
| 433 | 06/20/11 | J. Runyan | Citizen | III.G. | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | Protecting the public's right to access and use the shoreline are goals of both the Shoreline Management Act and the Shoreline Master Program. |
| 434 | 06/20/11 | J. Runyan | Citizen | V.D, E, H, J, | Responsibly address new commercial | Under the Shoreline Management Act, the |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | K, and L | development and other development of protect ecological function and public access and safety. | city's SMP must recognize and protect private property rights consistent with the public interest. The SMP must accommodate appropriate uses that require a shoreline location, protect the shoreline environmental resources and protect the public's right to access and use the shoreline. |
| 435 | 06/20/11 | G. Brewer | Citizen | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | See response to comment #431. |
| 436 | 06/20/11 | G. Brewer | Citizen | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | See response to comment #432. |
| 437 | 06/20/11 | G. Brewer | Citizen | III.G. | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | See response to comment #433. |
| 438 | 06/20/11 | G. Brewer | Citizen | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new commercial development and other development of protect ecological function and public access and safety. | See response to comment #434. |
| 439 | 06/20/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | III.B | Vegetation Conservation Area and new setback requirements provisions shall be applied only to new shoreline developments with existing native vegetation. *This meets the no net loss provision.* | Policies related to buffers and residential development are intended to both protect shoreline ecology and accommodate existing single-family residences on the shoreline. The regulations are still being drafted through the citizen workgroups. The no net loss standard will be applied through the permit process required for development or alteration of existing structures. |
| 440 | 06/20/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | III.L | Existing developments and land uses may remain and may be redeveloped or expanded where they are currently located provided the redevelopment does not cause a net loss of ecological function. *Redevelopment always improves the environment by managing* | Existing legally-established structures and uses which may not conform to current development standards, are allowed to remain and be maintained, repaired, and enlarged as long as the expansion does not increase the nonconformity and meets the standard of no net loss of ecological function. Mitigation will |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | *stormwater, filtering driveway runoff and upgrading the septic systems.* | be determined on a site-specific basis. |
| 441 | 06/20/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | VI.F | Allow docks and floats on the outside of the island subject to state environmental requirements and no net loss provisions of the SMP. *One man's esthetics does not outweigh the property owner's right to access the waters of the state.* | The policies regarding docks developed by the workgroups and any regulations which are currently under review by the workgroups will be reviewed by both Planning Commission and City Council prior to adoption. Dock regulations and requirements are intended to protect ecological functions and marine navigation and safety. |
| 442 | 06/20/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | VI.B | Bulkheads shall be allowed to protect both land and buildings from erosion. Requiring mitigation (adding gravel to the beach) is reasonable if loss or negative impact can be demonstrated. | WAC 176-23-231 states that "New or enlarged structural shoreline stabilization measures for an existing primary structure, including residences, should not be allowed unless there is conclusive evidence, documented by a geotechnical analysis, that the structure is in danger from shoreline erosion caused by tidal action, currents, or waves. Normal sloughing, erosion of steep bluffs, or shoreline erosion itself, without a scientific or geotechnical analysis, is not demonstration of need." |
| 443 | 06/21/11 | M. Ferm | Citizen | General | As a Bainbridge Island resident, I support strong safeguards for shorelines. | Comment noted. |
| 444 | 06/21/11 | M. Ferm | Citizen | | Whether or not on believes in climate change, there is no disputing that sea level is rising. We should plan to avoid giving permits for structures which will be at risk. Of erosion in the future. | Sea level rise was one of the factors considered in development of the state guidelines and will be addressed through the flood hazard provisions of the SMP> |
| 445 | 06/21/11 | M. Ferm | Citizen | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | Policies related to buffers and residential development are intended to both protect shoreline ecology and accommodate existing single-family residences on the shoreline. |
| 446 | 06/21/11 | M. Ferm | Citizen | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and | The draft SMP includes goals and policies to protect critical areas within the shoreline |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | critical saltwater habitats. | jurisdiction. Regulations for implementing those policies are currently being drafted by the citizen committees. |
| 447 | 06/21/11 | M. Ferm | Citizen | III.G. | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | Protecting the public's right to access and use the shoreline are goals of both the Shoreline Management Act and the Shoreline Master Program. |
| 448 | 06/21/11 | M. Ferm | Citizen | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new commercial development and other development of protect ecological function and public access and safety. | Under the Shoreline Management Act, the city's SMP must recognize and protect private property rights consistent with the public interest. The SMP must accommodate appropriate uses that require a shoreline location, protect the shoreline environmental resources and protect the public's right to access and use the shoreline. |
| 449 | 06/21/11 | J. Sutherland | Citizen | Process | It appears that at least some of the alleged draft reaches predetermined conclusions. | The only predetermined conclusions are the requirements of WAC 176.23 which all local SMPs must meet. |
| 450 | 06/21/11 | J. Sutherland | Citizen | Process | The taxpaying public has not been adequately informed. | The Public Participation Plan, created by citizens and approved by City Council, was adopted to ensure an open and transparent process. Barbara Nightingale from the Department of Ecology recently said that the City has "raised the bar" for involving citizens in the process. |
| 451 | 06/21/11 | J. Sutherland | Citizen | Designations | What we do know is that the redesignation of shoreline properties seem arbitrary. | Preliminary mapping has been done based on the criteria adopted by the Shoreline Master Program Task Force. The designation criteria and the designation map are currently in the draft phase and will be released to the public upon final recommendation of the Shoreline Master Program Task Force. |
| 452 | 06/21/11 | J. Sutherland | Citizen | Science | No science know to us, or ever published to our knowledge, gives any indication that such properties [as those in Blakely | The purpose of the Shoreline Residential Conservancy designation is to protect, conserve, and restore ecological functions of |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Harbor being resdesignated as Residential Conservancy] represent a risk to the health of Puget Sound. | open space, floodplain and other sensitive lands; to conserve and manage valuable historic and cultural resources where they exist and to accommodate compatible residential uses. |
| 453 | 06/21/11 | J. Sutherland | Citizen | General | Why doesn't the City concentrate more of its effort instead on the much more serious, known concerns over the adverse impact of commercial and public properties? | The purpose of the Shoreline Master Program is to address the impacts of human development and use of the shoreline. Other issues are addressed through myriad programs and regulations, from restoration and enhancement projects to regulations controlling stormwater, public, commercial, and industrial activities. |
| 454 | 06/21/11 | A. Lynn | Citizen | General | Assist homeowners and businesses in maintaining their properties as safe and healthy environments. Do what our community expects to help sustain not only the biological but the social ecology from harm. | See response to comment #453. |
| 455 | 06/21/11 | A. Lynn | Citizen | General | I think the rule makers need to set guidelines and goals, and trust shoreline property owners will do the right thing in their own best interest and the communities well being. On the whole that has worked pretty well for us. | Comment noted. |
| 456 | 06/21/11 | A. Lynn | Citizen | Designations | The SMP changes designating residential areas as conservation zones are unreasonable and counterproductive. | See response to comment #452. |
| 457 | 06/21/11 | B. Chamberlain | Citizen | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | Policies related to buffers and residential development are intended to both protect shoreline ecology and accommodate existing single-family residences on the shoreline. |
| 458 | 06/21/11 | B. Chamberlain | Citizen | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | The draft SMP includes goals and policies to protect critical areas within the shoreline jurisdiction. Regulations for implementing |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | those policies are currently being drafted by the citizen committees. |
| 459 | 06/21/11 | B. Chamberlain | Citizen | III.G. | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | Protecting the public's right to access and use the shoreline are goals of both the Shoreline Management Act and the Shoreline Master Program. |
| 460 | 06/21/11 | B. Chamberlain | Citizen | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new commercial development and other development of protect ecological function and public access and safety. | Under the Shoreline Management Act, the city's SMP must recognize and protect private property rights consistent with the public interest. The SMP must accommodate appropriate uses that require a shoreline location, protect the shoreline environmental resources and protect the public's right to access and use the shoreline. |
| 461 | 06/21/11 | C. Hunter | Citizen | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | See response to comment #457. |
| 462 | 06/21/11 | C. Hunter | Citizen | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | See response to comment #458. |
| 463 | 06/21/11 | C. Hunter | Citizen | III.G. | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | See response to comment #459. |
| 464 | 06/21/11 | C. Hunter | Citizen | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new commercial development and other development of protect ecological function and public access and safety. | See response to comment #460. |
| 465 | 06/21/11 | P. Conrad | Citizen | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | See response to comment #457. |
| 466 | 06/21/11 | P. Conrad | Citizen | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | See response to comment #458. |
| 467 | 06/21/11 | P. Conrad | Citizen | III.G. | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | See response to comment #459. |
| 468 | 06/21/11 | P. Conrad | Citizen | V.D, E, H, J, | Responsibly address new commercial | See response to comment #460. |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | K, and L | development and other development of protect ecological function and public access and safety. | |
| 469 | 06/21/11 | D. Spoor | Citizen | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | See response to comment #457. |
| 470 | 06/21/11 | D. Spoor | Citizen | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | See response to comment #458. |
| 471 | 06/21/11 | D. Spoor | Citizen | III.G. | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | See response to comment #459. |
| 472 | 06/21/11 | D. Spoor | Citizen | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new commercial development and other development of protect ecological function and public access and safety. | See response to comment #460. |
| 473 | 06/21/11 | Z. Merriman | Citizen | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | Policies related to buffers and residential development are intended to both protect shoreline ecology and accommodate existing single-family residences on the shoreline. |
| 474 | 06/21/11 | Z. Merriman | Citizen | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | The draft SMP includes goals and policies to protect critical areas within the shoreline jurisdiction. Regulations for implementing those policies are currently being drafted by the citizen committees. |
| 475 | 06/21/11 | Z. Merriman | Citizen | III.G. | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | Protecting the public's right to access and use the shoreline are goals of both the Shoreline Management Act and the Shoreline Master Program. |
| 476 | 06/21/11 | Z. Merriman | Citizen | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new commercial development and other development of protect ecological function and public access and safety. | Under the Shoreline Management Act, the city's SMP must recognize and protect private property rights consistent with the public interest. The SMP must accommodate appropriate uses that require a shoreline location, protect the shoreline environmental resources and protect the public's right to |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | access and use the shoreline. |
| 477 | 06/21/11 | M. McCabe | Citizen | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | See response to comment #473. |
| 478 | 06/21/11 | M. McCabe | Citizen | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | See response to comment #474. |
| 479 | 06/21/11 | M. McCabe | Citizen | III.G. | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | See response to comment #475. |
| 480 | 06/21/11 | M. McCabe | Citizen | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new commercial development and other development of protect ecological function and public access and safety. | See response to comment #476. |
| 481 | 06/21/11 | L. Macchio | Citizen | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | See response to comment #473. |
| 482 | 06/21/11 | L. Macchio | Citizen | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | See response to comment #474. |
| 483 | 06/21/11 | L. Macchio | Citizen | III.G. | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | See response to comment #475. |
| 484 | 06/21/11 | L. Macchio | Citizen | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new commercial development and other development of protect ecological function and public access and safety. | See response to comment #476. |
| 485 | 06/23/11 | E Wright | Vegetation Workgroup | General | It comes down to this: the waters of Puget Sound belong to all of us. There is no rational argument to counter the fact that increased human population has adversely affected the healthy ecosystem of our Sound. | Comment noted. |
