	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
1	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>
2	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."
3	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.
4	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.
5	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.
6	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.
7	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.

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
8	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.
9	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.
10	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.
11	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 benefits of bulkheads.	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. 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.
12	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.
13	04/26/11	G. Rees	Citizen	Designations	If the stated goal is no net loss, then why	Preliminary mapping has been done based on

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
					are so many more miles of shoreline designated Conservancy in the new plan?	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.
14	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.
15	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.
16	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.
17	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.
18	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.
19	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.
20	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	This is a site-specific issue. ETAC is discussing feeder bluff issues.

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
					clay which sloughs into large slabs.	
21	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.
22	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. 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.
23	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.
24	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.
25	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.
26	07/12/10	Paul & June	Shoreline owners	General	No one has considered the destruction	Ship wakes are not within the jurisdictional

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
		Raker			that is happening daily on the ecology of our tidelands from the wake of high-speed container ships	purview of the City.
27	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.
28	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
29	02/25/11	M.C. Halvorsen	Shoreline owner	General	The people who worked on this do not own waterfront property and do not have a nodding acquaintance with admiralty law.	There are waterfront property owners among 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.
30	03/28/11	M.C. Halvorsen	Shoreline owner	General	The City of Bainbridge Island is doing more harm than good with its excessive, biased, and unscientific proposals.	Comment noted.
31	03/31/11	A.G. Greiner	Shoreline owner	General	RCW 90.58.100 requires that 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.	The RCW refers to considering economics 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

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
						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.
32	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.
33	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 perceived deficiencies in the current Shoreline Master Program and point out how the draft policies address these deficiencies.	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).
34	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.

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
35	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.
36	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.
37	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.
38	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

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
						prescriptive and flexible options are being considered.
39	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.
40	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.
41	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.
42	04/25/11	C. Smith	Citizen	General	Making legally built existing structures nonconforming is fundamentally wrong. It will lower home values and property tax revenues. It will also significantly increase litigation against the city, which we can ill afford.	Comment noted.
43	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
44	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 homeowners were represented, but totally outnumbered by other “stakeholders” who are not impacted by the resulting ordinance.	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
						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.*
45	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.
46	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.
47	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.
48	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.
49	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.
50	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.
51	04/25/11	T. Sultan	Shoreline owner	General	What we on the Island don't need is	See response to comment #207.

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
					another messy and drawn-out battle like the one we had a few years back on the same issue.	
52	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.
53	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 residences and their appurtenant structures. RCW 90.58.020
54	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.
55	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.
56	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 currently available and relevant to Bainbridge Island.
57	04/26/11	D. Flora	Citizen	General	At a policy level, we obviously need to	Comment noted.

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
					know what changes we are trying to forestall, if only because there are various ways of getting there.	
58	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.
59	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.
60	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.
61	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.
62	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.
63	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	The notice process and procedures are laid out in the Public Participation Plan which was developed through a public process.

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
					reaches only a fraction of the shoreline property owners, but to properly inform those most affected.	
64	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.
65	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.*)
66	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.
67	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	Comment noted.

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
					improvement to the shoreline.	
68	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.
69	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.
70	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.
71	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.
72	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 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.	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. The draft Shoreline Master Program will go through numerous legal reviews, including the Department of Ecology approval process.
73	04/26/11	K. Marshall	Shoreline owner	General	I would not allow my 2nd and 3rd grade students to accept the "scientific	See response to comment #302.

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
					evidence" as the COBI has so gleefully done that does not live up to scrutiny on the Island's shorelines.	
74	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 policies are based on the best scientific data that is currently available and relevant to Bainbridge Island.
75	04/26/11	M. Sebastian	Shoreline owner	General	I object to the draft policies because they go against the SMA.	Comment noted.
76	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.
77	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.
78	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.
79	04/26/11	V. Chesterley	Citizen	General	Please think carefully about the impact to humans as well as sea creatures.	Comment noted.
80	04/26/11	W. Harper	Shoreline owner	General	As an active member of our broader community, I'm concerned that some of	Comment noted.

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
					the proposed goals and policies will create a deeply contentious and litigious atmosphere and risk impeding progress toward shared environmental goals.	
81	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 cookie-cutter community.	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.
82	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.
83	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
84	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 citizens?	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. 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.
85	06/20/11	P. Whitener	Bainbridge	General	Staff off my property!	Comment noted.

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
			Citizens			
86	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.
87	06/21/11	M. Ferm	Citizen	General	As a Bainbridge Island resident, I support strong safeguards for shorelines.	Comment noted.
88	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.
89	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.
90	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.
91	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.
92	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	The draft SMP will meet the requirements of WAC 176.23, the Guidelines.

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
					public waters.	
93	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.
94	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.
95	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.
96	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 nonconforming and their front yards are about to be converted into Open Space (Vegetation Management and Conservation Zones).	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

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
						participate in the Task Force. *Please see the 2011 Shoreline Master Program Update – Citizen Committees page for more information.*
97	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.
98	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.
99	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.
100	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 residences and their appurtenant structures. RCW 90.58.020
101	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.
102	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.
103	04/25/11	A. Greiner	Shoreline owner	III.1.c	Substitute "SSWS" for "shoreline".	Comment noted.

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
104	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.
105	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."
106	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.
107	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.
108	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

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
						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.
109	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.
110	04/26/11	D. Flora	Citizen	III.B	At the policy level we should consider the current status of shoreline biota and whether habitats are really in flux.	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.
111	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.
112	04/26/11	D. Flora	Citizen	III.B	It seems wholly prudent to leave vegetation decisions up to owners,	See response to comment #245.

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
					landscapers, garden experts, entomologists and pathologists.	
113	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.
114	04/26/11	D. Flora	Citizen	III.B	Imposing view corridors on residences is an incredible intrusion.	See response to comment #245.
115	04/26/11	D. Flora	Citizen	III.B	Structural functions do not depend on species nativeness.	See response to comment #245.
116	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.
117	04/26/11	E. Wright	Workgroup member	III.B	Please maintain or strengthen the Native Vegetation Management/ Conservation zones.	Comment noted.
118	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 the 50 foot buffer of the current Shoreline Master Program.	See response to comment #271.
119	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.
120	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

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
						net loss of ecological functions. That baseline is from the date of our shoreline characterization (2009 data).
121	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.
122	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.
123	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.
124	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.
125	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.
126	06/20/11	N. Keegel	Citizen	III.B	Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants.	See response to comment #410.

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
127	06/20/11	C. Pardy	Citizen	III.B	Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants.	See response to comment #410.
128	06/20/11	B. Trafton	Citizen	III.B	Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants.	See response to comment #410.
129	06/20/11	E. Wright	Citizen	III.B	Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants.	See response to comment #410.
130	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.
131	06/20/11	G. Brewer	Citizen	III.B	Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants.	See response to comment #431.
132	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.
133	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.
134	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.
135	06/21/11	C. Hunter	Citizen	III.B	Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants.	See response to comment #457.
136	06/21/11	P. Conrad	Citizen	III.B	Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants.	See response to comment #457.
137	06/21/11	D. Spoor	Citizen	III.B	Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants.	See response to comment #457.

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
138	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.
139	06/21/11	M. McCabe	Citizen	III.B	Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants.	See response to comment #473.
140	06/21/11	L. Macchio	Citizen	III.B	Protect existing natural vegetation and promote the planting of native plants.	See response to comment #473.
141	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 almost certainly increase the hardships encountered by existing homeowners trying to maintain or improve their properties, far beyond the already stringent standards.	Policies related to buffers and residential development are intended to both protect shoreline ecology and accommodate existing single-family residences on the shoreline.
142	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.
143	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.
144	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.

