

Olympia's Proposed Shoreline Master Program (SMP) Comprehensive Update

Summary of Ecology Public Hearing Comments

Comments received at hearing on July 31, 2014:

Commenter	Summary
Bob van Schoorl for Olympia Yacht Club (OYC)	SMP should consider history of waterfront OYC supports clear nonconforming regulations as proposed OYC supports 30-foot setbacks and vegetation conservation areas as proposed – ‘a compromise that works’ for downtown Public access should be a partnership, not a mandate Proposal is too restrictive regarding covered moorage; should be a Department of Natural Resources (DNR) lessor/lessee issue; need maintenance options Support some mixed use provisions OYC benefits the community; membership participates in shoreline and water quality activities and is present at this hearing
Bonnie Jacobs of Friends for the Waterfront	Consider placing OYC property in ‘urban recreation’ instead of ‘urban intensity’ SMP should more directly address flooding and liquefaction risk SMP should include response to sea level rise 30-foot setback along marine waters not enough; too limiting of options Setbacks of 50-feet or more should be required; and more if flooding not addressed
Susan Ahlschwede	Process should have included more community visioning 30-foot setback too small; should be 50-feet along marine waters – needed for flood control, adequate space for public trail, and for shoreline restoration (to address pollution); except zero setback okay at marine terminal Goal should be more than ‘no net loss’
Vida Zvirzdys- Farler of Image Source	Support proposed nonconforming provisions of SMP Support proposed setbacks and vegetation conservation areas – “good compromise” – need for larger setbacks not supported by record Should allow more mixed use – public access and shoreline restoration requirements too restrictive for this desirable use
Bob Jacobs	Major issue is urban intensity area setbacks 30-foot setback not enough space for “multi-use path”; 3-story buildings would be too close; Image Source building example of too narrow; need at least 50 feet of setback – 40 feet of flat land whether public or private Wider setback also needed for options to address flooding – see submitted graphics Wider setback appropriate to address liquefaction risk
Sherri Goulet	Urban Intensity 30-foot setback inadequate; not wide enough for multi-use pathway; allows 35-foot buildings adjacent to path; not enough space to address flooding, earthquake and liquefaction risks
Adam Frank for Olympia Master Builders	OMB supports the ‘compromise’ regarding setbacks and clear nonconforming development regulation 30-foot setback sufficient to achieve ‘no net loss’ Public access should not be required for mixed use – recommends removing that requirement

Kevin Stormans (Bayview grocery)	Recommends adopting SMP as proposed; strikes a balance and compromise and conformance to the shoreline guidelines
David Schaffert for Thurston County Chamber of Commerce	Concurs with support for proposed nonconforming regulations – Oyster House example Proposed setbacks consistent with the cumulative impacts assessment Mixed use key element of Chambers’ vision for the waterfront
Mike Reid for Port of Olympia	Support for SMP as proposed (including compromises)
Bonnie Jacobs	30-foot setback was not a compromise, it was a minimum proposed by city staff

Written comments received prior to September 9, 2014:

Commenter	Summary
Paul Ingman - Sept. 8 letter	SMP is not adequate to prevent flood damage; no sustainable strategy regarding sea level rise, no responsible choices (armoring will harm the environment), and no public involvement with sea level rise
John DeMeyer - Sept. 3 email	OYC member - proposed SMP ‘strikes an acceptable balance’ and should be approved
Bob Van Schoorl – Sept. 1 letter	Reaffirming comments at July 30 hearing – details regarding same points
Bob Jacobs – August 4 email	Regarding ‘Cap-6’ and Heritage Park; setback should be 100-feet and buildings limited to one-story consistent with Park plan, with an exception for a carillon
Gary Ball – Sept. 3 letter	OYC member – support for SMP as proposed
Edward, Victor, and Tom Zvirzdys and Vida Zvirzdys- Farler – Sept. 6 letter	Support for nonconforming provisions as proposed and for proposed setbacks and vegetative conservation areas in Urban Intensity; Public access and shoreline enhancement/restoration should not be required as a condition of mixed use development; significant public benefit should be required, but not those specific elements
Judy Bardin – Sept. 6 letter	Sea level rise and risk of flooding are not adequately addressed in proposed SMP ‘The City of Olympia Engineered Response to Sea Level Rise’ should be considered Given ‘data gaps,’ the proposed 30-foot setback is not adequate to provide enough flexibility for addressing flood risks
Walter Schefter – Sept. 3 letter	OYC member – support for SMP as proposed; larger setbacks not needed nor justified; OYC committed to shoreline preservation and ‘no net loss’ concept in modern context
Leslie Montecucco – Sept. 8 email	Proposed SMP does not meet statutory requirements regarding flooding Marine water 30-foot setback not sufficient to retain options to address flooding or sea level rise while preserving public access possibilities and vegetation conservation space 50-foot setback recommended
Dick Binns – Sept. 8 letter	OYC representative -- support for proposed nonconforming regulations, setbacks and vegetation conservation areas Support for mix of private and public uses, with reference to setbacks and public access in other communities like Portland and Seattle

James Legenfelder – Sept. 7 letter	Downtown waterfront setbacks should remain ‘as is’ (not increase to 30 feet) until there is community consensus Record doesn’t support setbacks greater than 30 feet Nonconforming repair provision should be exercised by repairing Percival Landing New covered moorage should be subject to standards, but not prohibited Specifically requiring public access and shoreline restoration is too restrictive regarding desirable mixed use – ‘significant public benefit’ should be required
Kevin Stormans – Sept. 5 email	Support for SMP as proposed; specifically nonconforming structure and use regulations, 30-foot setback downtown, and vegetation conservation area provisions
Robert Jensen – Sept. 3 letter	Request to “remand” to City of Olympia SMP fails to address flood risk as required by SMA, citing RCW 90.58.100 Particularly, marine flooding and sea level rise not adequately addressed
Jeffrey Jaksich – August 20 letter	Friends of Waterfront member Numerous public process flaws, including distortion and suppression of public input Intentional reduction in role of SMA and Ecology staff Require public access to the maximum extent practicable SMP lacks required plan for flood prevention Lacking ‘actual plans’ addressing flooding risk setbacks should be at least 50 to 55 feet. SMP should be specific regarding ‘light industrial uses’; heavy industry should be limited to marine terminal Sanitary sewer outfall associated with industry should be prohibited Uses of vegetation conservation areas should be carefully reviewed Moorage, boat storage and similar provisions are not clear Various building heights should be more limited Except for marine terminal (Budd 5B), Ward and Ken Lakes and shelters for public access, all minimum setbacks should be at least 50 feet
Mort James – August 14 letter	Comments of West Bay Drive Neighborhood Association Confirms prior comments and support for “West Bay Subarea Plan” Proposed SMP is good ‘compromise,’ approval encouraged
Jeanette Dickison – public hearing comment form	Proposed SMP does ‘good job’ of protecting shoreline and responding to sea level rise Approve with respect to West Bay Drive and “West Bay Plan” Disappointed “views” have usurped heights and providing density in other areas Contrary to vision of compact and dense small city; proposed SMP ‘does little to bring housing downtown Proposal would inhibit Port in exchange of goods and ideas