

DRAFT February 27, 2008
 PUBLIC COMMENTS AND PRELIMINARY KING COUNTY RESPONSES
 October – December 2007 Public Review of Draft Shoreline Master Program

Below is a summary of public comments received on the second Draft Shoreline Master Program from October – December 2007. A numbered list of the people and organizations that submitted comments is provided at the end of this summary; that list corresponds with the numbers in the 'Commentors' column below. These King County responses to comments are preliminary. The County will release a third Draft Shoreline Master Program for further public review in late summer 2008 and hold public meetings in early fall 2008. Please see information at the end of this document regarding review of the King County Shoreline Master Program by the WA Department of Ecology.

Comment topics	King County Response	Commentors
Shoreline Management Regulations		
Retain existing aquatic area buffer Disagree with proposed change to Type S aquatic area buffers in High Intensity and Residential shoreline environments in KCC 21A.24.358.	King County will retain existing critical areas buffers as adopted to protect shorelines of the state. The proposed change to Type S aquatic area buffers in High Intensity and Residential shoreline environments has been removed.	1, 20, 23, 95, 107, 108, 121, 150, 160, 184, 217, 221, 250, 264, 276, 299, 327, 407, 411, 412, 460, 482, 483, 543, 560, 563, 588, 593
Shoreline buffer along Lake Washington Increase the required buffer along the northeast Lake Washington shoreline given the ecological importance of this lakeshore area.	The criteria for shoreline designations have been revised to better recognize existing shoreline quality so that zoning is not as a dominant a factor in assigning designations. The restoration priority at this location on Lake Washington is low/medium based on existing conditions and previous watershed-based planning for this area. Given these conditions, the existing buffer of 115 feet will not be revised for this area.	1

Comment topics	King County Response	Commentors
<p>Shoreline buffers The proposed 115-foot buffer near Kirkland would not be appropriate for this urbanized area of Lake Washington. There is an average existing structure setback of 90 feet within the PAA located in unincorporated King County; many residences are located very close to the shoreline. A 115-foot setback on many residential parcels in the PAA would render them non-conforming or nearly undevelopable. Lake Forest Park's draft SMP proposed 40- and 50-foot setbacks in the Shoreline Residential and Conservancy environments with allowances for setback reduction. Lake Forest Park's residential shoreline is very similar to the PAA and the residential areas within Kirkland city limits. King County is proposing to use the same standards in the shoreline jurisdiction that it uses in its critical area regulations to regulate non-conforming structures. King County is proposing to allow the footprint of an existing residence and other residential structures located within critical area buffers to be expanded by up to 1,000 square feet. How would these exemptions be permitted under the SMP? The King County critical areas regulations contain a provision for lots created prior to January 1, 2005, allowing new single-family residences to be approved under certain circumstances. It appears that there is no minimum buffer width established under this provision. How would the County permit and evaluate such expansions under the SMP? Would other administrative provisions in critical areas regulations, such as buffer averaging, also be available under the SMP? If so, how will they be processed and analyzed?</p>	<p>King County proposes to adopt its critical area regulations as part of its Shoreline Master Program. King County believes that its shoreline buffers are consistent with best available science. Larger buffers in Kirkland's PAA will not present any problems when Kirkland annexes this area. At that time, Kirkland may reduce the buffers if it believes best available science supports smaller buffers. King County's critical areas regulations will be incorporated by reference in its SMP. Based on comments from Ecology and others, additional provisions will be added to ensure no net loss of shoreline function when standard buffers are modified or expansions of residences are allowed in critical area buffers.</p>	<p>99</p>