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
145	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.
146	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.
147	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.
148	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.
149	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

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
						baseline condition, proposed development, and proposed mitigation measures to offset any impacts.
150	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.
151	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 studies to prove that added property and vegetation are needed for survival of sea life.	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 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.
152	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.
153	04/25/11	J. Sweeney	Citizen	III.B., III.L, V.K	I'm told you are contemplating the establishment of a "Shoreline Vegetation Conservation and Management Zone	The citizen committees will make recommendations on regulations for vegetation buffer sizes and how existing

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
					which would make every existing shoreline use a nonconforming usage. Is that correct? Why	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.
154	04/25/11	A. Greiner	Shoreline owner	III.B.2-4	Please show studies applicable to Puget 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 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.
155	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.
156	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.
157	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.

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
158	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.
159	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.
160	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.
161	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.
162	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.
163	04/26/11	V. Chesterley	Citizen	III.B.6	Since the standard is "no net loss" from	The no net loss standard is derived from the

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
					the date of adoption of the updated Shoreline Master Program, leaving the current 50' buffer in place ensures "no net loss."	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.
164	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.
165	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.
166	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.
167	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.
168	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.
169	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.
170	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.
171	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.
172	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.
173	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.
174	04/27/11	Bainbridge	Bainbridge	III.B6	Leave the current 50 foot buffer in place	See response to comment #361.

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
		Shoreline Homeowners	Shoreline Homeowners		in the update. There is no peer-reviewed scientific evidence that shows by simply requiring a larger buffer, shoreline function will improve.	
175	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.
176	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.
177	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.
178	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.
179	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.
180	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.
181	06/20/11	B. Trafton	Citizen	III.D	Protect critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and critical saltwater habitats.	See response to comment #411.
182	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.

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
183	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.
184	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.
185	06/21/11	M. Ferm	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.
186	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 those policies are currently being drafted by the citizen committees.
187	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.
188	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.
189	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.
190	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.
191	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.

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
192	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.
193	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 enactment of this Shoreline Master Program."	Comment noted.
194	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.
195	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.
196	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.
197	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.
198	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.
199	04/01/11	M.C. Halvorsen	Shoreline owner	III.G	As the city gives access, it acquires the 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.	Protecting the public's right to access and use the shoreline are goals of both the Shoreline Management Act and the Shoreline Master Program.

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
200	06/07/11	S. Neff	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.
201	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.
202	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.
203	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.
204	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.
205	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.
206	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.
207	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.
208	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.
209	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.

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
210	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.
211	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.
212	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.
213	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.
214	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.
215	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.
216	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.
217	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.
218	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.
219	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

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
						visual.
220	04/25/11	A. Greiner	Shoreline owner	III.G.10	Delete the second sentence – its meaning is contained in the first.	Comment noted.
221	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.
222	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.
223	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.
224	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.
225	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.
226	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.
227	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.
228	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.

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
229	04/25/11	A. Greiner	Shoreline owner	III.G.8	Replace "minimize impacts" with "prevent impacts" before "private property."	Comment noted.
230	02/25/11	M.C. Halvorsen	Shoreline owner	III.G.9	This is too restrictive.	Comment noted.
231	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.
232	04/25/11	A. Greiner	Shoreline owner	III.H. Purpose	The first sentence needs editing for clarity.	Comment noted.
233	04/25/11	A. Greiner	Shoreline owner	III.H.1.b	Add "which affect SSWS" at the end of the first sentence.	Comment noted.
234	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.
235	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.
236	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.
237	02/25/11	M.C. Halvorsen	Shoreline owner	III.H.5	Already covered in Section III	Comment noted.
238	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.
239	02/25/11	M.C.	Shoreline owner	III.J.	Bulkheads can prevent erosion.	Agreed.

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
		Halvorsen				
240	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.
241	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.
242	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.
243	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.
244	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.
245	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,

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
						and industrial activities.
246	01/14/11	John Nute	Shoreline owner	III.L	Many of these provisions and regulations 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").	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.
247	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.
248	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.
249	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

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
						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.
250	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 decision on how nonconforming uses and structures will be regulated.
251	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.
252	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

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
						nonconforming uses and structures, while the City Council will make the final decision on how nonconforming uses and structures will be regulated.
253	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.
254	04/25/11	A. Greiner	Shoreline owner	III.L	Please change this title to "Legally Existing Development"	Comment noted.
255	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.
256	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).
257	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,

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
						and industrial activities
258	04/26/11	B. Peters	Councilmember	III.L	Eliminate the goal of "phasing out uses."	Comment noted.
259	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.
260	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.
261	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.
262	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.
263	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

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
						nonconformity.
264	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.
265	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.
266	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.
267	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.
268	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.
269	04/26/11	J. Grundman	Shoreline owner	III.L	At its most simple interpretation, this provision makes the eventual confiscation of our property without any compensation the stated goal of this program.	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

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
						City Council will make the final decision on how nonconforming uses and structures will be regulated.
270	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 structures will be regulated.
271	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.
272	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.
273	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.
274	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.

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
275	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 enlarging the non-water side of the home by a few feet.	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.
276	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.
277	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.
278	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
279	04/27/11	R. Holmgren	Shoreline owner	III.L	I am once again appalled at the proposed shoreline plan that you are considering,	Nonconforming means that the use or structure does not conform to the existing

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
					particularly the concept of making most of our waterfront homes "non-conforming."	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.
280	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
281	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.
282	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,

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
						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.
283	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.
284	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.
285	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.
286	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.
287	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 those rights to it.	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.
288	04/04/11	Ken Sethney, on behalf of the Board of Directors	Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners	III.L.	Mortgage lenders don't like nonconforming homes. City staff passed along a recommendation to change the references to "nonconforming" to "pre-existing." It is unknown, but highly unlikely, that lenders will confuse the true meaning of the term.	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.
289	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.
290	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.
291	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

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
						VII.K.1.b)
292	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.
293	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.
294	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.
295	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)
296	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.
297	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

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
						structures will be regulated.
298	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.
299	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.
300	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.
301	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.
302	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

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
						designation criteria and the designation map are in the preliminary draft phase and will be released soon. There will be opportunities for direct public input during Planning Commission and City Council review.
303	04/26/11	K. Wirthlin	Shoreline owner	IV	Object to a dramatic increase in Conservancy designation	See response to comment #316.
304	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.
305	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.
306	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 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 .
307	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

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
						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.
308	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.
309	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.
310	04/26/11	B. Peters	Councilmember	Mitigation	Please state more clearly in the policies 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.	Comment noted. The measurement of "no net loss" will be based on a site specific analysis of the existing baseline conditions, proposed development, and proposed mitigation measures to offset any impacts.
311	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

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
						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
312	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.
313	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.
314	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 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.
315	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	All comments are considered, posted on the web and provided to both the Planning Commission and City Council to be

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
					been answered.	considered during their deliberation of the Shoreline Master Program Update.
316	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.
317	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
318	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.
319	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.
320	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

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
						adoption. The Department of Ecology will also hold a public hearing and accept comments.
321	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.
322	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.
323	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
324	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

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
						to the Dept. of Ecology for review and approval.
325	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.
326	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.
327	06/15/11	G. Tripp	Bainbridge Citizens	Process	The SMP update deadline must be moved to 2012 to allow proper public participation and consideration by the City Council.	See response to comment #398.
328	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.
329	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.