| 486 | 06/23/11 | E. Wright | Vegetation Workgroup | General | There is no arguing with state law, which requires us to adopt a stronger management program to protect our public waters. | The draft SMP will meet the requirements of WAC 176.23, the Guidelines. |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 24, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 487 | 06/23/11 | E. Wright | Vegetation Workgroup | General | We are living on an island and rely on each other. Whether an upland or shoreline resident, we depend on each other to act responsibly for the common good. | Comment noted. |
| 488 | 06/23/11 | E. Wright | Vegetation Workgroup | General | To be effective, any regulations must strike a balance between unduly constraining people's use of their property and acting responsibly on current knowledge of the repercussions of those uses. | The Shoreline Master Program must accommodate appropriate uses, protect the shoreline environment, and protect public shoreline access, including visual. |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 28, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 489 | 06/24/11 | J. Sweeney | Waterfront owner | III.B | There should be no increase in the setback – my property was almost unbuildable with a 50' setback. | Policies related to buffers and residential development are intended to both protect shoreline ecology and accommodate existing single-family residences on the shoreline. The technical consultants have provided buffer width recommendations based on the available science. Those recommendations will be considered by the SMP workgroups when they are formulating their recommendations to the Planning Commission. The City Council will make the final policy decisions regarding buffers. |
| 490 | 06/24/11 | J. Sweeney | Waterfront owner | VI.B | My property will also probably require erosion protection – a bulkhead or seawall – when the trees protecting it fall into Fletcher Bay, so no restrictions on those should be imposed. | WAC 176-23-231 states that "New or enlarged structural shoreline stabilization measures for an existing primary structure, including residences, should not be allowed unless there is conclusive evidence, documented by a geotechnical analysis, that the structure is in danger from shoreline erosion caused by tidal action, currents, or waves. Normal sloughing, erosion of steep bluffs, or shoreline erosion itself, without a scientific or geotechnical analysis, is not |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 28, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | demonstration of need." |
| 491 | 06/24/11 | J. Sweeney | Waterfront owner | III.L | Certainly, the property should not become non-conforming by fiat. | Nonconforming means that the use or structure does not conform to the existing development standards. State law requires eventual conformance. However, the existing Shoreline Master Program allows 100% replacement of an existing nonconforming structure. How nonconforming uses and structures will be regulated will be determined during the process of drafting regulations. |
| 492 | 06/24/11 | J. Sweeney | Waterfront owner | VI.F | Banning docks and floats?! The water is the reason people pay up for these properties. It would destroy their recreation and the property's recreational value. | The purpose of the SMP is to address the impacts of human development and use of the shoreline. A balance between concern for ecosystem integrity and the rights of property owners is a primary goal of the Shoreline Management Act and the Shoreline Master Program. |
| 493 | 06/27/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | III.L | Under the proposed regulations, existing homes and lots are subject to the new Vegetation Conservation and Buffer Zones if they are rebuilt or remodeled beyond a certain percentage. | The existing Shoreline Master Program allows 100% replacement of an existing nonconforming structure in the same footprint. Draft regulations have not been finalized but will establish how expansion or replacement must be mitigated to achieve no net loss of ecological functions. |
| 494 | 06/27/11 | J. Grundman & L. Fergusson | Waterfront owner | Process | We would hope that in an effort to engage the public in these important considerations, the city would be extraordinarily informative and transparent and that we would be able to receive such information directly, including an appropriate introduction and explanation of how it is to be processed. | The regulations are still in working draft as they go through the citizen workgroup process. The recommended changes to the SMP will be compiled into a complete document, including vegetation regulations, and the draft SMP will be made available to the public in late July at a joint meeting of the City Council and Planning Commission. |
| 495 | 06/27/11 | J. Grundman & L. Fergusson | Waterfront owner | III.B | There is no allowance for construction of any structural protection for upland | WAC 176-23-231 states that "New or enlarged structural shoreline stabilization |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 28, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | property. | measures for an existing primary structure, including residences, should not be allowed unless there is conclusive evidence, documented by a geotechnical analysis, that the structure is in danger from shoreline erosion caused by tidal action, currents, or waves. There is no allowance for structural stabilization for undeveloped property. |
| 496 | 06/27/11 | J. Grundman & L. Fergusson | Waterfront owner | III.B | What criteria is included in "table XX" and what criteria is to be considered in the "site specific review" which may be necessary to determine the standard shoreline buffer? | The proposed prescriptive standard shoreline buffers will be based on a combination of shoreline designation and site-specific use. A site specific review based on the geophysical conditions and existing ecological functions provided by a specific property may be used to develop a site-specific management plan. The management plan may call for alternate buffer requirements. |
| 497 | 06/27/11 | J. Grundman & L. Fergusson | Waterfront owner | III.B | What scientific studies have documented the specific environmental damage resulting from the maintenance of the existing regulations in lieu of adopting the standard shoreline buffer dimensions proposed? What would be the specific "net loss of ecological function"? | The scientific background for the proposed buffer dimensions is discussed in pages 2-7 of the June 27, 2011, Herrerra memorandum and full citations are provided at the end of that document. |
| 498 | 06/27/11 | J. Grundman & L. Fergusson | Waterfront owner | III.B | How many shoreline homes would fall within the shoreline buffers proposed in the draft? | Through the city's GIS system it has been determined that 36% of all shoreline residences are nonconforming to the existing buffer requirements. The proposed buffer dimensions would result in a 9% increase in nonconformity. |
| 499 | 06/27/11 | J. Grundman & L. Fergusson | Waterfront owner | III.B | How many undeveloped properties would be made undevelopable? | The shoreline variance process is used for the development of heavily constrained or fully constrained (meaning that the entire property is within a critical area) property. |
| 500 | 06/27/11 | K. Jackson | Waterfront owner | III.B | Vegetation conservation areas and new | Policies related to buffers and residential |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 28, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | setback requirements shall be applied only to new shoreline developments with existing native vegetation. | development are intended to both protect shoreline ecology and accommodate existing single-family residences on the shoreline. The regulations are still being drafted through the citizen workgroups. The no net loss standard will be applied through the permit process required for development or alteration of existing structures. |
| 501 | 06/27/11 | K. Jackson | Waterfront owner | III.L | Existing developments and land uses may remain and may be redevelo9ped or expanded where they are currently located provided the redevelopment does not cause a net loss of ecological function. | Existing legally-established structures and uses which may not conform to current development standards, are allowed to remain and be maintained, repaired, and enlarged as long as the expansion does not increase the nonconformity and meets the standard of no net loss of ecological function. Mitigation will be determined on a site-specific basis. |
| 502 | 06/27/11 | K. Jackson | Waterfront owner | VI.L | Allow docks and floats on the outside of the island subject to state environmental requirements and no net loss provisions of the SMP. | The policies regarding docks developed by the workgroups and any regulations which are currently under review by the workgroups will be reviewed by both Planning Commission and City Council prior to adoption. Dock regulations and requirements are intended to protect ecological functions and marine navigation and safety. |
| 503 | 06/27/11 | K. Jackson | Waterfront owner | VI.B | Allow bulkheads to protect both land and buildings. | WAC 176-23-231 states that ”New or enlarged structural shoreline stabilization measures for an existing primary structure, including residences, should not be allowed unless there is conclusive evidence, documented by a geotechnical analysis, that the structure is in danger from shoreline erosion caused by tidal action, currents, or waves.” There is no allowance for structural stabilization for undeveloped property. |
| 504 | 06/27/11 | Foxpaw1 | Citizen | III.B | Vegetation conservation areas and new | See response to comment #500. |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 28, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | setback requirements shall be applied only to new shoreline developments with existing native vegetation. | |
| 505 | 06/27/11 | Foxpaw1 | Citizen | III.L | Existing developments and land uses may remain and may be redevelo9ped or expanded where they are currently located provided the redevelopment does not cause a net loss of ecological function. | See response to comment #501. |
| 506 | 05/27/11 | Foxpaw1 | Citizen | VI.L. | Allow docks and floats on the outside of the island subject to state environmental requirements and no net loss provisions of the SMP. | See response to comment #502. |
| 507 | 05/27/11 | Foxpaw1 | Citizen | VI.B | Allow bulkheads to protect both land and buildings. | See response to comment #503. |
| 508 | 6/27/11 | T. Kelly | Citizen | III.L | Attached MYNorthwest.com article titled "Shoreline plan updates could use a little logic" | Existing legally-established structures and uses which may not conform to current development standards, are allowed to remain and be maintained, repaired, and enlarged as long as the expansion does not increase the nonconformity and meets the standard of no net loss of ecological function. Mitigation will be determined on a site-specific basis. |
| 509 | 6/28/11 | J. Sutherland | Waterfront owner | Process | There were no less than 13 emails from individuals, all with identical text, sent in just two days. I would like to caution you against being influences by such activist stuffing tactics. | Comment noted. |
| 510 | 6/28/11 | J. Grundman | Waterfront owner | Process | I look forward to learning more, and getting answers to all my questions, including those below. | Comment noted. |
| 511 | 6/28/11 | J. Grundman | Waterfront owner | III.B | I would like to better understand COBI's justification for potentially changing residential property buffers given the conclusions of the Washington State Department of Ecology's Environmental | WAC 173-26-201 (Guidelines) states that local jurisdictions must identify how existing shoreline vegetation provides ecological functions and determine methods to ensure protection of those functions. Identify |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 28, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Assessment Program's "Toxics in Surface Runoff to Puget Sound, Phase 3 Date and Load Estimates." | important ecological functions that have been degraded through loss of vegetation. Consider the amount of vegetated shoreline area necessary to achieve ecological objectives. While there may be less vegetation remaining in urbanized areas than in rural areas, the importance of this vegetation, in terms of the ecological functions it provides, is often as great or even greater than in rural areas due to its scarcity." . |
| 512 | 6/28/11 | J. Grundman | Waterfront owner | III.B | How will development and landscaping changes to a small strip of land in the 5.8% of residential property surrounding Puget Sound result in "no net loss of environmental function" that could possible by quantified and measured? | WAC 176-23-201 states that shoreline vegetation provides the following ecological functions: maintaining temperature; removing excessive nutrients and toxic compound, attenuating wave energy, removing and stabilizing sediment; and providing woody debris and other organic matter. |
| 513 | 06/28/11 | J. Grundman | Waterfront owner | III.B | How will the eventual restoration of that strip of land to a forest like state result in "no net loss of environmental functions" if the most effective control strategies for some parameters may be source prevention; especially given that it may be difficult to reduce the low concentrations in runoff from forested areas using conventional stormwater treatment practices? | The SMP must be coordinated with other local, state, and federal regulations. The City's SMP update must follow the guidelines provided in the WAC. |
| 514 | 06/28/11 | J. Grundman | Waterfront owner | III.B | If the "streams draining did exhibit the highest concentrations of contaminants" shouldn't the "no net loss of environmental function" focus be on addressing those problem areas rather than making costly (to the owners) property use restricting changes resulting in unmeasurable benefits. | See the response to comment #513. |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 28, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 515 | 06/28/11 | B. Henshaw | Citizen | Process | The latest draft of the Shoreline Management Plan (SMA) are still in need of a major overhaul in that they do not meet the need of the substantial number of property owners affected. | Comment noted. |
| 516 | 06/28/11 | B. Henshaw | Citizen | Process | The draft is so draconian that the City of Bainbridge Island should do the right thing and provide notice of proposed changes to all property owners affected so that all of the property owners can be heard. | A postcard notification of the update process with information on how to provide comments and stay informed was mailed to every shoreline property. |