DRAFT February 27, 2008

Comment topics	King County Response	Commentors
<p>Lake Setbacks Last year a house was built closer than 100 feet to the lake. As far as we know, Shoreline Management still requires a 100 foot setback and there is no known reason for the variation for that one house.</p>	<p>Without more information about the specific development proposal, including when the application was filed, it is not possible to provide a complete answer. The current regulations do allow some flexibility if the applicant can demonstrate that the development proposal with a smaller buffer will be as protective of critical areas as would the standard buffer. In addition, if there is no other location on the property due to other considerations, such as location of a septic drainfield, a location closer to the water may be allowed.</p>	195
<p>Clarify when wetlands would prevent new docks Wetland protection requirements could prevent new docks on Lake Desire. The definition of significant wetland and habitat scoring is too vague and subject to a wide range of interpretation.</p>	<p>The Executive has proposed revisions to Chapter 21A.24 that better define significant vegetation. With respect to determining the habitat score for wetlands, this is established using Ecology's Wetland Rating Manual. There is considerable guidance available on using the manual, but a wetland consultant may be needed to ensure accurate rating.</p>	350
<p>Allow new docks Shoreline residents have docks to further their water dependent uses. I would suggest that docks be allowed to be built with specified materials, be 6 feet wide, and the longer of 20 feet or 6 feet below the ordinary high water mark.</p>	<p>King County is proposing changes to its existing regulations on docks. The proposed regulations will allow docks in more circumstances that are currently allowed. The proposed regulations include limitations on materials used in construction and limits on size or location in order to avoid adverse impacts in aquatic areas that are used by salmon.</p>	195
<p>Shoreline accessory structure height limit Where is the standard that restricts accessory structures to a maximum 8-foot height located in the code and what is the definition of an accessory building?</p>	<p>The 8-foot height limitation on residential accessory structures is an existing restriction in K.C.C. 25.16.110B. for the Urban environment and is also applied in the Rural environment in K.C.C. 25.20.090A., the Conservancy environment in K.C.C. 25.24.090B and the Natural environment in K.C.C. 25.29.090B. An accessory building is a building that is incidental to, or subordinate to, a building that supports the primary use for that zone.</p>	453
<p>Shoreline buffer compensation Wherever King County restricts land for setbacks or buffers the County should pay private property owners for that setback.</p>	<p>Under the federal and state constitutions, compensation is only required when all reasonable use of property is taken as a result of regulations. Requirements for buffers do not remove all reasonable use of property. In addition, King County has a shoreline variance process that can be used when reasonable use of a property is prevented.</p>	163

DRAFT February 27, 2008

Comment topics	King County Response	Commentors
<p>Edits regarding WRIA 9</p> <p>Page 5, line 94: Section A seems superfluous because sections B and C that follow address the map amendment process.</p> <p>Page 16, new section 15: should consider listing the WRIA plans.</p> <p>Page 18, add new definition for Marine nearshore per the Puget Sound Partnership legislation.</p> <p>Page 22, lines 448 492: Not clear why sub sections A and B are proposed for deletion.</p> <p>Page 43, shoreline mod table-bulkheads-see WRIA 9 armoring policy CUP?</p> <p>Page 45, line 963-change manager to director.</p> <p>Page 46, line 968- Recommend the adoption of WRIA 9 model code language to address shoreline armoring.</p> <p>Page 82, line 1775, water-enjoyment use: too open ended, give example.</p>	<p>Page 5, line 94: This is existing code and the suggested change is not related to the shoreline update.</p> <p>Page 16, new section 15: Section 15 identifies the components of the King County shoreline master plan. The WRIA plans are not a component of the King County shoreline master plan.</p> <p>Page 18: A new definition for nearshore has been added.</p> <p>Page 22, lines 448-492: There is no line 448 on page 22. If this comment relates to lines 489-493, subsections A and b are redundant with K.C.C. 21A.02.080. The shoreline regulations will be codified in K.C.C. Title 21A.</p> <p>Page 43. A shoreline conditional use permit will be required in the Conservancy, Natural, Forestry and Aquatic environments, but not in the High Intensity, Residential, Rural and Resource environments.</p> <p>Page 45, line 963: This subsection B has been deleted entirely. See response below related to comment on page 46.</p> <p>Page 46, line 968: Most of the suggested language is covered in various parts of the draft regulations, which have been rewritten based on comments from the public review draft. The biggest change in the language is to clearly state that shoreline armoring is not automatically allowed. The property owner will need to demonstrate that the shoreline armoring is actually necessary for the protection of existing legally established primary structures, new non-water-dependent development, existing water-dependent development or projects for the restoration of ecological functions or hazardous substance remediation. Part of this test is to require a geotechnical report that demonstrates erosion from waves or currents is imminently threatening and that damage is expected to occur within three years if the shoreline stabilization is not constructed. Other tests are that the erosion is not caused by upland conditions, non-structural approaches cannot adequately protect, the proposal is the minimum necessary and mitigation measures will be provided that ensure no net loss or function of intertidal or riparian habitat.</p> <p>Page 82, line 1775: This definition is from WAC 173-26-020(37). King County is required to use the Shoreline Management Act definitions. This WAC definition is proposed to be added to King County code to assist implementation.</p>	<p>551</p>