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
330	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.
331	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.
332	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.
333	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.
334	09/20/10	Richard Nerf	Physicist	Science	Of the more than 20 possible regressions of ecological functions vs. stressors or 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.	Comment noted.
335	9/20/10	Richard Nerf	Physicist	Science	I am <u>not</u> claiming that it represents direct	Comment noted.

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
					man-made influence on the near-shore ecology.	
336	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.
337	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 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.
338	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 hypotheses.	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)
339	04/26/11	C. March	Shoreline owner	Science	As a scientist by training and being an 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.	The State Shoreline Master Program 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.
340	04/26/11	E. Dailey	Citizen	Science	I am concerned that the City is not	The City is utilizing current science to update

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
					relying on the best available science in developing the Shoreline Master Program as recommended in the guidelines.	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.
341	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 relevant to Bainbridge Island.
342	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.
343	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.
344	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.
345	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.
346	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.)*
347	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.
348	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

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
						opportunities for public involvement remain the process as the Planning Commission and City Council review .
349	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 Harbor being resdesignated as Residential Conservancy] represent a risk to the health of Puget Sound.	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.
350	02/25/11	M.C. Halvorsen	Shoreline owner	Sec. III	This whole section is overkill (over-regulation).	Comment noted.
351	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.
352	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.
353	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	This site is no longer being considered for lease.

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
					significant marine usage and may in fact violate shoreline use laws. The permitting would be extraordinary.	
354	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.
355	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.
356	9/21/10	John Grinter	Boater; Coast Guard	V.D	Increase public moorings/dockage in the city pier area.	See response to comment #12.
357	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.
358	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.
359	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 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.
360	06/20/11	N. Keegel	Citizen	V.D, E, H, J,	Responsibly address new commercial	See response to comment #413.

	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.	
361	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.
362	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.
363	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.
364	06/20/11	J. Runyan	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.
365	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.
366	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.

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
367	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.
368	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.
369	06/21/11	P. Conrad	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.
370	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.
371	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 access and use the shoreline.
372	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.
373	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	See response to comment #476.

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
					access and safety.	
374	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.
375	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.
376	02/25/11	M.C. Halvorsen	Shoreline owner	V.D.4	This is overreaching and too broad.	Comment noted.
377	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.
378	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 provide for public access, both physical and visual.
379	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.
380	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.
381	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.
382	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.
383	04/25/11	A. Greiner	Shoreline owner	V.K	Please change this heading to "New	These regulations also apply to the

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
					Residential Development" and make appropriate word changes within the text to reflect this section applies only to new development.	modification or expansion of existing residential development.
384	04/25/11	G. Tripp	Bainbridge Citizens	V.K	The draft does not promote or protect single-family homes as a preferred 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, 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
385	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.
386	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
387	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.
388	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.
389	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.
390	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 shoreline development is mostly a politically correct sentiment instead of based on trying to fix a real problem.	See response to comment #24.
391	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.
392	01/14/11	Claes Hagstromer	Shoreline owner	V.K.	Preserving views from both the land and water conflicts with preserving	Under the Shoreline Management Act, the city's Shoreline Master Program must

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
					vegetation in side yards.	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.
393	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...
394	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.
395	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
396	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.
397	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 promote, policy and regulation?	The citizens' workgroups specifically chose the verb "promote" to strengthen the importance of residential use.
398	01/14/11	John Nute	Shoreline owner	V.K.	This title Residential Development and	Comment noted.

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
					its treatment make little syntactic sense given the foregoing three paragraphs.	
399	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.
400	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
401	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.
402	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.
403	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	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
					homes.	allowed to remain and be maintained, repaired, and enlarged as long as the expansion does not increase the nonconformity.
404	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.
405	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.
406	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.
407	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.
408	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.
409	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.
410	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.
411	03/25/11	Robert	Citizen	V.K.8	Does the prohibition against expansion	A houseboat is not considered an "overwater

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
		Hershberg			of existing, legally established overwater residences apply to houseboats?	structure" so the prohibition does not apply.
412	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.
413	02/25/11	M.C. Halvorsen	Shoreline owner	V.L.2	Too restrictive.	Comment noted.
414	02/25/11	M.C. Halvorsen	Shoreline owner	V.L.3	Access by trails and bicycle systems encourage crime and attracts criminals.	Comment noted.
415	04/26/11	H. & P. Cook	Shoreline owner	Various	Copy of Gace comment	See responses to Gace comments.
416	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.
417	04/26/11	Kacy Struzzieri	Shoreline owner	Various	Copy of K. Struzzieri comment	See responses to comments from K. Struzzieri.
418	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).
419	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."
420	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

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
						Commission and City Council prior to adoption.
421	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 what does existing information reflect about demand.
422	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.
423	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).
424	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.
425	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.
426	04/25/11	A. Greiner	Shoreline owner	VI.A.3	Add "and effective" after "appropriate."	Comment noted.
427	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).
428	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.
429	04/26/11	J. Grundman	Shoreline owner	VI.A.5	The concept of incorporating "all	Regulations will define the measures

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
					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 provision since it is unachievable.	necessary to meet the policy.
430	02/25/11	M.C. Halvorsen	Shoreline owner	VI.A.7	Too vague and, as written, unconstitutional.	See response to comment #67.
431	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.
432	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.
433	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)
434	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	WAC 176-23-231 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
					adjacent shoreline, provide a net loss in ecological functions.	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.
435	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 placement of bulkheads interferes with a homeowner's right to protect his/her home.	From Department of Ecology "Frequently Asked Questions: Marine Shoreline Armoring and Puget Sound": By armoring our areas where upland and marine vegetation meet, the negative impacts can be extensive. Bulkheads can: • Reduce the natural delivery of sand and gravel to our shorelines. • Bury the upper beach and reduce the amount of large woody debris deposited on the beach, which results in habitat loss • 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. Impacts from site disturbance during the voluntary restoration action are temporary and will subside when the ecosystem has reached equilibrium.
436	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

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
						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.”
437	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 valid studies, the badness of bulkheads hardly cries out for control.	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.
438	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” By armoring our areas where upland and marine vegetation meet, the negative impacts can be extensive. Bulkheads can: • Reduce the natural delivery of sand and gravel to our shorelines. • Bury the upper beach and reduce the amount of large woody debris deposited on the beach, which results in habitat loss. • 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. Impacts from site disturbance during the

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
						voluntary restoration action are temporary and will subside when the ecosystem has reached equilibrium.
439	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.”
440	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.
441	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.”
442	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.
443	04/26/11	K. Bayne-	Shoreline owner	VI.B	The removal of the bulkheads or any	From Department of Ecology “Frequently

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
		Rodocker			other existing shoreline structures would be highly disruptive and destructive to the existing wildlife, ecosystems, and real property.	Asked Questions: Marine Shoreline Armoring and the Puget Sound" By armoring our areas where upland and marine vegetation meet, the negative impacts can be extensive. Bulkheads can: • Reduce the natural delivery of sand and gravel to our shorelines. • Bury the upper beach and reduce the amount of large woody debris deposited on the beach, which results in habitat loss. • 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. Impacts from site disturbance during the voluntary restoration action are temporary and will subside when the ecosystem has reached equilibrium.
444	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."
445	04/26/11	N. Marshall	Shoreline owner	VI.B	The placement of a bulkhead still allows natural runoff to occur bringing with it a	Comment noted.