| 517 | 06/28/11 | B. Henshaw | Citizen | General | I wish to point out that the Shoreline Management Act does not prohibit development of the state's shorelines, but instead calls for coordinated planning, recognizing and protecting private property rights consistent with public interest. | Agreed. Single-family residential uses shall be preferred if they are consistent with the control of pollution and prevention of damage to the natural environment. In those limited instances when authorized, alteration of the natural condition of the shoreline of the state shall be given priority for single family residences and their appurtenant structures. RCW 90.58.020 |
| 518 | 06/28/11 | B. Henshaw | Citizen | General | Any restoration is voluntary with cooperation between the County and private individuals. | Restoration is voluntary. Mitigation may be required to achieve the goal of no net loss for a specific project. |
| 519 | 06/28/11 | B. Henshaw | Citizen | General | I am concerned that members of the staff and council view the SMA as a preservation law, which precludes reasonable use and development of the shorelines. | The Washington State Department of Ecology adopted WAC guidelines to implement the Shoreline Management Act. The city is required to update its Shoreline Master Program to be consistent with those guidelines. |
| 520 | 06/28/11 | B. Henshaw | Citizen | III.B | The current buffers as proposed create large swaths of nonconforming uses along our shorelines. Buffer programs are at the heart of a restoration scheme designed to ultimately return the land to some prior state or condition, and ultimately the removal of "nonconforming " structures | The proposed buffers are intended to protect the functions that are fundamental to maintaining a healthy functioning marine nearshore. |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 28, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | and uses within the buffers. | |
| 521 | 06/28/11 | B. Henshaw | Citizen | Science | Where in science or practice are buffers the accepted approach to protecting critical functions and values? Where is the science behind 150 foot buffers across the built environment as the effective or appropriate method for marine shorelines? | The scientific references were provided in the Addendum to the Summary of Science Report (Herrera 2011) and are briefly summarized in the June 27, 2011, Herrera memorandum on marine shoreline buffers and riparian areas. The proposed standard buffer widths vary by designation and site-specific conditions. The proposed regulations also provide for an alternative buffer determined through a site-specific analysis. |
| 522 | 06/28/11 | B. Henshaw | Citizen | General | Given these serious flaws with the draft plan, it is incumbent upon the Council and Planning Commission to request that staff address the numerous issues brought forth. | Comment forwarded to both Planning Commission and City Council. |
| | **Date** | **Name** | **Interest** | **Section** | **Comment** | **Response as of July 12, 2011** |
| 523 | 07/07/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | Process | The three Citizen Work Groups have been meeting for over a year and only during the last two meetings have we been "allowed" by staff to discuss the BIG ISSUES: buffers (science and size) and nonconforming uses. | The workgroup meeting schedule, and the topics covered, were based on the City Council's adopted review schedule. |
| 524 | 07/07/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | III.L | The draft regulations would make 50% of shoreline homes "nonconforming" and most of all uses (lawns, gardens, recreation areas) in the Shoreline Standard Buffer nonconforming. | 36% of all shoreline residences are nonconforming under current regulations. Changes to existing uses in the buffer area may be required as mitigation to help achieve no net loss for a specific project. |
| 525 | 07/07/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | III.B | In determining the purposed buffer sizes, the City and the Herrera Memo try to compare shorelines in their natural state to developed shorelines and conclude to RESTORE the functions of a natural shoreline, large buffers are needed. The SMP standard is NO NET LOSS from today. It is not forced restoration at the | No net loss is determined by the city's baseline. The city's baseline is from the date of our shoreline characterization, as updated in 2009. Policies and regulations related to buffers and residential development are intended to both protect shoreline ecology and accommodate existing single-family residences on the shoreline. Restoring the |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 28, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | private property owners' expense. | buffer may be required as part of the mitigation plan for proposed development and is not otherwise required. |
| 526 | 07/07/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | General | Protect our shoreline by using the "no net loss" standard. | The Department of Ecology has set "no net loss" as the standard and will approve a local Shoreline Master Program only if it is found to meet that standard. |
| 527 | 07/07/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | Designations | Do not rezone the 40% of shoreline to Residential Conservancy. | The current shoreline designations were based on land use whereas the Guidelines [WAC 173-26] requires them to be based on the existing ecological conditions of the nearshore environment, existing development, and anticipated future use. The purpose of the Shoreline Residential Conservancy designation is to protect, conserve, and restore ecological functions of open space, floodplain and other sensitive lands; to conserve and manage valuable historic and cultural resources where they exist and to accommodate compatible residential uses. |
| 528 | 07/07/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | III.B & L | Do not apply vegetation buffers to existing developments making them nonconforming. | Existing legally-established structures and uses which may not conform to current development standards, are allowed to remain and be maintained, repaired, and enlarged as long as the expansion does not increase the nonconformity and meets the standard of no net loss of ecological function. Mitigation will be determined on a site-specific basis. |
| 529 | 07/07/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | VI.B | Continue to authorize bulkheads to protect both land (front yards) and homes. | WAC 176-23-231 states that "New or enlarged structural shoreline stabilization measures for an existing primary structure, including residences, should not be allowed unless there is conclusive evidence, documented by a geotechnical analysis, that the structure is in danger from shoreline |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 28, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | erosion caused by tidal action, currents, or waves." There is no allowance for structural stabilization for undeveloped property. |
| 530 | 07/07/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | V.D | Continue to permit docks on the outside of the island. | Under the Guidelines [WAC 173-26-231(3)(F)(b)], pier and dock construction shall be restricted to the minimum size necessary and shall be designed and constructed to avoid or minimize and mitigate the impacts to ecological functions, critical areas resources and processes. |
| 531 | 07/07/11 | R Weaver | Waterfront property owner | General | Neither new legislation clarifying the issue nor lack of scientific support for the extreme solutions to imaginary problems now proposed has stopped environmental extremists in their rush to make other people pay for their Utopian vision. | Comment noted. |
| 532 | 07/07/11 | R Weaver | Waterfront property owner | General | In the meantime, this 20 year BI resident and waterfront property owner is not amused. I haven't paid $140,000 in property taxes over that period to have my property, already down 35% in value from its peak, further devalued by feel good regulations that will not accomplish any of the goals set forth by the SMP, since it will not solve the real problems that exist, namely, Roads, Roads, Roads and the huge quantities of pollutants that wash off of them right into the Sound. Why don't you solve that one first? Oh, I know. Because EVERYBODY on BI would have to pay for that fix. The one you're so excited about will only be paid for by a small minority. Democracy in action. | Under the Shoreline Management Act, the city must prepare and adopt a Shoreline Master Program that is consistent with the Guidelines [WAC 173-26] and that is tailored to the specific geographic, economic and environmental needs of the community. Other issues are addressed through myriad programs and regulations, from restoration and enhancement projects to stormwater, public, commercial, and industrial activities. |
| 533 | 07/07/11 | R Weaver | Waterfront property owner | General | Protect our shoreline by using the "no net loss" standard. | See response to comment #526. |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 28, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 534 | 07/07/11 | R Weaver | Waterfront property owner | Designations | Do not rezone the 40% of shoreline to Residential Conservancy. | See response to comment #527. |
| 535 | 07/07/11 | R Weaver | Waterfront property owner | III.B & L | Do not apply vegetation buffers to existing developments making them nonconforming. | See response to comment #528. |
| 536 | 07/07/11 | R Weaver | Waterfront property owner | VI.B | Continue to authorize bulkheads to protect both land (front yards) and homes. | See response to comment #530. |
| 537 | 07/07/11 | R Weaver | Waterfront property owner | V.D | Continue to permit docks on the outside of the island. | See response to comment #531. |
| 538 | 07/07/11 | C. and K. Hanson | Waterfront property owners | III.B | Unfortunately, we believe that the Herrera proposal goes way beyond a reasonable approach in that its goal seems to be **restoring** the functions of a natural shoreline with large buffer zones rather than the SMP standard of **no net loss** from current conditions. | The proposed buffers are intended to protect the functions that are fundamental to maintaining a healthy functioning marine nearshore. The proposed vegetation requirements will be imposed as part of a permit activity, not on existing development that is repaired and maintained as it is. |
| 539 | 07/07/11 | C. and K. Hanson | Waterfront property owners | General | Most of the damage to the shoreline and Puget Sound Waters does not come from responsible shoreline homeowners. The marine life in Puget Sound has been decimated by four factors: over harvesting, hatcheries and their dilution of the gene pool, dams and habitat (primarily streams). | |
| 540 | 07/07/11 | C. and K. Hanson | Waterfront property owners | Science | The fact is, there is very little, if any, definitive science that "near shore habitat" has had any significant effect on marine life in Puget Sound. | |
| 541 | 07/07/11 | C. and K. Hanson | Waterfront property owners | General | Protect our shoreline by using the "no net loss" standard. | See response to comment #533. |
| 542 | 07/07/11 | C. and K. Hanson | Waterfront property owners | Designations | Do not rezone the 40% of shoreline to Residential Conservancy. | See response to comment #534. |
| 543 | 07/07/11 | C. and K. Hanson | Waterfront property owners | III.B & L | Do not apply vegetation buffers to existing developments making them nonconforming. | See response to comment #535. |
| 544 | 07/07/11 | C. and K. | Waterfront | VI.B | Continue to authorize bulkheads to protect | See response to comment #536. |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of June 28, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Hanson | property owners | | both land (front yards) and homes. | |
| 545 | 07/07/11 | C. and K. Hanson | Waterfront property owners | V.D. | Continue to permit docks on the outside of the island. | See response to comment #537. |
| 546 | 07/07/11 | P. Whitener | Waterfront property owner | General | Protect our shoreline by using the "no net loss" standard. | See response to comment #533. |
| 547 | 07/07/11 | P. Whitener | Waterfront property owner | Designations | Do not rezone the 40% of shoreline to Residential Conservancy. | See response to comment #534. |
| 548 | 07/07/11 | P. Whitener | Waterfront property owner | III.B & L | Do not apply vegetation buffers to existing developments making them nonconforming. | See response to comment #535. |
| 549 | 07/07/11 | P. Whitener | Waterfront property owner | VI.B | Continue to authorize bulkheads to protect both land (front yards) and homes. | See response to comment #536. |
| 550 | 07/07/11 | P. Whitener | Waterfront property owner | VI.B | Continue to authorize bulkheads to protect both land (front yards) and homes. | See response to comment #536. |
| | **Date** | **Name** | **Interest** | **Section** | **Comment** | **Response as of August 12, 2011** |
| 551 | 07/11/11 | B. Martin | Waterfront property owner | | The B.I. Council is considering an SMP policy under which (a) a previously approved waterfront house becomes non-conforming and (b) that house cannot be rebuilt if seriously damaged by earthquake or fire… | Existing legally-established structures and uses which may not conform to current development standards, are allowed to remain and be maintained, repaired, and enlarged as long as the expansion does not increase the nonconformity and meets the standard of no net loss of ecological function. Mitigation will be determined on a site-specific basis. |
| 552 | 07/21/11 | D. Reynolds Law Office | Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners | | The Consistency Analysis prepared by ICF International is incomplete, and applies the wrong standards in certain respects. | |
| 553 | 07/21/11 | D. Reynolds Law Office | Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners | | The Shoreline Management Act has primacy over the Guidelines, so the language of that law and related case interpretations must be considered. | |
| 554 | 07/21/11 | D. Reynolds Law Office | Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners | | By law, consistency must also include an examination of the local government's comprehensive plan and development regulations adopted under the Growth Management Act. | |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of August 12, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 555 | 07/21/11 | D. Reynolds Law Office | Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners | | A local jurisdiction is required to make amendments to the Master Program only when "deemed necessary to reflect changing local circumstances, new information or approved data. | |
| 556 | 07/21/11 | D. Reynolds Law Office | Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners | | Case law has superseded some of the state Guidelines, such as the Guidelines' somewhat unfriendly attitude towards docks and residential protection. | |
| 557 | 07/21/11 | D. Reynolds Law Office | Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners | | The consistency analysis for critical areas uses the wrong standard. | |
| 558 | 07/21/11 | D. Reynolds Law Office | Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners | | Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners is unaware of any document produced by the City to date justifying changes to the SMP based upon changing local circumstances, new information or improved data. An audit of the existing regulatory system ("cause-and-effect analysis") and whether it needs to be changed is in order. | |