DRAFT February 27, 2008

Comment topics	King County Response	Commentors
<p>Shoreline impervious limits In the May 2007 Draft Shoreline Regulations it states that the entire lot that has a shoreline can only have 10% impervious coverage for the entire per KCC 9.04. Clarify impervious limits in shoreline jurisdiction.</p>	<p>Shoreline impervious surface limits have been removed from the proposed regulations.</p>	<p>453</p>
<p>Shoreline accessory structures Parcels within the Residential and Conservancy environments are each allowed a maximum 150 square foot residential accessory building. What types of accessory structures would this limit apply to?</p>	<p>King County's zoning code does not define the types of structures, but does require that they be accessory to the residential use. Garages are clearly contemplated. Accessory dwelling units may be in an accessory structure, but are subject to further limitations.</p>	<p>99</p>
<p>Shoreline boat lifts The draft SMP does not appear to discuss the permitting and/or allowance of boatlifts. The City of Kirkland has recently experienced a number of inquires about boatlifts and has identified the need to more clearly address the issue.</p>	<p>Provisions governing boat lifts are included in the proposed amendment to existing KCC 25.16.120.</p>	<p>99</p>

Comment topics	King County Response	Commentors
<p>Shoreline canopies</p> <p>a. SMP regulations for the use of canopies are found in Section 38. Specifically, canopies are not allowed to cover any dock or pier waterward of the OHWM within any shoreline environment. However, submerged free-standing mechanical boat lifts associated with single-family docks and piers may be covered with a canopy, subject to certain standards. While the SMP allows boat canopies to the extent they fall within the RGP-3-specific size criteria for the pier as a whole, RGP-3 does not address canopies and does not include them in its overall square-footage requirements. RGP-1 (Watercraft lifts in Fresh and Marine/Estuarine Waters within the State of Washington) appears to be another applicable reference for canopies. Has King County considered referencing RGP-1 for standards relating to canopies? Can the SMP allow canopies that are consistent with RGP-1 or that provide proof of federal and state agency approval of an alternate proposal?</p> <p>b. SMP regulations for canopies would require that the canopies be made out of canvas or other non-toxic materials. This does not appear to be consistent with the approach provided in RGP-1 (Watercraft lifts in Fresh and Marine/Estuarine Waters within the State of Washington) which establishes standards for installation of a translucent canopy. Has the County considered including a requirement for the use of translucent materials in canopies?</p> <p>c. SMP regulations for canopies require that the highest portion of the canopy be located below the topographical grade of existing homes on surrounding properties. In many areas along the shoreline in the PAA, the grade of surrounding properties is relatively flat and near the lake elevation and, as a result, new canopies would not be permitted and existing canopies would be nonconforming. Is this the intent? Has the County taken into account the existing topographical issues and the number of nonconformances that would result from this standard?</p>	<p>Comment noted. King County will review RGP-1 and evaluate its applicability to the King County regulations.</p>	<p>99</p>