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
					degree of soil or clay to filter onto the shoreline.	
446	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.”
447	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).
448	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 available and relevant to Bainbridge Island.
449	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."
450	05/18/11	D. & S. Lindsey	Citizen	VI.B	Simply said, there does not appear to be any reason to support the theory that bulkheads are bad.	The draft language meets the requirements of the Shoreline Master Program Guidelines (WAC 173-26-231(3)(a)(iii)(C). 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.
451	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.
452	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,

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
						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."
453	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."
454	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 90.58.100, the measure utilized must be both timely and effective."	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 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.
455	02/25/11	M.C.	Shoreline owner	VI.B policy #3	Why would anyone discourage shoreline	WAC 173-26-231 states that hardening of the

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
		Halvorsen			stabilization?	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.
456	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.
457	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.
458	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
459	02/25/11	M.C. Halvorsen	Shoreline owner	VI.B.1	Why would anyone discourage shoreline stabilization?	See response to comment #72.
460	04/25/11	A. Greiner	Shoreline owner	VI.B.1	Restate as "Discourage shoreline stabilization, particularly 'hard' structural stabilization when not in	Regulations will provide more detail.

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
					conflict with RCW 90.58.100 requirements for timeliness and effectiveness."	
461	04/25/11	A. Greiner	Shoreline owner	VI.B.10	Do not force property owners to provide restoration for public benefit at private expense.	Comment noted.
462	04/25/11	A. Greiner	Shoreline owner	VI.B.11	Excellent!	No response necessary.
463	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.
464	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.
465	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."
466	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	WAC 176-23-231 states that "New or enlarged structural shoreline stabilization measures for an existing primary structure,

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
					failures.	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."
467	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.
468	04/25/11	A. Greiner	Shoreline owner	VI.B.9	Add "and its mitigation" and "shoreline stabilization."	Comment noted.
469	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 seaward of their original location."	The draft language meets the requirements of the Shoreline Master Program Guidelines (WAC 173-26-231(3)(a)(iii)(C), to limit armoring due to adverse impacts.
470	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.
471	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.
472	04/25/11	A. Greiner	Shoreline owner	VI.E.1	Add "vital public transportation uses" after "public access uses."	Comment noted.
473	04/25/11	A. Greiner	Shoreline owner	VI.E.3	Add "over time" at the end of the sentence.	Comment noted.
474	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.
475	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.

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
476	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.
477	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.
478	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.
479	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.
480	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.
481	05/18/11	D. & S.	Citizen	VI.F	There are no facts supporting the belief	The draft language meets the requirements of

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
		Lindsey			that overwater structures cause a new loss of ecological function.	the Shoreline Master Program Guidelines (WAC 173-26-231(3)(b). The regulations associated with overwater structures are in the preliminary draft phase.
482	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.
483	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.
484	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.
485	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.
486	03/28/11	M.C. Halvorsen	Shoreline owner	VI.F.3	Grated docks may harm fish.	Comment noted.
487	02/25/11	M.C. Halvorsen	Shoreline owner	VL.4	I cannot see why this is indiscriminately required.	Comment noted.

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 24, 2011
488	02/25/11	M.C. Halvorsen	Shoreline owner	VL.7	Access by trails and bicycle systems encourage crime and attracts criminals.	Comment noted.
	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 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

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 28, 2011
						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 property.	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.
496	06/27/11	J. Grundman &	Waterfront owner	III.B	What criteria is included in "table XX" and	The proposed prescriptive standard shoreline

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 28, 2011
		L. Fergusson			what criteria is to be considered in the "site specific review" which may be necessary to determine the standard shoreline buffer?	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 setback requirements 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. 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	Existing legally-established structures and

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 28, 2011
					remain and may be redevelo9ped or expanded where they are currently located provided the redevelopment does not cause a net loss of ecological function.	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 setback requirements shall be applied only to new shoreline developments with existing native vegetation.	See response to comment #500.
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	See response to comment #502.

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 28, 2011
					the island subject to state environmental requirements and no net loss provisions of the SMP.	
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 Assessment Program's "Toxics in Surface Runoff to Puget Sound, Phase 3 Date and Load Estimates."	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 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

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 28, 2011
						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.
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	A postcard notification of the update process with information on how to provide comments and stay informed was mailed to every shoreline property.

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 28, 2011
					the property owners can be heard.	
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 and uses within the buffers.	The proposed buffers are intended to protect the functions that are fundamental to maintaining a healthy functioning marine nearshore.
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

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 28, 2011
						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 private property owners' expense.	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 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

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 28, 2011
						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 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

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 28, 2011
						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.
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.

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 28, 2011
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. Hanson	Waterfront property owners	VI.B	Continue to authorize bulkheads to protect both land (front yards) and homes.	See response to comment #536.
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	See response to comment #535.