| 559 | 07/21/11 | M. Lagerloef | Waterfront property owner/ workgroup member | | The SMA recognizes that the shoreline and the water they encompass are "among the most valuable and fragile of the state's natural resources." I can validate that from what I've learned in ecology and marine science over the years. | |
| 560 | 07/21/11 | M. Lagerloef | Waterfront property owner/ workgroup member | | Edge environments are some of the most productive and diverse environments on the planet…Creatures from both habitat types overlap there and physical forces may concentrate materials, so potential food is abundant. | |
| 561 | 07/21/11 | M. Lagerloef | Waterfront property owner/ workgroup | | The nearshore environment is essential in the early life cycle of salmon relying heavily on invertebrates found in shallow | |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of August 12, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | member | | nearshore sediments. | |
| 562 | 07/21/11 | M. Lagerloef | Waterfront property owner/ workgroup member | | Habitat complexity is important in nurturing a diverse biological life. A lawn offers far less than a community of plants, particularly mature native plants, including shrubs and trees. | |
| 563 | 07/21/11 | M. Lagerloef | Waterfront property owner/ workgroup member | | The land and aquatic habitats are far from separate. There is an important flow of carbon that goes from the land to the water in the nearshore area, generally in the form of leaf detritus and terrestrial insects. | |
| 564 | 07/21/11 | M. Lagerloef | Waterfront property owner/ workgroup member | | W have well-documented evidence of dramatic decreases in almost every fish species, except rat fish, in the Sound. We also have extensive studies on impacts to fish health because of the accumulative of toxic chemicals in their fatty tissues and liver. | |
| 565 | 07/21/11 | M. Lagerloef | Waterfront property owner/ workgroup member | | Given the existing development along the shoreline, the draft regulations are reasonable. They do not require removal of existing bulkheads and they allow repair and replacement where there is a demonstrated danger to primary structures. | |
| 566 | 07/21/11 | M. Lagerloef | Waterfront property owner/ workgroup member | | A shoreline homeowner is not going to be denied the ability to protect their existing home and primary appurtenances. The emphasis is on those who seek to develop new property, who have an ability to adjust the siting of the home to minimize the threat from shoreline erosion. | |
| 567 | 07/21/11 | M. Lagerloef | Waterfront property owner/ workgroup member | | The draft SMP contains much more detail on materials allowed [for overwater structures], grating to allow light penetration, spacing of pilings, and size of | |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of August 12, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | docks and floats. These provisions are consistent with requirements in the Corps of Engineers' General Permit and therefore provide both consistency and regulatory certainty, while also minimizing the impacts of overwater structures o n the fish and vegetation. | |
| 568 | 07/21/11 | M. Lagerloef | Waterfront property owner/ workgroup member | | Puget Sound has gotten to the condition it's in by "death by a thousand cuts." The only way to stem that tide is to take every responsible measure we can to protect existing habitat and where possible increase productive nearshore habitat, decrease/eliminate toxic products going into the Sound, and manage the fishery. | |
| 569 | 07/21/11 | M. Lagerloef | Waterfront property owner/ workgroup member | | These regulations are not punishing shoreline homeowners. They are asking that all of us on the shoreline approach modifications to the shoreline through a rigorous process that considers no- or least-impacting actions first, and that mitigates for any impact to ecological functions. | |
| 570 | 07/21/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | General | In the SMP update process, the city staff has acted as a special interest lobby pushing one extreme point of view, restoration of the shoreline to its original condition. | Staff provided background information concerning the requirements of the SMA and Guidelines and the most recent scientific data to the workgroups and made recommendations on changes needed to comply with the Guidelines. The workgroups' recommendations are now being reviewed by the Planning Commission. |
| 571 | 07/21/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | | There is no science showing normal low-density residential uses are causing any harm. Restoration is not the goal of the SMP and is not required by any regulation. | |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of August 12, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 572 | 07/21/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | General | The City Council should reject the policies and regulations and begin the process over again in an honest matter. The first step should be to mail a statement of the potential impacts of the SMP update to every shoreline property owner containing drawings and restrictions of the range of potential buffers, under what conditions (remodeling and rebuilding) these buffers will be imposed on existing residences, proposed restrictions on bulkheads, and bans on docks and floats. | |
| 573 | 07/21/11 | J. Greiner | Waterfront property owner | General | It is in the areas of options that we should focus our discussion and deliberation. [Clearly indicating what is mandatory and what is discretionary] would certainly make it much easier for all concerned to do a more thorough and thoughtful job of evaluation. | |
| 574 | 07/21/11 | P. Borman | Bainbridge Alliance for Puget Sound (BAPS) | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | The draft SMP includes goals and policies to protect critical areas within the shoreline jurisdiction. Regulations for implementing those policies are currently being drafted by the citizen committees. |
| 575 | 07/21/11 | P. Borman | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | Policies related to buffers and residential development are intended to both protect shoreline ecology and accommodate existing single-family residences on the shoreline. |
| 576 | 07/21/11 | P. Borman | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | Protecting the public's right to access and use the shoreline are goals of both the Shoreline Management Act and the Shoreline Master Program. |
| 577 | 07/21/11 | P. Borman | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | Under the Shoreline Management Act, the city's SMP must recognize and protect private property rights consistent with the public |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of August 12, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | interest. The SMP must accommodate appropriate uses that require a shoreline location, protect the shoreline environmental resources and protect the public's right to access and use the shoreline. |
| 578 | 07/21/11 | J. Vassiliadis | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 579 | 07/21/11 | J. Vassiliadis | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 580 | 07/21/11 | J. Vassiliadis | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 581 | 07/21/11 | J. Vassiliadis | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 582 | 07/21/11 | F. Renna, Jr. | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 583 | 07/21/11 | F. Renna, Jr. | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 584 | 07/21/11 | F. Renna, Jr. | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 585 | 07/21/11 | F. Renna, Jr. | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 586 | 07/21/11 | G. Kuntz | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 587 | 07/21/11 | G. Kuntz | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 588 | 07/21/11 | G. Kuntz | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of August 12, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 589 | 07/21/11 | G. Kuntz | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 590 | 07/21/11 | T. Wentzel | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 591 | 07/21/11 | T. Wentzel | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 592 | 07/21/11 | T. Wentzel | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 593 | 07/21/11 | T. Wentzel | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 594 | 07/21/11 | D. Landry | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 595 | 07/21/11 | D. Landry | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 596 | 07/21/11 | D. Landry | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 597 | 07/21/11 | D. Landry | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 598 | 07/21/11 ` | D. Bricklin | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 599 | 07/21/11 ` | D. Bricklin | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 600 | 07/21/11 ` | D. Bricklin | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 601 | 07/21/11 ` | D. Bricklin | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, | |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of August 12, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | and safety. | |
| 602 | 07/21/11 | K. Casey | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 603 | 07/21/11 | K. Casey | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 604 | 07/21/11 | K. Casey | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 605 | 07/21/11 | K. Casey | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 606 | 07/21/11 | I. Macdougall | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 607 | 07/21/11 | I. Macdougall | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 608 | 07/21/11 | I. Macdougall | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 609 | 07/21/11 | I. Macdougall | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 610 | 07/21/11 | G. Cook | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 611 | 07/21/11 | G. Cook | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 612 | 07/21/11 | G. Cook | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 613 | 07/21/11 | G. Cook | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 614 | 07/21/11 | T. Macdougall | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and | |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of August 12, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 615 | 07/21/11 | T. Macdougall | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 616 | 07/21/11 | T. Macdougall | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 617 | 07/21/11 | T. Macdougall | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 618 | 07/21/11 | J. Quitslund | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 619 | 07/21/11 | J. Quitslund | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 620 | 07/21/11 | J. Quitslund | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 621 | 07/21/11 | J. Quitslund | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 622 | 07/21/11 | J. Langley | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 623 | 07/21/11 | J. Langley | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 624 | 07/21/11 | J. Langley | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 625 | 07/21/11 | J. Langley | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 626 | 07/21/11 | B. McAllister | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of August 12, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 627 | 07/21/11 | B. McAllister | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 628 | 07/21/11 | B. McAllister | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 629 | 07/21/11 | B. McAllister | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 630 | 07/21/11 | J. Wilson | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 631 | 07/21/11 | J. Wilson | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 632 | 07/21/11 | J. Wilson | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 633 | 07/21/11 | J. Wilson | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 634 | 07/21/11 | D. Sutter | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 635 | 07/21/11 | D. Sutter | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 636 | 07/21/11 | D. Sutter | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 637 | 07/21/11 | D. Sutter | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 638 | 07/21/11 | H. Gilbert | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 639 | 07/21/11 | H. Gilbert | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of August 12, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 640 | 07/21/11 | H. Gilbert | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 641 | 07/21/11 | H. Gilbert | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 642 | 07/21/11 | S. Hellrieyel | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 643 | 07/21/11 | S. Hellrieyel | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 644 | 07/21/11 | S. Hellrieyel | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 645 | 07/21/11 | S. Hellrieyel | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 646 | 07/21/11 | T. Tully | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 647 | 07/21/11 | T. Tully | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 648 | 07/21/11 | T. Tully | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 649 | 07/21/11 | T. Tully | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 650 | 07/21/11 | T. Jones | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 651 | 07/21/11 | T. Jones | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 652 | 07/21/11 | T. Jones | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does | |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of August 12, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 653 | 07/21/11 | T. Jones | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 654 | 07/21/11 | J. ten Hove | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 655 | 07/21/11 | J. ten Hove | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 656 | 07/21/11 | J. ten Hove | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 657 | 07/21/11 | J. ten Hove | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 658 | 07/21/11 | D. Allen | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 659 | 07/21/11 | D. Allen | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 660 | 07/21/11 | D. Allen | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 661 | 07/21/11 | D. Allen | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 662 | 07/21/11 | L. Duwers | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 663 | 07/21/11 | L. Duwers | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 664 | 07/21/11 | L. Duwers | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 665 | 07/21/11 | L. Duwers | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, | Responsibly address new development to | |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of August 12, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | K, and L | protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 666 | 07/21/11 | L. Richard | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 667 | 07/21/11 | L. Richard | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 668 | 07/21/11 | L. Richard | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 669 | 07/21/11 | L. Richard | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 670 | 07/21/11 | K. Molinari | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 671 | 07/21/11 | K. Molinari | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 672 | 07/21/11 | K. Molinari | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 673 | 07/21/11 | K. Molinari | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 674 | 07/21/11 | K. Wilken | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 675 | 07/21/11 | K. Wilken | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 676 | 07/21/11 | K. Wilken | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 677 | 07/21/11 | K. Wilken | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of August 12, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 678 | 07/21/11 | M. Potter | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 679 | 07/21/11 | M. Potter | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 680 | 07/21/11 | M. Potter | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 681 | 07/21/11 | M. Potter | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 682 | 07/21/11 | E. Grice | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 683 | 07/21/11 | E. Grice | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 684 | 07/21/11 | E. Grice | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 685 | 07/21/11 | E. Grice | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 686 | 07/21/11 | E. Grice | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 687 | 07/21/11 | E. Grice | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 688 | 07/21/11 | E. Grice | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 689 | 07/21/11 | E. Grice | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 690 | 07/21/11 | W. Strickland | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and | |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of August 12, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 691 | 07/21/11 | W. Strickland | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 692 | 07/21/11 | W. Strickland | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 693 | 07/21/11 | W. Strickland | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 694 | 07/1/11 | W. Luria | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 695 | 07/1/11 | W. Luria | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 696 | 07/1/11 | W. Luria | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 697 | 07/1/11 | W. Luria | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 698 | 07/21/11 | C. Ho | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 699 | 07/21/11 | C. Ho | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 700 | 07/21/11 | C. Ho | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 701 | 07/21/11 | C. Ho | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 702 | 07/21/11 | R. Carter | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 703 | 07/21/11 | R. Carter | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and | |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of August 12, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 704 | 07/21/11 | R. Carter | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 705 | 07/21/11 | R. Carter | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 706 | 07/21/11 | S. Hylen | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 707 | 07/21/11 | S. Hylen | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 708 | 07/21/11 | S. Hylen | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 709 | 07/21/11 | S. Hylen | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 710 | 07/21/11 | J. Franks | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 711 | 07/21/11 | J. Franks | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 712 | 07/21/11 | J. Franks | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 713 | 07/21/11 | J. Franks | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 714 | 07/21/11 | J. Martine | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 715 | 07/21/11 | J. Martine | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 716 | 07/21/11 | J. Martine | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public | |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of August 12, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 717 | 07/21/11 | J. Martine | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 718 | 07/21/11 | A. Kubiak | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 719 | 07/21/11 | A. Kubiak | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 720 | 07/21/11 | A. Kubiak | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 721 | 07/21/11 | A. Kubiak | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 722 | 07/21/11 | M. Jacobs | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 723 | 07/21/11 | M. Jacobs | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 724 | 07/21/11 | M. Jacobs | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 725 | 07/21/11 | M. Jacobs | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 726 | 07/21/11 | M. Stewart | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 727 | 07/21/11 | M. Stewart | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 728 | 07/21/11 | M. Stewart | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of August 12, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 729 | 07/21/11 | M. Stewart | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 730 | 07/21/11 | E. Hubbard | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 731 | 07/21/11 | E. Hubbard | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 732 | 07/21/11 | E. Hubbard | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 733 | 07/21/11 | E. Hubbard | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 734 | 07/21/11 | L. Schmid | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 735 | 07/21/11 | L. Schmid | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 736 | 07/21/11 | L. Schmid | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 737 | 07/21/11 | L. Schmid | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 738 | 07/21/11 | S. Stolee | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 739 | 07/21/11 | S. Stolee | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 740 | 07/21/11 | S. Stolee | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 741 | 07/21/11 | S. Stolee | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, | |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of August 12, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | and safety. | |
| 742 | 07/21/11 | J. Katilus | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 743 | 07/21/11 | J. Katilus | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 744 | 07/21/11 | J. Katilus | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 745 | 07/21/11 | J. Katilus | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 746 | 07/21/11 | J. Knox | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 747 | 07/21/11 | J. Knox | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 748 | 07/21/11 | J. Knox | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 749 | 07/21/11 | J. Knox | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 750 | 07/21/11 | D. Andersen | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 751 | 07/21/11 | D. Andersen | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 752 | 07/21/11 | D. Andersen | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 753 | 07/21/11 | D. Andersen | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 754 | 07/21/11 | P. Lee | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and | |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of August 12, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 755 | 07/21/11 | P. Lee | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 756 | 07/21/11 | P. Lee | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 757 | 07/21/11 | P. Lee | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 758 | 07/21/11 | J. Hennessy | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 759 | 07/21/11 | J. Hennessy | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 760 | 07/21/11 | J. Hennessy | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 761 | 07/21/11 | J. Hennessy | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 762 | 07/21/11 | P. Konis | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 763 | 07/21/11 | P. Konis | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 764 | 07/21/11 | P. Konis | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 765 | 07/21/11 | P. Konis | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 766 | 07/21/11 | E. Rehm | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of August 12, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 767 | 07/21/11 | E. Rehm | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 768 | 07/21/11 | E. Rehm | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 769 | 07/21/11 | E. Rehm | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 770 | 07/21/11 | R. Dryden | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 771 | 07/21/11 | R. Dryden | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 772 | 07/21/11 | R. Dryden | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 773 | 07/21/11 | R. Dryden | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 774 | 07/21/11 | V. Bresc | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 775 | 07/21/11 | V. Bresc | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 776 | 07/21/11 | V. Bresc | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 777 | 07/21/11 | V. Bresc | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 778 | 07/21/11 | C. Smellow | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 779 | 07/21/11 | C. Smellow | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of August 12, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 780 | 07/21/11 | C. Smellow | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 781 | 07/21/11 | C. Smellow | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 782 | 07/21/11 | R. Jackson | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 783 | 07/21/11 | R. Jackson | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 784 | 07/21/11 | R. Jackson | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 785 | 07/21/11 | R. Jackson | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 786 | 07/21/11 | R. Matson | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 787 | 07/21/11 | R. Matson | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 788 | 07/21/11 | R. Matson | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 789 | 07/21/11 | R. Matson | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 790 | 07/21/11 | R. Spoor | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 791 | 07/21/11 | R. Spoor | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 792 | 07/21/11 | R. Spoor | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does | |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of August 12, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 793 | 07/21/11 | R. Spoor | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 794 | 07/21/11 | L. Marshall | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 795 | 07/21/11 | L. Marshall | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 796 | 07/21/11 | L. Marshall | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 797 | 07/21/11 | L. Marshall | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 798 | 07/21/11 | D. Mohr | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 799 | 07/21/11 | D. Mohr | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 800 | 07/21/11 | D. Mohr | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 801 | 07/21/11 | D. Mohr | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 802 | 07/21/11 | S. von Tachy | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 803 | 07/21/11 | S. von Tachy | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 804 | 07/21/11 | S. von Tachy | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 805 | 07/21/11 | S. von Tachy | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, | Responsibly address new development to | |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of August 12, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | K, and L | protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 806 | 07/21/11 | S. Negri | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 807 | 07/21/11 | S. Negri | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 808 | 07/21/11 | S. Negri | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 809 | 07/21/11 | S. Negri | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 810 | 07/21/11 | K. Mackinnon | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 811 | 07/21/11 | K. Mackinnon | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 812 | 07/21/11 | K. Mackinnon | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 813 | 07/21/11 | K. Mackinnon | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 814 | 07/21/11 | M. Lepriere | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 815 | 07/21/11 | M. Lepriere | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 816 | 07/21/11 | M. Lepriere | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 817 | 07/21/11 | M. Lepriere | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of August 12, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 818 | 07/21/11 | C. Pardy | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 819 | 07/21/11 | C. Pardy | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 820 | 07/21/11 | C. Pardy | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 821 | 07/21/11 | C. Pardy | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 822 | 07/21/11 | E. Cowan | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 823 | 07/21/11 | E. Cowan | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 824 | 07/21/11 | E. Cowan | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 825 | 07/21/11 | E. Cowan | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 826 | 07/21/11 | N. Keegel | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 827 | 07/21/11 | N. Keegel | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 828 | 07/21/11 | N. Keegel | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 829 | 07/21/11 | N. Keegel | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 830 | 07/21/11 | D. Snider | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and | |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of August 12, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 831 | 07/21/11 | D. Snider | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 832 | 07/21/11 | D. Snider | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 833 | 07/21/11 | D. Snider | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 834 | 07/21/11 | D. Berg | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 835 | 07/21/11 | D. Berg | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 836 | 07/21/11 | D. Berg | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 837 | 07/21/11 | D. Berg | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 