

Still some sticky points for me with the draft

Gordon Shaw

I would like to see something in the overview statement that addresses the current status of our shorelines compared with other marine jurisdictions. Something that accounts for what Burien has done and has planned to do to improve our stewardship of the actual condition of the shoreline, as Rose has suggested. Something that describes the lack of detrimental uses such as commercial & industrial uses even the lack of permitted residential uses such as floats and piers. Something that identifies the only non-governmental (park) use of our shoreline as being a long established single family home use which has the highest priority of any sanctioned use under the SMA.

20.30.050 (IV-14/15) How does this provision relate to 20.30.007 Existing development.

20.30.070 (IV-19) (2) regulations (b) replacement For something that seems to be an acknowledged right under the SMA these conditions to allow replacement seem unnecessary. In addition there is no carrot here to encourage someone to replace his bulkhead with a less destructive one. Example if he wanted to put in an angled concrete bulkhead instead of a vertical concrete bulkhead the process is still the same there is no encouragement here to give us the improved shoreline we are looking for.

20.30.070 (IV-20) Second paragraph I need an explanation of what situation this section is meant to address and if mitigation would be considered to achieve no net loss. Again it seems to me that we get more acceptance and cooperation if we structured the language to encourage the kind of structures we want rather than this restrictive avoidance language. We are forcing people to go out and hire experts and lawyers to achieve an inferior result than we could achieve by allowing some options that are less damaging than vertical concrete without all of the justification

20.30.080 (IV-24) (2) Regulations (f) existing artificial structures. Please explain what this means in the context of this section which is about restoration and enhancement.

20.30.095 (IV-29) (2) Regulations (a) Does this section restrict a property owner from obstructing his neighbors view with "residential development". Does this go beyond the intent of the SMA which covers views from public property. (c) (i-v) My reading of this is that there is no conditional use permit if you meet any of the criteria in i-v.

20.30.105 (IV34) Utilities (2) regulations (j) Why the change from practical to feasible. If it's about \$ they both have a subjective relationship to money in my mind.

20.35.010 (IV-34) v-2 shoreline permit types This section moves from non-exempt development to exempt development which a reasonable person would say is a less procedure oriented direction yet the exempt development is subject to a variance procedure WITH A DOE DECISION! Requiring more procedure and undoubtedly more time. If it were me the last thing I would want would be to be declared an exempt activity. Can we just eliminate the exempt category?

20.20 025 (II-7) Circulation element Pol. CI 2 I thought this comment about prohibiting Cross Sound bridges had been eliminated. Having something like this in the plan just makes us look silly. A Cross Sound Bridge would be an essential public facility and local decision making authority would be gone. So it's meaningless. Ask those that fought against the third runway.

20.20.030 (II-10) USE 11 (1-g) & 2 are redundant