DRAFT February 27, 2008

Comment topics	King County Response	Commentors
<p>Shoreline covered docks The draft regulations prohibit (with limited exceptions) all covered docks, piers, moorages, floats, or other covered structures. The County may want to consider whether there are additional situations, beyond those listed, where covered piers or structures should be allowed.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>	<p>471</p>
<p>Shoreline historic access According to King County's draft responses to the comments at the June 2007 Open House, this issue is still under review. This needs a more clear definition if it is not deleted.</p>	<p>This is a requirement in the current King County Shoreline Master Program. The goal of the provision is consistent with goals of the Shoreline Management Act. King County is not aware of any particular problems that the current provision has created. King County staff will continue to consider changes that provide greater certainty.</p>	<p>453</p>

Comment topics	King County Response	Commentors
<p>Shoreline dock and pier standards The KCSMP proposes that any residential dock, pier, moorage, float or launching facility located on Lake Washington conform to the standards of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers RGP-3 (Construction of New or Modification of Existing Residential Overwater Structures and Installation of Moorage Piling in Lake Washington, Lake Sammamish, the Sammamish River and Lake Union, including the Lake Washington Ship Canal), which provides for streamlined federal permitting of new and modified residential piers. The City of Kirkland had observed over the last several years that many property owners have requested greater flexibility in new pier design as well as modifications to existing piers to respond to local circumstances (for example, many properties with shallow lakebeds cannot reach a suitable moorage depth with the RGP-3 length limitations and many property owners are concerned about safety). Further, federal agencies have routinely approved new piers and pier modifications that do not meet the standard, subject to submittal of a Biological Evaluation, a mitigation plan, and a longer review process. Though the City of Kirkland has not developed its dock and pier development standards, based on our past experiences with the Regional General Permit we would recommend that the County explore including provisions that would allow applicants the opportunity to deviate from the RGP-3, with proof of federal and state agency approval of alternate proposals. Will the KCSMP allow deviation from the RGP-3? Can the KCSMP allow projects that are consistent with the RGP-3 or that provide proof of federal and state agency approval of alternate proposals?</p>	<p>King County will consider whether to allow alternatives in appropriate circumstances. King County's critical areas regulations include an alterations exception process that allows for this type of flexibility.</p>	<p>99</p>

DRAFT February 27, 2008

Comment topics	King County Response	Commentors
<p>Shoreline retail and commercial uses near Kirkland The program appears to permit a number of retail and other commercial uses in the Residential Environment (and adjacent Aquatic Environment) that traditionally have not been authorized in residential areas within the City of Kirkland. The proposed regulations require that the uses be permitted by the underlying zoning and that they be water-oriented uses. Has the County considered other standards that would address the compatibility of these uses to the surrounding residential development?</p>	<p>The allowance in the King County zoning code for retail and commercial uses in residential zones is quite limited. With the additional requirement that these uses be water-oriented if they are proposed within the shoreline jurisdiction, King County does not believe there are any incompatibilities with Kirkland's zoning.</p>	<p>99</p>
<p>Shoreline utilities a. The draft KCSMP regulations address utilities in a number of sections, including Section 56, Section 48, and Section 35 (in particular, the regulations pertaining to Government Services in the Aquatic Environment). These regulations, taken together, seem to appropriately allow upland utility projects. After reviewing these sections, I am unclear how the County would address smaller-scale utility projects located along the lakeshore, for instance, those that may require excavation and then backfill in the Aquatic environment in order to connect to the Metro Sewer trunk line in the lake, paralleling the lakeshore. b. Repair and maintenance activities are allowed by exemption, except where repair causes substantial adverse effects to shoreline resource or environment. How will repair/maintenance of utilities of non-statewide importance that may have adverse effects in the Aquatic environment be handled?</p>	<p>a. Only utility production and processing facilities, such as power plants and sewage treatment plants, will be outright prohibited within the shoreline jurisdiction. Any utility work that must be located within the aquatic environment will require a shoreline conditional use permit. b. Repair, replacement and maintenance of utilities of non-statewide importance will be allowed, but must include mitigation to address impacts to minimize soil erosion and maintain plan and wildlife habitat.</p>	<p>99</p>
<p>Shoreline Policies (Chapter 5 of Draft King County Comprehensive Plan)</p>		
<p>Marine economic development The policy for economic development should exclude marine shorelines when planning for industries, industrial projects, commerce and transportation facilities (except for public use).</p>	<p>King County will rely on shoreline designations to plan for land uses along shorelines of the state. All marine shorelines cannot be excluded from policies for economic development.</p>	<p>104</p>