838 | 07/21/11 | B. Trafton | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 839 | 07/21/11 | B. Trafton | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 840 | 07/21/11 | B. Trafton | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 841 | 07/21/11 | B. Trafton | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 842 | 07/21/11 | J. Azis | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 843 | 07/21/11 | J. Azis | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and | |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of August 12, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 844 | 07/21/11 | J. Azis | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 845 | 07/21/11 | J. Azis | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 846 | 07/21/11 | P. Lentz | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 847 | 07/21/11 | P. Lentz | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 848 | 07/21/11 | P. Lentz | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 849 | 07/21/11 | P. Lentz | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 850 | 07/21/11 | E. Wright | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 851 | 07/21/11 | E. Wright | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 852 | 07/21/11 | E. Wright | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 853 | 07/21/11 | E. Wright | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 854 | 07/21/11 | C. Harrington | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 855 | 07/21/11 | C. Harrington | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 856 | 07/21/11 | C. Harrington | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public | |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of August 12, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 857 | 07/21/11 | C. Harrington | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 858 | 07/21/11 | P. Brians | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 859 | 07/21/11 | P. Brians | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 860 | 07/21/11 | P. Brians | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 861 | 07/21/11 | P. Brians | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 862 | 07/21/11 | P. Elliot | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 863 | 07/21/11 | P. Elliot | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 864 | 07/21/11 | P. Elliot | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 865 | 07/21/11 | P. Elliot | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 866 | 07/21/11 | A. Wilson | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 867 | 07/21/11 | A. Wilson | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 868 | 07/21/11 | A. Wilson | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of August 12, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 869 | 07/21/11 | A. Wilson | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 870 | 07/21/11 | T. Fehsenfeld | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 871 | 07/21/11 | T. Fehsenfeld | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 872 | 07/21/11 | T. Fehsenfeld | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 873 | 07/21/11 | T. Fehsenfeld | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 874 | 07/21/11 | N. Jacobs | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 875 | 07/21/11 | N. Jacobs | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 876 | 07/21/11 | N. Jacobs | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 877 | 07/21/11 | N. Jacobs | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 878 | 07/21/11 | E. Wright | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 879 | 07/21/11 | E. Wright | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 880 | 07/21/11 | E. Wright | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 881 | 07/21/11 | E. Wright | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, | |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of August 12, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | and safety. | |
| 882 | 07/21/11 | R. Jacobs | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 883 | 07/21/11 | R. Jacobs | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 884 | 07/21/11 | R. Jacobs | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 885 | 07/21/11 | R. Jacobs | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 886 | 07/21/11 | A. Kamer | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 887 | 07/21/11 | A. Kamer | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 888 | 07/21/11 | A. Kamer | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 889 | 07/21/11 | A. Kamer | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 890 | 07/21/11 | Z. Smith | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 891 | 07/21/11 | Z. Smith | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 892 | 07/21/11 | Z. Smith | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 893 | 07/21/11 | Z. Smith | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 894 | 07/21/11 | K. deVeaux | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and | |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of August 12, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 895 | 07/21/11 | K. deVeaux | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 896 | 07/21/11 | K. deVeaux | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 897 | 07/21/11 | K. deVeaux | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 898 | 07/21/11 | R. Jacobs | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 899 | 07/21/11 | R. Jacobs | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 900 | 07/21/11 | R. Jacobs | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 901 | 07/21/11 | R. Jacobs | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 902 | 07/21/11 | A. Gustitus | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 903 | 07/21/11 | A. Gustitus | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 904 | 07/21/11 | A. Gustitus | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 905 | 07/21/11 | A. Gustitus | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 906 | 07/21/11 | J. Knochenash | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of August 12, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 907 | 07/21/11 | J. Knochenash | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 908 | 07/21/11 | J. Knochenash | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 909 | 07/21/11 | J. Knochenash | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 910 | 07/21/11 | S. Anderson | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 911 | 07/21/11 | S. Anderson | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 912 | 07/21/11 | S. Anderson | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 913 | 07/21/11 | S. Anderson | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 914 | 07/21/11 | S. Copland | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 915 | 07/21/11 | S. Copland | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 916 | 07/21/11 | S. Copland | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 917 | 07/21/11 | S. Copland | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 918 | 07/21/11 | K. Scott | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 919 | 07/21/11 | K. Scott | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of August 12, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 920 | 07/21/11 | K. Scott | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 921 | 07/21/11 | K. Scott | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 922 | 07/21/11 | S. Minor | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 923 | 07/21/11 | S. Minor | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 924 | 07/21/11 | S. Minor | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 925 | 07/21/11 | S. Minor | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 926 | 07/21/11 | K. Cramer | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 927 | 07/21/11 | K. Cramer | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 928 | 07/21/11 | K. Cramer | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 929 | 07/21/11 | K. Cramer | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 930 | 07/21/11 | W. Hughes | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 931 | 07/21/11 | W. Hughes | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 932 | 07/21/11 | W. Hughes | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does | |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of August 12, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 933 | 07/21/11 | W. Hughes | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 934 | 07/21/11 | M. Garthweite | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 935 | 07/21/11 | M. Garthweite | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 936 | 07/21/11 | M. Garthweite | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 937 | 07/21/11 | M. Garthweite | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 938 | 07/21/11 | R. Hughes | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 939 | 07/21/11 | R. Hughes | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 940 | 07/21/11 | R. Hughes | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 941 | 07/21/11 | R. Hughes | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 942 | 07/21/11 | C. Pardy | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 943 | 07/21/11 | C. Pardy | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 944 | 07/21/11 | C. Pardy | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 945 | 07/21/11 | C. Pardy | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, | Responsibly address new development to | |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of August 12, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | K, and L | protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 946 | 07/21/11 | J. Wright | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 947 | 07/21/11 | J. Wright | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 948 | 07/21/11 | J. Wright | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 949 | 07/21/11 | J. Wright | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 950 | 07/21/11 | R. Branting | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 951 | 07/21/11 | R. Branting | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 952 | 07/21/11 | R. Branting | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 953 | 07/21/11 | R. Branting | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 954 | 07/21/11 | J. Poss | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 955 | 07/21/11 | J. Poss | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 956 | 07/21/11 | J. Poss | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 957 | 07/21/11 | J. Poss | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of August 12, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 958 | 07/21/11 | C. Waters | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 959 | 07/21/11 | C. Waters | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 960 | 07/21/11 | C. Waters | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 961 | 07/21/11 | C. Waters | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 962 | 07/21/11 | L. Desresieri | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 963 | 07/21/11 | L. Desresieri | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 964 | 07/21/11 | L. Desresieri | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 965 | 07/21/11 | L. Desresieri | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 966 | 07/21/11 | G. Becker | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 967 | 07/21/11 | G. Becker | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 968 | 07/21/11 | G. Becker | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 969 | 07/21/11 | G. Becker | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 970 | 07/21/11 | K. Breyer | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and | |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of August 12, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 971 | 07/21/11 | K. Breyer | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 972 | 07/21/11 | K. Breyer | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 973 | 07/21/11 | K. Breyer | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 974 | 07/21/11 | V. Brewer | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 975 | 07/21/11 | V. Brewer | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 976 | 07/21/11 | V. Brewer | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 977 | 07/21/11 | V. Brewer | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 978 | 07/21/11 | M. McCabe | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 979 | 07/21/11 | M. McCabe | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 980 | 07/21/11 | M. McCabe | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 981 | 07/21/11 | M. McCabe | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 982 | 07/21/11 | R. Schulze | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 983 | 07/21/11 | R. Schulze | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and | |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of August 12, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 984 | 07/21/11 | R. Schulze | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 985 | 07/21/11 | R. Schulze | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 986 | 07/21/11 | T. Moench | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 987 | 07/21/11 | T. Moench | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 988 | 07/21/11 | T. Moench | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 989 | 07/21/11 | T. Moench | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 990 | 07/21/11 | A. Cohen | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 991 | 07/21/11 | A. Cohen | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 992 | 07/21/11 | A. Cohen | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 993 | 07/21/11 | A. Cohen | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 994 | 07/21/11 | K. Asadoviau | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 995 | 07/21/11 | K. Asadoviau | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 996 | 07/21/11 | K. Asadoviau | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public | |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of August 12, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 997 | 07/21/11 | K. Asadoviau | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 998 | 07/21/11 | C. Rovelstad | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 999 | 07/21/11 | C. Rovelstad | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 1000 | 07/21/11 | C. Rovelstad | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 1001 | 07/21/11 | C. Rovelstad | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 1002 | 07/21/11 | N. Welton | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 1003 | 07/21/11 | N. Welton | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 1004 | 07/21/11 | N. Welton | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 1005 | 07/21/11 | N. Welton | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 1006 | 07/21/11 | A. Rovelstad | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 1007 | 07/21/11 | A. Rovelstad | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 1008 | 07/21/11 | A. Rovelstad | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of August 12, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1009 | 07/21/11 | A. Rovelstad | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 1010 | 07/21/11 | M. Gwaltney | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 1011 | 07/21/11 | M. Gwaltney | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 1012 | 07/21/11 | M. Gwaltney | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 1013 | 07/21/11 | M. Gwaltney | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 1014 | 07/21/11 | A. Reida | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 1015 | 07/21/11 | A. Reida | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 1016 | 07/21/11 | A. Reida | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 1017 | 07/21/11 | A. Reida | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 1018 | 07/21/11 | M. Bonnier | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 1019 | 07/21/11 | M. Bonnier | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 1020 | 07/21/11 | M. Bonnier | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 1021 | 07/21/11 | M. Bonnier | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, | |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of August 12, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | and safety. | |