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of June 28, 2011
					nonconforming.	
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.	
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 improved 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.	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
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 member		The nearshore environment is essential in the early life cycle of salmon relying heavily on invertebrates found in shallow 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		The land and aquatic habitats are far from separate. There is an important flow of carbon that goes from the land to the water	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
			member		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 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/		Puget Sound has gotten to the condition it's in by "death by a thousand cuts." The	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
			workgroup member		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.	
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	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
					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 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	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
					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.	
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	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
					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, 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.	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
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 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,	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
					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.	
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	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
					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.	
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.	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
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 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.	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
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, K, and L	Responsibly address new development to 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	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
					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.	
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,	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.	
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 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.	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
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 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	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
					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 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	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
					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.	
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	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
					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, 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.	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
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 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,	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
					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.	
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	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
					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.	
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.	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
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 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.	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
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, K, and L	Responsibly address new development to 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	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
					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.	
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,	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.	
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 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.	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
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 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	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
					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 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	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
					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.	
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	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
					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, 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.	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
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 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,	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
					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.	
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	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
					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.	
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.	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
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 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.	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
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, K, and L	Responsibly address new development to 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	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
					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.	
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,	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.	
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 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.	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
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 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	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
					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 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	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
					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.	
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	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
					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, 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.	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
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 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,	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
					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 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 A. Tawresey J. Bomben A. Mueller	Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners/ workgroup	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	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
			members		see what the policies or goals looked like in a regulation, they could be revisited and tweaked.	
1049	07/26/11	K. Sethney A. Tawresey J. Bomben 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 A. Tawresey J. Bomben 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 A. Tawresey J. Bomben 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 A. Tawresey J. Bomben 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 A. Tawresey J. Bomben A. Mueller	Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners/ workgroup members		We support allowing shoreline armoring to protect existing development with requirements to mitigate as much as possible the impacts.	
1054	07/26/11	K. Sethney A. Tawresey J. Bomben 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	Bainbridge	General	We support taking a second look at the	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
		A. Tawresey J. Bomben A. Mueller	Shoreline Homeowners/ workgroup members		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 A. Tawresey J. Bomben 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 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	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
					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 and 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 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	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
					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 Shoreline Homeowners	Process	The Planning Commission and Council 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.	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
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.	
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-	Shoreline owner		If all these homes are labeled	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
		Wellman			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 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	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
					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. Armstrong	Shoreline owner	General	We have not seen a discussion of the tax 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	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
					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 Citizens	Science	Don Flora, PHD, has reviewed the science 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	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
					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 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	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
					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 F. Stowell M. Dawson 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 policies with the right mix of protections for the shoreline environment, public access, and private property rights.	
1121	08/11/11	L. Macchio F. Stowell M. Dawson 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	Bainbridge	Buffers	In order to protect and maintain all	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
		F. Stowell M. Dawson B. Taft	Alliance for Puget Sound		shoreline functions, not just the water quality function, buffers need to be wider than 30 feet.	
1123	08/11/11	L. Macchio F. Stowell M. Dawson 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 F. Stowell M. Dawson 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 F. Stowell M. Dawson 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 F. Stowell M. Dawson B. Taft	Bainbridge Alliance for Puget Sound	General	We support the use of terms that everyone can understand.	
1127	08/11/11	L. Macchio F. Stowell M. Dawson B. Taft	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 functions equivalent to those of native plants.	