DRAFT February 27, 2008

Comment topics	King County Response	Commentors
<p>Aquaculture policies Pierce County recently established Interim Regulatory Requirements for Geoduck Aquacultural Operations and Other Aquaculture Practices, Piers, Docks, and Related Structures) to address aquaculture activities in Pierce County. I am wondering about King County's experience has been and it's intentions in this arena. In a cursory review of the draft Shoreline Master Program I could not find any indication of land use for Aquaculture and have been unable to determine what the County intends in face of a burgeoning geoduck industry in the South Sound. It would seem that the County should be anticipating some activity in this arena and consider inclusion of appropriate policies, regulations and plans while the Program is under revision.</p>	<p>Draft aquaculture policies and regulations have been added to the draft Shoreline Master Program. Thank you for providing this helpful guidance.</p>	<p>359</p>
<p>Geoduck harvest We shouldn't allow commercial harvest of geoducks if we want to restore Puget Sound. The commercial methods stir things up too much. If the state needs the money, float oysters instead.</p>	<p>Geoduck harvest will only be allowed if there is no net loss of ecological processes and functions.</p>	<p>463</p>
<p>Shoreline access in residential areas So not to limit the amount of people that can access and enjoy the shoreline remove the wording 'substantial numbers' of from Residential Shoreline Policy S-513.</p>	<p>Policy S-513 has been edited according to this comment.</p>	<p>453</p>
<p>Shoreline changes on Cottage Lake What changes might affect those of us who live on Cottage Lake?</p>	<p>Proposed changes to the Shoreline Master Program will primarily affect the shoreline designation and associated allowed uses, and the standards for residential docks on Cottage Lake. Cottage Lake's current shoreline designation would be changed from Conservancy to a combination of Rural, Conservancy and Natural. Shoreline designations are proposed to be revised based on shoreline ownership, zoning, current conditions and restoration priorities. Rural residential uses are prioritized in the Rural designation, public safety and recreation are prioritized in the Conservancy designation and ecological protection is prioritized in the Natural designation. It is proposed that one dock or pier be allowed per single family residential site except in the Natural designation (no new docks are to be allowed). In the Conservancy designation, docks must be 250 feet from another existing dock and there must be no other location available.</p>	<p>442</p>