| 1022 | 07/21/11 | W. Wallace | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 1023 | 07/21/11 | W. Wallace | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 1024 | 07/21/11 | W. Wallace | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 1025 | 07/21/11 | W. Wallace | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 1026 | 07/21/11 | O. Ribeiro | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 1027 | 07/21/11 | O. Ribeiro | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 1028 | 07/21/11 | O. Ribeiro | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 1029 | 07/21/11 | O. Ribeiro | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 1030 | 07/21/11 | C. Knowles | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 1031 | 07/21/11 | C. Knowles | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 1032 | 07/21/11 | C. Knowles | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 1033 | 07/21/11 | C. Knowles | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 1034 | 07/21/11 | P. Kresser | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and | |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of August 12, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 1035 | 07/21/11 | P. Kresser | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 1036 | 07/21/11 | P. Kresser | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 1037 | 07/21/11 | P. Kresser | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 1038 | 07/21/11 | G. Leach | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 1039 | 07/21/11 | G. Leach | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 1040 | 07/21/11 | G. Leach | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 1041 | 07/21/11 | G. Leach | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 1042 | 07/21/11 | J. Helmiere | BAPS | III.D | Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats. | |
| 1043 | 07/21/11 | J. Helmiere | BAPS | III.B | Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants. | |
| 1044 | 07/21/11 | J. Helmiere | BAPS | III.G | Provide abundant and appropriate public access to the shoreline in a way that does not harm the ecosystem. | |
| 1045 | 07/21/11 | J. Helmiere | BAPS | V.D, E, H, J, K, and L | Responsibly address new development to protect ecological function, public access, and safety. | |
| 1046 | 07/25/11 | E. Lockert | Waterfront property owner | | We request that COBI efforts to protect the shoreline use the “no net loss” standard and not rezone 40$ of shoreline to | |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of August 12, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Residential Conservancy. | |
| 1047 | 07/25/11 | E. Lockert | Waterfront property owner | | Do not apply vegetation buffers to existing developments making then nonconforming and continue to authorize bulkheads to protect both yards and homes. | |
| 1048 | 07/26/11 | K. Sethney<br>A. Tawresey<br>J. Bomben<br>A. Mueller | Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners/ workgroup members | General | We spent too much time on goals and policies and too little time working on actual regulations. There was not time for an iterative process, where once we could see what the policies or goals looked like in a regulation, they could be revisited and tweaked. | |
| 1049 | 07/26/11 | K. Sethney<br>A. Tawresey<br>J. Bomben<br>A. Mueller | Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners/ workgroup members | Designations | We support criteria that results in a map that leaves most residential uses in the Shoreline Residential designation. | |
| 1050 | 07/26/11 | K. Sethney<br>A. Tawresey<br>J. Bomben<br>A. Mueller | Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners/ workgroup members | | We support making all single family residences conforming with regulations that would allow rebuilding and expansion similar to what would be allowed under the current SMP> | |
| 1051 | 07/26/11 | K. Sethney<br>A. Tawresey<br>J. Bomben<br>A. Mueller | Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners/ workgroup members | | We support leaving the shoreline buffers at the same distance from OWHM [ordinary high water mark] that they are under the current SMP and allowing a larger square footage for the building under a reasonable use exception. | |
| 1052 | 07/26/11 | K. Sethney<br>A. Tawresey<br>J. Bomben<br>A. Mueller | Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners/ workgroup members | | The no net loss standard can be achieved through voluntary mitigation, public shoreline restoration and mitigation banking. | |
| 1053 | 07/26/11 | K. Sethney<br>A. Tawresey | Bainbridge Shoreline | | We support allowing shoreline armoring to protect existing development with | |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of August 12, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | J. Bomben<br>A. Mueller | Homeowners/ workgroup members | | requirements to mitigate as much as possible the impacts. | |
| 1054 | 07/26/11 | K. Sethney<br>A. Tawresey<br>J. Bomben<br>A. Mueller | Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners/ workgroup members | General | We support establishing a region-wide board of qualified, Northwest based, salt-water scientists who can review and critique any science that is used to promulgate shoreline regulations. | |
| 1055 | 07/26/11 | K. Sethney<br>A. Tawresey<br>J. Bomben<br>A. Mueller | Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners/ workgroup members | General | We support taking a second look at the regulations to see what of the current SMP can be retained under the DOE Guidelines and removing as many as possible of the proposed new regulations that beyond the current SMP. | |
| 1056 | 07/26/11 | K. Sethney<br>A. Tawresey<br>J. Bomben<br>A. Mueller | Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners/ workgroup members | General | We suggest that the Planning Commission and the City Council take time to consider what these regulations will do on the ground, what their basis in science is, and how they will help to achieve the goal of the Shoreline Management Act – to balance the rights of private property ownership with protection of the environment. | |
| 1057 | 07/27/11 | W. Daley | Citizen/ workgroup member | General | There was a spirit of willingness [in the workgroups] to get the job done correctly. We did not always agree unanimously but on all issues with the exception of the actual map of shoreline designations we had a majority vote and most issues it was unanimous. | |
| 1058 | 07/27/11 | W. Daley | Citizen/ workgroup member | General | We have altered the shorelines so severely with bulkheads and created a toxic environment with the chemicals we use in our yards, that life along the shoreline is no longer able to support a healthy population | |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of August 12, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | of salmon or many other important saltwater species. There is science showing us the young salmon are dying in Puget Sound and never reaching the ocean to grow and return as the beautiful creatures they have become over millions of year. | |
| 1059 | 07/28/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | General | To increase public participation and so the public's comments may be considered during the meeting, public comments should be taken at the beginning of the meeting rather than at the end. | |
| 1060 | 07/28/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | Process | Because staff has not been honest brokers in the process, disregarded shoreline property owners input in favor of their predetermined goals, and acted as a special interest lobbying group, the City Council should reject the policies and regulations and begin the process over again in an honest matter. | |
| 1061 | 07/28/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | General | Homeowners try to live as lightly on the land as possible and it is unfair nad unrealistic to compare developed property with a nature preserve. | |
| 1062 | 07/28/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | Science | The Herrera buffer science memo just released lists all the beneficial attributes of a natural shoreline and undeveloped uplands, and from this it suggests creating buffers of 35- to 150-foot around the entire island for wildlife habitat and open space. | |
| 1063 | 08/01/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | Designations map | The Shoreline Designation Map and particularly the Conservancy and Natural Designations are not the product of the Citizen Workgroup. | The shoreline designation map was based on the designation criteria and mapping rules that were adopted by the SMP Task Force. Although the Task Force did not adopt the map, all but one member agreed that it accurately reflects the criteria that they |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of August 12, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | developed. |
| 1064 | 08/01/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | Process | Presenting the Designations map before and separate from the regulations does not allow the Planning Commission and City Council to consider the large and broad impacts this will have on the shoreline properties and uses. | |
| 1065 | 08/01/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | | Conservancy and Natural designations will make more properties and residential uses nonconforming. | |
| 1066 | 08/01/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | | Conservancy and Natural designations will restrict or prohibit standard water dependent uses, such as stairs, boating, swim rafts, waterskiing, docks, decks, and boathouses. | |
| 1067 | 08/01/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | | Conservancy and Natural designations will justify larger buffers. | Conservancy and Natural designations include the most ecologically fragile areas within the City's jurisdiction and need more protection from degradation. |
| 1068 | 08/01/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | | Conservancy and Natural designations will make existing bulkheads and docks nonconforming and prevent their repair or replacement. | |
| 1069 | 08/01/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | Designations | Use three shoreline designations: a. Urban b. Shoreline residential c. Natural (for very sensitive and unique areas) | |
| 1070 | 08/01/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | Designations | Don't approve any shoreline designations or map until it can be analyzed in conjunction with the regulations. | |
| 1071 | 08/01/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | Process | Before approving any shoreline designations, inform in writing those whose property will be affected and what the new restrictions on their property will be. | |
| 1072 | 08/04/11 | A. Tawresey | Bainbridge | Process | The Planning Commission and Council | |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of August 12, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Shoreline Homeowners | | must consider the map and the regulations together. | |
| 1073 | 08/04/11 | A. Tawresey | Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners | | Properties containing existing, lawfully built residential structures must not be included in a shoreline Conservancy designation since state law clearly states that new regulations are intended to apply to future development and changes in land use. | |
| 1074 | 08/04/11 | A. Tawresey | Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners | | Wide vegetation buffers required in Residential Conservancy designations should not apply to existing homes. | |
| 1075 | 08/04/11 | A. Tawresey | Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners | | The Planning Commission and City Council should recommend that all shorelines with existing lawfully built residential structures should be designated Residential with a buffer equal to the buffer under the current SMP unless it can be proven that there is a severe threat of harm to public health, safety, or the environment on an individual property. | |
| 1076 | 08/04/11 | R. Valentine | Shoreline owner | Designations | I'd support a three-designation system: Urban, Shoreline Residential, and Natural. | |
| 1077 | 08/04/11 | P. Moldon | Shoreline owner | General | Is the taking of our property rights give us a tax deduction as being deprived if the bulkhead was destroyed? | Comment forwarded to City Council and Planning Commission. |
| 1078 | 08/04/11 | D. DuMont | Citizen | Process | I am alarmed and disheartened by the way the employees at city hall seem to be directing the update for the shoreline management regulations, rather than accepting direction from shoreline property owners and the city council, which, I believe, is supposed to be directing the city hall employees on behalf of the citizens of Bainbridge Island. | |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of August 12, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1079 | 08/04/11 | D. DuMont | Citizen | General | Please reconsider the draconian plans currently being presented concerning shoreline management, and put plans in place that will be inclusive of property owners and reasonable use of their land. | |
| 1080 | 08/04/11 | A. Moser-Wellman | Shoreline owner | | I don't see how you can apply buffers to existing development, now or when and if we need to rebuild our bulkhead. | |
| 1081 | 08/04/11 | A. Moser-Wellman | Shoreline owner | | If all these homes are labeled nonconforming, property values will go down on resale. | |
| 1082 | 08/04/11 | A. Moser-Wellman | Shoreline owner | Process | I suspect that at least 7% of shoreline home owners are not aware of what is at stake here for them personally. | |
| 1083 | 08/04/11 | D. King | Shoreline owner | Designations | Use three shoreline designations: Urban, Shoreline Residential, and Natural. | |