1128	08/11/11	L. Macchio F. Stowell M. Dawson 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 F. Stowell M. Dawson	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	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
		B. Taft			the plans must meet the no-net-loss standard with mitigation sequencing.	
1130	08/11/11	L. Macchio F. Stowell M. Dawson 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 F. Stowell M. Dawson 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 F. Stowell M. Dawson 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 F. Stowell M. Dawson 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 F. Stowell M. Dawson 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?	
1135	08/11/11	L. Macchio F. Stowell M. Dawson 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 F. Stowell	Bainbridge Alliance for	Structure Setback Line	For clarity, we suggest changing this to read, "Where there are no primary	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
		M. Dawson B. Taft	Puget Sound		residential structures on abutting properties, the standard setbacks apply."	
1137	08/11/11	L. Macchio F. Stowell M. Dawson 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 basic recreational usage, but is further casting outrage against the government for their obvious need toward complete control.	
1141	08/11/11	R. King	Citizen	Designations	How can you justify classification of private property as Conservation Land without compensation of the owner of said private property? …From what I've read the Council and planning folks'	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
					justification of this proposal remains weak scientifically.	
1142	08/11/11	S. Snyder	Citizen	Designations	Do not change the zoning of the shorelines of Bainbridge Island. Who is going to pay the property owners the money you are taking away by substantially lowering the value they are paying to live on the water?	
1143	08/11/11	G. Tripp	Bainbridge Citizens	Designations	Please tell the Planning Commission not to restrict Water Dependent uses by classifying large parts of the developed shoreline as Conservancy.	
1144	08/11/11	J. Tingley	Citizen	Designations	(Conservancy standard) Please consider "grandfathering" in property that has been long developed and in existence rather than making it nonconforming.	
1145	08/12/11	G. Tripp	Bainbridge Citizens	Buffers	Buffers do not meet the legal requirement for cause and effect and proportionality.	
1146	08/12/11	G. Tripp	Bainbridge Citizens	Buffers	The proposed buffers are not a direct mitigation for the direct impacts of the development but are an attempt to restore the ecosystem and mitigate the impacts of other developments like Seattle and Bremerton.	
1147	08/12/11	G. Tripp	Bainbridge Citizens	Buffers	A written legal brief is a minimum requirement and a second opinion would be prudent.	
1148	08/12/11	P. Brachvogel	Citizen	Nonconforming; science	Please refrain from adjusting the code to make uses and structures nonconforming when absolutely no science supports such action.	
1149	08/12/11	C. & E. Cole	Shoreline owners	Designations	Live and let live. Offer to buy our property, but this is a taking. We oppose your taking of any of the Island.	
1150	08/12/11	J. Rosling	Shoreline owner	Designations	Your social activism and defacto redistribution of my property value is	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
					abhorrent and anti-American.	
1151	08/12/11	G. Tripp	Bainbridge Citizens	Residential use	There is no science indicating that residential uses are a measurable negative contributing factor in the Sound's demise.	
1152	08/13/11	S. Snyder	Shoreline owner	Designations	What does the scientific research say you will gain by destroying our lives on the spit?	
1153	08/15/11	D. Bennett	Shoreline owner	Residential use	It seems to us that individual residential use of a shoreline property is near the bottom of the list when ranking environmental damages of anthropocentric shoreline use and related activities.	
1154	08/15/11	D. Bennett	Shoreline owner	Vegetation	We do not understand the focus on "native vegetation" as one of the required remedies.	
1155	08/15/11	D. Bennett	Shoreline owner	Science	In general, the science being used in COBI SMP update proposals is not definitive about cause and effect beyond conclusions that could be reached with common sense assumptions.	
1156	08/15/11	D. Bennett	Shoreline owner	Process	We recommend that you minimize any changes to the current COBI SMP and include nothing that goes beyond that required to satisfy the Department of Ecology Guidelines.	
1157	08/15/11	A. Tawresey	Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners	Nonconforming	The SMP Update must declare existing, lawfully built homes to be conforming structures.	
1158	08/15/11	A. Tawresey	Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners	General	Any new regulations, including vegetation buffers, must apply to future development only.	
1159	08/15/11	A. Tawresey	Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners	Stabilization	Shoreline armoring regulations must balance one's need to protect private property from erosion with the positive effects of onsite mitigation or participation	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
					in restoration programs in other locations in the City.	
1160	08/15/11	A. Tawresey	Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners	Cumulative impacts	Any measure of "cumulative impacts" must account for restoration and mitigation projects undertaken by individuals, nonprofits and government entities	
1161	08/15/11	A. Tawresey	Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners	Cumulative impacts	New regulations must fairly allocate the burden of addressing "cumulative impacts" of predicted future development.	
1162	08/15/11	A. Tawresey	Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners	Overwater structures	Except in Aquatic Conservancy areas, docks and floats must be permitted if they follow US Army Corps of Engineers specifications.	
1163	08/15/11	A. Tawresey	Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners	Science	The City Council must encourage the State of Washington to establish a senior level peer review panel of scientists, separate from the Dept. of Ecology, to assist local jurisdictions in the preparation of future SMP updates.	
1164	08/15/11	A. Tawresey	Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners	Designations	Properties containing existing, lawfully built residential structures must not be included in a shoreline residential conservancy designation.	
1165	08/15/11		Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners	Process	With the timeline to submit our recommended SMP by late December, 2011, we were expecting definitive answers to be available to the public.	
1166	08/15/11		Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners	Nonconforming	We clearly do not understand using the word "nonconforming" as a COBI choice of language when we understand it is not required by state regulations.	
1167	08/15/11		Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners	Process	It is easy for staff to report on issues citizens agree on, while difficult issues which potentially will be incorporated into the SMP are obfuscated.	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
1168	08/15/11		Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners	General	We hope the Planning Commission and City Council will consider the inherent financial impact of adopting any SMP policy which overreaches the requirements of state and federal statutes and thereby places the City in a high-risk litigious position.	
1169	08/15/11		Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners	Process	I am very frustrated that existing waterfront owners are given less input than non-waterfront owners on Bainbridge Island.	
1170	08/15/11		Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners	Process/ Property rights	I don't feel that the City of Bainbridge Island Dept. of Community Development should be allowed to develop regulations, which may reduce the value of my property and affect, in any way, the uses to which I may now put it.	
1171	08/15/11		Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners	Buffers	I think the buffer regulations are the taking of property without due process.	
1172	08/15/11		Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners	Overwater structures	Regulation of docks is under the jurisdiction of the Army Corps of Engineers and any other regulations are illegal. Sharing of docks was already declared unconstitutional.	
1173	08/15/11		Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners	Stabilization	The Washington Court of Appeals ruled that property owners have a right to control erosion; thus, "soft" bulkheads cannot be required.	
1174	08/15/11		Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners	General	It is difficult enough to try and maintain shoreline property in a way that attempts to utilize native vegetation with the challenging soil conditions and underground springs but for a government body to have the ability to disregard	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
					homeowners' efforts and deny them the right to create/improve their property in ways that would protect rather than damage is beyond belief.	
1175	08/15/11		Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners	Stabilization	Reinforcements such as what is being discussed for Rockaway Beach Road should be allowed without requiring a $12,000+ shoreline permit.	
1176	08/15/11		Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners	General	No one cares more about my property than I. No one can take care of my property better than I.	
1177	08/15/11		Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners	General	Shoreline property owners purchased their property with an expectation of how they could utilize their asset and it is unlawful and unfair to change the rules after they had made their purchase.	
1178	08/15/11		Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners	General	This needs to be toned down considerably and not add excessive restrictions to this property.	
1179	08/15/11		Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners	General	Please find a way to protect the shoreline environment and our property rights.	
1180	08/15/11		Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners	Stabilization	Bulkheads were not needed on the south side of the inner harbor prior to the large ferries.	
1181	08/15/11		Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners	General	Please do not unreasonably inhibit our property rights, way in excess of what state law requires, in a misguided attempt to show the rest of Puget Sound that Bainbridge is greenest of all.	
1182	08/15/11		Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners	General	Do you really want to place restrictions on part of the residents for the benefit of all without compensation to those restricted?	
1183	08/15/11		Bainbridge Shoreline	Process	Since being on the Island for 11 years, it has been a constant war between the	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
			Homeowners		waterfront property owners and the Council and its biased "City" employees. Why?	
1184	08/15/11		Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners	General	Nothing of this kind is calculated to succeed without the solid sense of trust and reliability of those affected. At this point, those factors do not exist.	