DRAFT February 27, 2008

Comment topics	King County Response	Commentors
<p>Shoreline fill policies Change Fill Policy S-791 to include water related uses and water enjoyment uses for both public and private access. To not burden private single-family residences with expensive shoreline studies and lengthy permitting, add the following as a Fill Policy: Without requiring identification of impacts or migration of ecological functions, each single-family lot within a Residential Shoreline Environment shall be allowed to place a 4-inch thick layer of washed sand and/or washed gravel within a 15-foot wide area down to the shoreline and out into the water to a depth of 6-feet below the ordinary high water mark.</p>	<p>Consistent with State shoreline management guidance (WAC 173-26-231(3)(c)), King County proposes to allow fill waterward of the ordinary high water mark only when necessary to support water dependent uses. Analysis of potential impacts associated with fill activities, including creation of beaches on single family lots, are intended to ensure that there is no net loss of shoreline processes and functions.</p>	<p>453, 195</p>
<p>High Intensity designation along Dockton Road The area between Dockton Road SW and SW 222nd PI on Vashon/Maury Island is proposed for High Intensity shoreline designation. Although the zoning appears to be NB (neighborhood business), aerial photographs show what appears to be a wetland on or near the NB zoned properties. Given the scale of the proposed shoreline designation map it is difficult to determine exactly where the proposed High Intensity shoreline designation is proposed. We recommend that the presence of absence of wetlands on the proposed High Intensity designated properties be confirmed, and that the designation be revised to Rural if wetlands are present.</p>	<p>The High Intensity shoreline designation will be retained along Dockton Road. Critical areas regulations will be maintained to protect resources in all shoreline areas, including wetland and aquatic area buffers and use restrictions.</p>	<p>551</p>
<p>High Intensity designation along Snoqualmie Several parcels along the Snoqualmie River at Fall City are designated high intensity under the proposed SMP. Though there is existing development on the parcels, these businesses are not water related or water dependent uses.</p>	<p>The shoreline area along the Snoqualmie River at Fall City is zoned for business uses and thus will be designated a High Intensity shoreline. This area is currently in medium condition according to the King County shoreline characterization. A buffer of 165-feet would be required to protect ecological processes and functions and the area would receive preservation, enhancement and restoration priority (rating B) under the Shoreline Protection and Restoration Plan.</p>	<p>160</p>
<p>WRIA 9 Salmon Habitat Plan WRIA 9 Salmon Habitat Plan has recommendations to encourage the use of alternatives to bulkheads.</p>	<p>The proposed SMP includes most of the provisions recommended by the WRIA 9 Salmon Habitat Plan. King County already considers feeder bluffs to be a critical area. Staff will review King County regulations to determine if additional provisions are necessary to address habitat issues related to feeder bluffs.</p>	<p>551</p>

DRAFT February 27, 2008

Comment topics	King County Response	Commentors
<p>Shoreline agriculture policies Support for shoreline agriculture policies.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>Put Shoreline Master Program update on hold</p>	<p>King County has decided to delay transmittal of the Shoreline Master Program to the King County Council. A new departmental draft will be presented for public review in late summer 2008 with public meetings held in early fall. The program will be transmitted to the King County Council for consideration in November 2008. The Council will conduct further public review of the Program in 2009. Please note that there were two previous rounds of public review on the proposed Shoreline Master Program: a 9-week review period in May-July 2007 and a 3-month review period in October - December 2007. The State requires King County to update the Shoreline Master Program and be consistent with State guidelines by December 2009.</p>	<p>1, 15, 21, 33, 34, 38, 59, 66, 67, 80, 87, 89, 97, 111, 117, 124, 140, 155, 162, 165, 172, 175, 176, 190, 192, 203, 207, 226, 227, 242, 244, 263, 272, 273, 285, 289, 303, 307, 309, 316, 320, 346, 349, 352, 353, 357, 362, 363, 372, 391, 392, 402, 405, 416, 417, 418, 433, 443, 447, 448, 458, 474, 476, 481, 509, 520, 532, 543, 562, 594, 598, 604, 605, 606</p>
<p>Glacier NW mining permit Opposed to mining operations and industrial dock permit at the Glacier NW site on Maury Island.</p>	<p>King County will continue to evaluate potential designations and use policies for Maury Island.</p> <p>Future applications for mining within the shoreline jurisdiction would be reviewed under the proposed Shoreline Master Program and would have to comply with new mining standards.</p>	<p>5, 20, 21, 59, 66, 79, 94, 97, 108, 111, 121, 130, 140, 141, 237, 263, 276, 289, 299, 346, 352, 353, 392, 418, 460, 477, 480, 505, 507, 511, 528, 536, 563, 572, 590, 593, 612</p>
<p>Increased Density in shoreline These multiple ways to increase density in urban and rural shoreline areas, whether inside or outside the buffer setback areas, do not provide assurance that the regulations and mitigation standards for permitted development will not result in a net loss of shoreline processes and functions.</p>	<p>Except for the allowance for expansions of existing residences when located within the buffer, the provisions for allowing greater density, whether through TDR or detached accessory dwelling units, will require new structures to be located outside of the critical area buffer.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>Industrial Uses in Maury Island Aquatic Reserve Restrict uses in or adjacent to the Maury Island Aquatic Reserve.</p>	<p>Proposed policies and permitted uses within the shoreline designations are consistent with the recommendations of the Maury Island Aquatic Reserve management plan. Proposed Shoreline Master Program industrial, commercial and residential uses are also consistent with State shoreline management guidelines.</p> <p>A shoreline conditional use permit will be required for industrial and commercial docks; this permit includes State review to ensure that there is no net loss of ecological functions. Prior to issuing any shoreline permit, King County will require that all adverse environmental impacts be mitigated.</p>	<p>1, 104, 320, 327, 407, 450, 524, 593</p>