| 1084 | 08/04/11 | D. King | Shoreline owner | Process | Don't approve any shoreline designations or map until it can be analyzed in conjunction with the regulations. | |
| 1085 | 08/04/11 | D. King | Shoreline owner | Process | Before approving any shoreline designations, inform in writing those whose property will be affected and what the new restrictions on their property will be. | |
| 1086 | 08/04/11 | E. Wright | Workgroup member | Designations | The designations and buffers attached to them represent a significant compromise by the City and environmental advocates responding to pressure from property rights advocates on the Vegetation Committee and the Task Force. | |
| 1087 | 08/04/11 | E. Wright | Workgroup member | Buffers | Native Vegetation Zone buffers (currently called the Riparian Protection Zone or RPZ) have been reduced from 50' to 30' for the majority of the island, including bot6h the Shoreline Residential and | |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of August 12, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Shoreline Residential Conservancy designations. | |
| 1088 | 08/04/11 | E. Wright | Workgroup member | Buffers | The policy to minimize nonconforming property designations protects property rights at the expense of the overall goal of the SMP – protection of our marine natural resources. | |
| 1089 | 08/04/11 | E. Wright | Workgroup member | Buffers | Buffers would be extended farther than 30' for the Shoreline Residential Conservancy designation only in locations where native vegetation already exists, and only when a property is developed or re-developed. | |
| 1090 | 08/04/11 | E. Wright | Workgroup member | Buffers | The majority of the responsibility for no net loss will be borne by public parks and community shorelines. | |
| 1091 | 08/04/11 | E. Wright | Workgroup member | Designations | I believe the shoreline designations are fair, and have made after considerable marine geologic, geographic and ecological analysis. | |
| 1092 | 08/04/11 | E. Wright | Workgroup member | Buffers | The buffer designations attached to these designations are minimally restrictive. | |
| 1093 | 08/04/11 | M. Bice | Shoreline owner | Site-specific designation question | [An area west of the North-Western mouth of Port Madison ay and extending to County Park] consists of low bank waterfront homes, most within 50 feet of the shoreline and with existing bulkheads and almost zero native vegetation. I request that the Shoreline Residential classification that is shown at Port Madison Bay be extended to the County Park boundary. | |
| 1094 | 08/04/11 | D. and B. Armstrong | Shoreline owner | Nonconforming | Property owners should be allowed to maintain structures, including buildings, bulkheads and docks, that were conforming when built. | |
| 1095 | 08/04/11 | D. and B. | Shoreline owner | General | We have not seen a discussion of the tax | |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of August 12, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Armstrong | | | consequences of the proposed SMP and believe that a change in shoreline regulation that goes beyond what is required by the state without consideration of the impact on local tax revenues is short-sighted. | |
| 1096 | 08/04/11 | D. and B. Armstrong | Shoreline owner | General | If shoreline property owners are to understand and support the Bainbridge Island SMP, they must understand what the WA SMP Guidelines require and how they apply to their property. | |
| 1097 | 08/04/11 | G. Tulou | Shoreline owner | Process | We have just watched part of the meeting and the public comment section of your meeting tonight August 4th. We found the information confusing and cause for concern. | |
| 1098 | 08/04/11 | G. Tulou | Shoreline owner | Designations | Could you please explain the proposed shoreline designations map so that citizens, including homeowners, can analyze it and read the regulations? | |
| 1099 | 08/04/11 | G. Tulou | Shoreline owner | Process | Could we make this process more transparent and open to public input please. | |
| 1100 | 08/04/11 | D. Armstrong | Shoreline owner | Process | I am concerned about the lack of information the SMP process, and lack of public information on the impact on property values and the tax base. If property owners are to support the SMP, they must be a part of its development. | |
| 1101 | 08/05/11 | M. Halvorsen | Shoreline owner | Process | It is time for Waterfront Property Owners to let the Bainbridge Island City Council know that we will not allow our constitutionally protected property rights to be usurped by out of control city staffers as we ll as out of control DOE employees. | |
| 1102 | 08/08/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge | Science | Don Flora, PHD, has reviewed the science | |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of August 12, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Citizens | | offered by the City and found it lacking. | |
| 1103 | 08/08/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | Science | It is inappropriate to use buffer science from: (1) agriculture, feedlots, and logging; (2) the Midwest and East where they experience heavy rains during the summer months; and (3) logging near the headwaters of streams. | |
| 1104 | 08/08/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | Buffers | Residential buffers won't increase the the abundance of salmon, cod, herring, surf smelt, kelp, or eelgrass. | |
| 1105 | 08/08/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | Vegetation | Grass is the best mediator of residential stormwater, chemicals and stabilizers. | |
| 1106 | 08/08/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | Buffers | 80% of pollutants are restrained in the first 16 feet. | |
| 1107 | 08/08/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | Vegetation | There is no advantage requiring native species. | |
| 1108 | 08/08/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | Vegetation | Trees on near slopes create a hazard. | |
| 1109 | 08/08/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | General | On Bainbridge there is no correlation between residential uses and the health of the beach. | |
| 1110 | 08/08/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | Process | Could we please have public comments at the beginning of the Planning Comission meetings and study sessions so the public's comments could be considered by the commissioners and council members during their discussions. | |
| 1111 | 08/08/11 | A. Tawresey | Shoreline owner | General | Think about the human face of the decision to create larger buffers, place more shoreline homes into conservancy status and make a lot more properties nonconforming. | |
| 1112 | 08/09/11 | B. Henshaw | Shoreline owner | Site-specific | To suggest that our community at Agate Point which has been developed for 75 plus years should now be placed into a | |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of August 12, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | zoning of residential conservancy does not make any sense at all. | |
| 1113 | 08/09/11 | B. Henshaw | Shoreline owner | General | There is no rationale for increasing buffer sizes, planting native vegetation, eliminating bulkheads, planting shade trees, etc. and that has been conclusively provide to be erroneous. | |
| 1114 | 08/09/11 | B. Henshaw | Shoreline owner | Designations | I respectfully request that you consider three shoreline designations and they are urban, shoreline residential and natural for sensitive areas. | |
| 1115 | 08/09/11 | R. & C. Albrecht | Shoreline owner | Petition | We urge our City's Planning Commission and City Council to adopt a Shoreline Master Program that follows state law while protecting the environment and our property rights. | |
| 1116 | 08/11/11 | M. Whalen | Citizen | Buffers | It is apparent by now that the proposed shoreline buffer and vegetation regulations are more restrictive than necessary to meet the State's SMP guidelines. Why is that? | |
| 1117 | 08/11/11 | M. Whalen | Citizen | Buffers | I believe that Port Townsend provides a precedent that is worthy of consideration and should be part of the discussion. | |
| 1118 | 08/11/11 | M. Whalen | Citizen | Buffers | Make existing shoreline development categorically exempt from regulations that require restoration of multi-storied native plantings as a condition of future modifications, alterations or additions. | |
| 1119 | 08/11/11 | M. Whalen | Citizen | Buffers | Provide a package of incentives to encourage voluntary implement shoreline restoration. | |
| 1120 | 08/11/11 | L. Macchio<br>F. Stowell<br>M. Dawson<br>B. Taft | Bainbridge Alliance for Puget Sound | Process | We support the City's citizen committee approach to this process because we think it has succeeded in attaining its main goal : using a collaborative process to develop | |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of August 12, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | policies with the right mix of protections for the shoreline environment, public access, and private property rights. | |
| 1121 | 08/11/11 | L. Macchio<br>F. Stowell<br>M. Dawson<br>B. Taft | Bainbridge Alliance for Puget Sound | Nonconforming | The concept of "nonconforming" actually protects property owners by exempting them from some of the newer, tougher requirements; it does not rob them of value. | |
| 1122 | 08/11/11 | L. Macchio<br>F. Stowell<br>M. Dawson<br>B. Taft | Bainbridge Alliance for Puget Sound | Buffers | In order to protect and maintain all shoreline functions, not just the water quality function, buffers need to be wider than 30 feet. | |
| 1123 | 08/11/11 | L. Macchio<br>F. Stowell<br>M. Dawson<br>B. Taft | Bainbridge Alliance for Puget Sound | Vegetation | We support the emphasis on the use of native vegetation. Although the approach of allowing alternatives to planting native species was in our previous SMP, we believe that the allowance adds an additional and unnecessary burden on both the applicant and the city staff. | |
| 1124 | 08/11/11 | L. Macchio<br>F. Stowell<br>M. Dawson<br>B. Taft | Bainbridge Alliance for Puget Sound | Buffers | What have a policy saying setbacks should minimize how many properties are nonconforming? That's like saying we can just go on doing more of what we've been doing. | |
| 1125 | 08/11/11 | L. Macchio<br>F. Stowell<br>M. Dawson<br>B. Taft | Bainbridge Alliance for Puget Sound | Vegetation | A common, re-appearing error is the use of the wording "natives trees and shrubs" without also including native ground cover. | |
| 1126 | 08/11/11 | L. Macchio<br>F. Stowell<br>M. Dawson<br>B. Taft | Bainbridge Alliance for Puget Sound | General | We support the use of terms that everyone can understand. | |
| 1127 | 08/11/11 | L. Macchio<br>F. Stowell<br>M. Dawson | Bainbridge Alliance for Puget Sound | Vegetation | Section 3(a) should be deleted.. We note that it has not been demonstrated that non-native plants do or do not provide all of the | |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of August 12, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | B. Taft | | | functions equivalent to those of native plants. | |
| 1128 | 08/11/11 | L. Macchio<br>F. Stowell<br>M. Dawson<br>B. Taft | Bainbridge Alliance for Puget Sound | General | We have concerns about allowing the use of pesticides and fertilizers in the RPZ. | |
| 1129 | 08/11/11 | L. Macchio<br>F. Stowell<br>M. Dawson<br>B. Taft | Bainbridge Alliance for Puget Sound | Parks | We support the idea that shoreline parks must be developed in accord with a publicly accessible design process and that the plans must meet the no-net-loss standard with mitigation sequencing. | |
| 1130 | 08/11/11 | L. Macchio<br>F. Stowell<br>M. Dawson<br>B. Taft | Bainbridge Alliance for Puget Sound | Vegetation | The plan should require the use of appropriate native plants for all layers of vegetation including native ground covers. | |
| 1131 | 08/11/11 | L. Macchio<br>F. Stowell<br>M. Dawson<br>B. Taft | Bainbridge Alliance for Puget Sound | Vegetation | While the city may conclude that gaining 65 percent coverage of the shoreline with natives trees, shrubs, and ground covers is good enough, this certainly should not be the limit, or even the goal. We suggest adding “at least” before each reference to 65 percent coverage. | |
| 1132 | 08/11/11 | L. Macchio<br>F. Stowell<br>M. Dawson<br>B. Taft | Bainbridge Alliance for Puget Sound | Vegetation | At a minimum, the wording of section 4 should state that a building may go into an expanded RPZ only if there is no other feasible option. | |
| 1133 | 08/11/11 | L. Macchio<br>F. Stowell<br>M. Dawson<br>B. Taft | Bainbridge Alliance for Puget Sound | Vegetation | The replacement ratio should depend on the quality of the habitat being disturbed. | |
| 1134 | 08/11/11 | L. Macchio<br>F. Stowell<br>M. Dawson<br>B. Taft | Bainbridge Alliance for Puget Sound | Vegetation | After 65% of the RPZ is covered with native tree and native shrub canopy, shouldn’t there be the option of planting the remaining 35% OR moving on the more landward zone? | |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of August 12, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1135 | 08/11/11 | L. Macchio<br>F. Stowell<br>M. Dawson<br>B. Taft | Bainbridge Alliance for Puget Sound | Vegetation | For clarity and to make sure the mitigation helps the shoreline, we suggest changing "on the applicant's property outside of the SSB" to read "elsewhere on the applicant's property, but within the 200-foot shoreline jurisdiction." | |
| 1136 | 08/11/11 | L. Macchio<br>F. Stowell<br>M. Dawson<br>B. Taft | Bainbridge Alliance for Puget Sound | Structure Setback Line | For clarity, we suggest changing this to read, "Where there are no primary residential structures on abutting properties, the standard setbacks apply." | |
| 1137 | 08/11/11 | L. Macchio<br>F. Stowell<br>M. Dawson<br>B. Taft | Bainbridge Alliance for Puget Sound | Clearing and grading | We especially support the prohibition on speculative clearing and grading. Please retain wording that allows these activities only in conjunction with an approved development plan. | |
| 1138 | 08/11/11 | D. Devin | Shoreline owner | Designations | We urge that no action be taken to designate the Sand Spit lagoon as a conservancy area until all affected property owners are given timely notice in writing of the need for such a designation and its full ramifications. | |
| 1139 | 08/11/11 | G. Tripp | Bainbridge Citizens | Designations | The conservancy designation brings with it larger shoreline buffers and the presumption that the areas are "not generally suitable for water-dependent uses" such as docks, floats, boathouses, and would place more restrictions on other uses including stairs, decks, and bulkheads. It is wrong to classify previously developed property as Conservancy and restrict water—dependent uses. | |
| 1140 | 08/11/11 | K. Struzzieri | Citizen | Designation | I strongly oppose the Shoreline designations in the SMP. This proposal damages not only property values and | |

| | Date | Name | Interest | Section | Comment | Response as of August 12, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | basic recreational usage, but is further casting outrage against the government for their obvious need toward complete control. | |