1185	08/15/11		Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners	Site-specific	Why are the 7 homes between Port Madison "Nature Preserve" and the Gordon Drive road end singled out for Residential Conservancy status? They have been bulkheaded for years.	
1186	08/15/11		Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners	General	Why is Bainbridge Council spending our taxpayers' [money] to go against homeowners and state legislation when so many other higher priority issues need to be addressed?	
1187	08/15/11		Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners	Process/ Science	I urge the City Council to completely reject this unnecessary intrusion into our property rights. There is no sound science whatsoever behind these very restrictive designations.	
1188	08/15/11		Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners	Process/ Science	The Planners are ignoring science and relying upon sources that are ignoring the realities of shoreline operation. These planners have lost the trust of the people they are supposed to be working for and who they are supposed to be representing.	
1189	08/15/11		Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners	General/ Nonconforming	I hope decision makers focus on the very simple technical solutions to keeping Puget Sound a clean eco system rather than simply creating nonconforming structures on Bainbridge Island.	
1190	08/15/11		Bainbridge Shoreline	Process	It is important to avoid the US vs. THEM mentality that has pervaded so much of this	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
			Homeowners		discussion.	
1191	08/15/11		Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners	General	Someone should point out the total disconnect between rampant giveaways to developers down island, bringing in lots of folks who will put heavy demands on the schools, shopping areas, roads, sewers, water and electric utilities, ferries, etc. and the hypergreen/fundamentalist restrictions elsewhere both on the shore and inland.	
1192	08/15/11		Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners	General	The Bainbridge Island planning department taking of waterfront land is based on its' citizen wish list surveys rather than real science.	
1193	08/15/11		Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners	Stabilization	We have to have the right to maintain and protect our home and the bulkhead is the key.	
1194	08/15/11		Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners	General	Do you really think you can shove this through and not subject the City to dozens of lawsuits that will waste the limited tax dollars that are needed to upgrade infrastructure and fund basic services?	
1195	08/15/11		Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners	General	Please stop worshiping at the altar of Gaia and start being part of the solution – commonsense, cost effective, VOLUNTARY proposals to improve the near shore environment.	
1196	08/15/11		Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners	General	The whole plan is unconstitutional as it is the taking of property right without due process of law.	
1197	08/15/11	D. Flora	Citizen	Buffers	Statistical analyses repeatedly showed that the hypothesis that human-installed stressors (bulkheads, et al) are not negatively correlated with habitat measures.	
1198	08/16/11	T. Mitchell	Citizen	Designations	Do NOT change zoning.	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
1199	08/16/11	T. Mitchell	Citizen	Nonconforming	Do NOT make existing structures nonconforming.	
1200	08/16/11	T. Mitchell	Citizen	Designations	Do NOT make Fletcher Bay a conservancy without a vote of the people.	
1201	08/16/11	T. Mitchell	Citizen	Buffers	Do NOT change buffers.	
1202	08/16/11	T. Mitchell	Citizen	General	You do NOT need to go overboard again. I HATE IT when you let developers do what they want and accept their blanket assurances while at the same time restrict what a homeowner can do on similar property. It is unacceptable.	
1203	08/17/11	M. Dawson	BAPS	Science	A reasonable assessment of the cumulative scientific data regarding shoreline habitats as well as anecdotal data collected over many years has shown that the ailing health of the marine environment of Puget Sound is directly influenced by human activities along its shorelines.	
1204	08/17/11	M. Dawson	BAPS	Monitoring	We can make sure a solid monitoring program is implemented so that when it comes time for our next update we will have acquired more of the kind of data we need to generate an even more refined plan to improve the quality of our marine habitat.	
1205	08/19/11	G. Tripp	Bainbridge Citizens	Buffers	Dr. Flora solves the thirty-foot buffer mystery for the City Council: even for heavy pollution from farming, a 20 to 30 foot grass buffer removes most pollutants.	
1206	08/19/11	G. Tripp	Bainbridge Citizens	Buffers	Understanding buffer science is not difficult. 1. The pollution is best controlled at the source. 2. The larger the pollution load – the larger the buffer needed to trap the pollution. 3. Most of the pollution is removed in the very first part of the buffer.	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
1207	08/19/11	R. Dashiell	Citizen	Buffers	Dr. Flora has not solved the 30 foot buffer mystery for the City Council. What I take away from the data charts is a 30 foot buffer would remove about 58% of a nitrogen load. For phosphorus, a 30% buffer removes about 55% of the load.	
1208	08/19/11	R. Dashiell	Citizen	Buffers	Also of note, there are other buffer environmental considerations other than just pollution, and they are not addressed.	
1209	08/20/11	G. Tripp	Bainbridge Citizens	Legal	The ruling that RCW 82.02.020 does not apply to SMP buffer regulations is not a big deal for citizens wanting to bring a challenge. The ruling simply instructs such land owners to name Ecology as a defendant and assert a constitutional violation.	
1210	08/30/11	G. Tripp	Bainbridge Citizens	Legal	SB 5451 stated that "Classifying existing structures as legally conforming will not create a risk of degrading shoreline natural resources." This confirms that existing structures and residential uses comply with "no net loss" and do not degrade the environment.	
1211	09/01/11	J. Quitslund	Citizen	Process	I believe that much of the negative commentary and distrust of the update process has arisen from insecurity and fear. I hope that it will be possible to clarify the actual impact of new regulations on existing structures and their owners.	
1212	09/01/11	J. Quitslund	Citizen	No net loss	Shoreline property owners need to understand what the "no net loss" standard requires of them, and what it doesn't. The SMP offers considerable latitude to homeowners who want to modify the use of their land, so long as the modifications	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
					don't add up to a loss of ecological functions.	
1213	09/01/11	J. Quitslund	Citizen	Overwater structures and stabilization	The SMP regulations are quite strict regarding docks and bulkheads; in this area, where "waters of the sate" will obviously be impacted by development, we are obliged to follow Department of Ecology guidelines very closely.	
1214	09/06/11	G. Tripp	Bainbridge Citizens	Water-dependent uses	The Draft SMP Policies and Regulations appear to ban docks, floats, boat houses, and all water dependent uses, including stairs and buoy from most of the Island.	
1215	09/06/11	G. Tripp	Bainbridge Citizens	Docks	The length of docks should be the minimum necessary to reach deep water – not a fixed number.	
1216	09/06/11	J. Dorner	Puget Sound Partnership	General	Safeguarding shorelines to function naturally is critical to ecosystem health by maintaining beach-forming sediment processes, providing shade, food resources, and habitat through native plant communities, and retaining large wood from fallen trees on the beach that create valuable habitat and refuge areas for fish and other shoreline animals.	
1217	09/06/11	J. Dorner	Puget Sound Partnership	Residential development	Residential development along shorelines is an important threat to Puget Sound.	
1218	09/06/11	J. Dorner	Puget Sound Partnership	Development	The Action Agenda strategies are intended to address the adverse effects of threats to Puget Sound. One of these threats is habitat alteration and land use, which includes development along the shoreline.	
1219	09/06/11	M .Whalen	Shoreline homeowner	General	Looking at the big picture, how important are expanded buffers/native vegetation restoration compared to other urgent threats and priorities? It appears that they	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
					are considered to have some lower level of urgency and priority.	
1220	09/06/11	M .Whalen	Shoreline homeowner	General	We on Bainbridge Island might make a more important contribution if we focused on controlling pollution and conserving existing areas of high-value habitat.	
1221	09/06/11	M .Whalen	Shoreline homeowner	Restoration	There is no disagreement that native species should be used in restoration projects, or that restoration projects will have ecosystem benefits. On the other hand, there is nothing suggesting that forced restoration of native vegetation on existing residential property is a high priority.	
1222	09/06/11	M .Whalen	Shoreline homeowner	Buffers	Revise the proposed regulations to make existing shoreline residences categorically exempt from the increased buffer and riparian vegetation restoration requirements.	
1223	09/06/11	M .Whalen	Shoreline homeowner	Restoration	Add incentive programs to encourage private homeowners to voluntarily undertake and maintain restoration projects.	
1224	09/06/11	M .Whalen	Shoreline homeowner	General	To meet the standard of "no net loss", focus more attention on efforts to control pollution entering the Sound, such as improved management of storm water runoff form Island streets and parking lots and better monitoring of failing septic systems.	
1225	09/07/11	W. Daley	Citizen	Nonconforming	The issue of nonconformity only relates to the structure on a parcel of land. The land itself is not nonconforming. If the building is nonconforming a property can be sold and financial institutions will make loans	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
					for the sale of the property which includes a nonconforming structure.	
1226	09/07/11	J. Morgan	Shoreline owner	Designations	The inner part of Fletcher Bay previously designated as Aquatic Conservancy goes dry at low tide. This is consistent with other areas so designated Aquatic Conservancy. Based on existing use of Fletcher Bay, the Aquatic Conservancy designation should not be expanded to cover all of the bay.	
1227	09/08/11		Bainbridge Citizens	SSB 5451	Bainbridge's SMP should incorporate the protections authorized by SSB 5451 for existing homes and uses.	
1228	09/08/11		Bainbridge Citizens	SSB 5451	Authorize residential structures and appurtenant structures that are legally established and are used for a conforming use to be considered conforming structures	
1229	09/08/11		Bainbridge Citizens	SSB 5451	The SMP must clearly state: "Existing homes, appurtenant structures and residential uses, including lawns, landscaping, and recreation areas, are conforming and may be remodeled, rebuilt, and redeveloped, provided that any new additional impact must be mitigated.	
1230	09/08/11	D. Flora	Citizen	Buffers	The relevance of residential contributions of sediment, shade, woody debris, and nutrients to marine welfare has not been demonstrated for Island nor Puget Sound.	
1231	09/08/11	D. Flora	Citizen	Buffers	I don't find in Herrera 8/1 the clear rationale for the thirty-footer that the Council sought.	
1232	09/08/11	G. Tripp	Bainbridge Citizens	Buffers	Any change triggers the requirement for existing homes to give up the use of their front yard and install a buffer. This was not the intent of the workgroup.	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
1233	09/08/11	G. Tripp	Bainbridge Citizens	Mitigation	A change in landscaping does not cause an impact and should not require mitigation.	
1234	09/08/11	Anonymous	Bainbridge Citizens	General	A law that is complex, draconian, and impractical in enforcement and compliance alienates citizens from their own government. People need to be governed by consent and not be dictate.	
1235	09/12/11	J. Rosling	Shoreline owner	General	I am vehemently opposed to the "taking" of my property rights and also to the taking to my neighbor's rights.	
1236	09/12/11	K. Harrington	Citizen	Science	I have not seen estimates of the relative amounts of pollution from Bainbridge Island, contributed by type of source and ranked by level of damaged caused, with the Bainbridge Island sources of origin (point and no-point) specifically noted.	
1237	09/12/11	K. Harrington	Citizen	Science	It is my surmise that Bainbridge municipal storm water discharges may be our major contributor to pollution of Puget Sound, but I have not seen its importance ranked against other sources.	
1238	09/12/11	K. Kraft	Shoreline owner	General	Perhaps the city could mitigate the effects on Puget Sound by caring for the storm runoff instead of destroying the property value of the shoreline homeowners.	
1239	09/12/11	T. Perilstein	Shoreline owner	Science	Why are you insisting on impacting a large group of people on this island in a very negative way when you really have no hard evidence that shows any of this will make a difference?	
1240	09/13/11	S. McMullen	Citizen	General	If you stay the course in the defense of the shorelines and such measures as CONSERVANCY to protect them, it will be YOU and YOUR COURAGE that future generations will celebrate on behalf	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
					of the non-human natural world who have no voice or vote, as well as the human community who will live more happily within the greater health of the ecosystem that sustains them.	
1241	09/13/11	R. King	Citizen	General	With all due respect, the City's track record with litigation has been poor recently and the current proposal strikes me as an illegal taking – any proposal that does not grandfather existing homes seems ripe for litigation. This is not a threat, but please take a step back and give consideration to the big picture here.	
1242	09/13/11		Bainbridge Citizens	Nonconforming	Are we going to make existing homes and uses permanently conforming?	
1243	09/13/11		Bainbridge Citizens	Buffers	Retain the existing buffers or set new ones.	
1244	09/13/11		Bainbridge Citizens	Uses	All shoreline property on Bainbridge, except those rare areas classified as Natural, shall be designated as suitable for water dependent uses. Areas with high ecological function will require more care to avoid impacts and more mitigation of any impacts.	
1245	09/13/11		Bainbridge Citizens	General	Place more weight on the decisions of the City Council and on the opinions of third party experts and professional, such as engineers, arborists, geologists, and wildlife biologists.	
1246	09/15/11	T. Robertson, J. Vanderlee	Shoreline owners	Designations	The City has not undertaken any site-specific studies to confirm that aquatic conservancy is an appropriate designation for Fletcher Bay or, for that matter, to determine what regulatory actions should be taken to potect it.	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
1247	09/15/11	T. Robertson, J. Vanderlee	Shoreline owners	Designations	We know of no reason why recreational aquaculture should be barred from Fletcher Bay.	
1248	09/15/11	T. Robertson, J. Vanderlee	Shoreline owners	Designations	City planning staff as administratively interpreted the aquatic conservancy designation to generally mean that only non-motorized activities, such as kayaking and canoeing, are allowed. There is no reasonable connection between such a determination and the needs of Fletcher Bay.	
1249	09/15/11	T. Robertson, J. Vanderlee	Shoreline owners	Nonconforming	City planning staff has suggested that nonconforming structures and uses can continue. This is not clearly stated in the original SMP policies, and we urge you to do whatever is needed to clarify the City's intentions in the text of the proposed update.	
1250	09/15/11	T. Robertson, J. Vanderlee	Shoreline owners	General	Secret meetings by non-elected officers [workgroups] in which votes are taken to determine city policy is hardly a way to generate public trust or confidence.	Workgroup meetings were advertised on the city's webpage and by the Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners.
1251	09/21/11		Bainbridge Citizens	Overwater structures	Dock locations and lengths should be determined by engineering and not by arbitrarily and manipulated requirements.	
1252	09/21/11		Bainbridge Citizens	Overwater structures	Docks should be the minimum size necessary to accomplish the purpose.	
1253	09/21/11		Bainbridge Citizens	Overwater structures	The primary criteria [for docks] should remain "no net loss."	
1254	09/21/11	M.C. Halvorsen	Shoreline owner	Overwater structures	New docks should be the minimum necessary to accomplish the intended purpose.	
1255	09/21/11	M.C. Halvorsen	Shoreline owner	Overwater structures	Docks should meet the requirements of the Army Corps of Engineers.	
1256	09/21/11	M.C.	Shoreline owner	Overwater	Docks should meet the requirements of the	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
		Halvorsen		structures	Department of Fish and Wildlife.	
1257	09/21/11	M.C. Halvorsen	Shoreline owner	Overwater structures	Docks should meet the requirement of no net loss.	
1258	09/21/11	M.C. Halvorsen	Shoreline owner	Overwater structures	Nothing else [should be required of docks that meet the requirements of the Corps, WDFW, and the no net loss standard.	
1259	09/22/11	D. Dunavant	Shoreline owner	General	We insult our history by adopting new rules and regulations which limit the relationship between man, water, and land.	
1260	09/22/11	D. Dunavant	Shoreline owner	Overwater structures	New docks should be the minimum necessary to accomplish the intended purpose.	
1261	09/22/11	D. Dunavant	Shoreline owner	Overwater structures	Docks should meet the requirements of the Army Corps of Engineers.	
1262	09/22/11	D. Dunavant	Shoreline owner	Overwater structures	Docks should meet the requirements of the Department of Fish and Wildlife.	
1263	09/22/11	D. Dunavant	Shoreline owner	Overwater structures	Docks should meet the requirement of no net loss.	
1264	09/22/11	D. Dunavant	Shoreline owner	Overwater structures	Nothing else [should be required of docks that meet the requirements of the Corps, WDFW, and the no net loss standard.	
1265	09/22/11	G. Tollefson	Shoreline owner	Designations	I am writing to question the proposed designation of the properties located on NE Gordon Drive as Shoreline Residential Conservancy.	
1266	10/03/11	B. Taft	Citizen	General	I describe this incident to alert the Planning Commission to the importance of examining carefully testimony they receive. It is very important that false assertions not be allowed to go unchallenged.	
1267	10/04/11	E. Wright	Citizen	Nonconforming	Most homes on Bainbridge, unless built to standards of the latest code updates, are already nonconforming in some respect. This does not affect the appraisal value, the	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
					resale value, or the ability to obtain a mortgage or refinance the property in any way.	
1268	10/05/11	A. Greiner	Shoreline owner	Nonconforming	There are now 929 citizens that have signed a petition saying they strongly disagree with those five "yea" votes. They want the City to utilize SB5451.	
1269	10/05/11	A. Greiner	Shoreline owner	Buffers	There has been no evidence presented to the public that predicts a quantifiable environmental benefit from these proposed buffer regulations. Until a substantial benefit can be reliably predicted, such costly and burdensome regulations on a subset of our citizens are simply not justified.	
1270	10/06/11	J. Vanderlee, R. Robertson	Shoreline owners	General	We had hoped to offer suggestions on a technical level that might help avoid needless misunderstandings or disputes over meaning, but find ourselves faced with incomplete and inconsistent language that begs for clarification and seems likely to frustrate predictability, foster disputes, and vest inappropriate discretion in city staff.	
1271	10/06/11	J. Vanderlee, R. Robertson	Shoreline owners	Nonconforming	We therefore suggest that subsection 4.3.2 be deleted or substantially rewritten. In its current form, it is overbroad, unnecessarily alarming to property owners, and inconsistent with a number of the policies and regulations that follow.	
1272	10/06/11	J. Vanderlee, R. Robertson	Shoreline owners	Overwater structures	We would also ask that there be an explicit statement that existing docks and moorings can remain and continue to be used as docks and moorings.	
1273	10/06/11	J. Vanderlee,	Shoreline owners		Paragraph 5.b of subsection 4.3.6 seems to	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
		R. Robertson			be inconsistent with paragraph 5 of policy 4.3.3 and paragraph 2 of subsection 4.3.6, and should be deleted.	
1274	10/06/11	J. Vanderlee, R. Robertson	Shoreline owners	Designations	Fletcher Bay is both loved and used by residents of the area and any restrictions imposed through the update process should be tailored to address specific problems that the Planning Commission actually identifies as warranting remedial action.	
1275	10/06/11	B. Taft	Citizen	General	I describe this incident to alert the Planning Commission to the importance of examining carefully testimony they receive. It is very important that false assertions not be allowed to go unchallenged.	
1276	10/06/11	C. Schmid	Citizen	Nonconforming	The term "nonconforming" has a long history – and, if only for the purposes of reference, for consistency, and for understanding, it needs to remain included in the updated Shoreline Master Plan.	
1277	10/09/11	J. Kennell	Citizen	Nonconforming	I urge you to declare existing homes to be conforming, not nonconforming.	
1278	10/09/11	J. Kennell	Citizen	Buffers	Retain the current shoreline buffers.	
1279	10/11/11		Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners	Nonconforming	The SMP update must declare existing, lawfully built homes to be "conforming" structures as per SSB 5451.	
1280	10/11/11		Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners	Buffers	Any new regulations, including vegetation buffers, must apply to future development only, as per state SMP guidelines.	
1281	10/11/11	M. Dawson	Shoreline owner	Nonconforming	Rather than worrying about whether my home is identified as nonconforming, I am much more troubled by the possibility that *upland* property owners might be upset about shoreline property owners receiving special treatment.	

	Date	Name	Interest	Section	Comment	Response as of August 12, 2011
1282	10/11/11	M. Dawson	Shoreline owner	Nonconforming	Eliminating the term "nonconforming" in our SMP may lead to confusion and unintended legal consequences.	
1283	10/12/11	A. Tawresey	Bainbridge Shoreline Homeowners	Nonconforming	The issue is that residential structure that now are conforming and are not changed in any way do not cause any net loss of ecological function by just existing.	
1284						