DRAFT February 27, 2008

Comment topics	King County Response	Commentors
<p>Maury Island Resource designation Do not change shoreline designation of the mining site on Maury Island to Resource.</p>	<p>King County will continue to evaluate potential designations and use policies for Maury Island.</p> <p>All mineral resource lands on unincorporated King County shorelines are proposed to be designated as a Resource environment.</p> <p>Please note that the proposed Shoreline Master Program cannot modify or affect the vested permit for the Glacier NW site, and the same mining and protection standards would be applied whether the site is designated Conservancy (as it is currently) or Resource (as proposed). Specific mining standards have been added to the draft shoreline management regulations to ensure no net loss of ecological processes and functions. The level of protection for many shoreline reaches on Vashon/Maury Island is proposed to be increased as part of the Shoreline Master Program update; approximately 350 acres that were designated Conservancy would be designated Natural.</p>	<p>1, 15, 16, 18, 20, 33, 34, 38, 48, 53, 56, 59, 60, 61, 66, 67, 80, 84, 87, 89, 94, 104, 106, 107, 111, 112, 116, 117, 124, 130, 140, 145, 150, 155, 162, 165, 172, 175, 176, 179, 190, 191, 192, 203, 207, 217, 226, 227, 237, 242, 244, 245, 247, 250, 264, 272, 273, 274, 285, 289, 291, 300, 303, 307, 309, 316, 320, 346, 349, 357, 362, 363, 367, 372, 391, 392, 402, 405, 417, 418, 423, 424, 432, 435, 443, 446, 447, 448, 449, 458, 460, 464, 468, 474, 480, 482, 483, 507, 508, 509, 516, 520, 532, 536, 543, 547, 559, 562, 563, 568, 588, 593, 594, 598, 601, 604, 605, 606, 608</p>
<p>Shoreline Program compatibility with Carnation The King County SMP designates all of the parcels within the City of Carnation PAA as Residential Shoreline. However, there are parcels within the PAA that will be zoned for commercial use upon annexation into the city, according to the Carnation Zoning Map</p>	<p>King County does not believe that designating these areas as Residential Shoreline will create problems for the City of Carnation when it does annex these areas. At that time, the City may modify apply the designations that it has established under its SMP.</p>	<p>490</p>
<p>Shoreline maps Maps in Folio are not readable.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The shoreline maps are also available at www.metrokc.gov/shorelines and can be viewed at a larger scale.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>Shoreline jurisdiction Should S-105 indicate that King County shoreline jurisdiction extends over shorelines of the state within unincorporated King County?</p>	<p>This clarification has been made.</p>	<p>46</p>

DRAFT February 27, 2008

Comment topics	King County Response	Commentors
<p>Shoreline modification policies To not burden private single-family residences with expensive shoreline studies and lengthy permitting, add the following as a General Shoreline Modifications Policy. Without requiring identification of impacts or migration of ecological functions, each single-family lot within a Residential Shoreline Environment shall be allowed to clear a 15-foot wide area of vegetation down to the shoreline and out into the water to a depth of 6-feet below the ordinary high water mark.</p>	<p>Analysis of potential impacts associated with shoreline modifications, including clearing within the shoreline buffer on single family lots, is intended to ensure that there is no net loss of shoreline processes and functions. This requirement will not be removed from existing critical area protection regulations.</p>	<p>453</p>
<p>Shoreline planting requirements Any permit granted to waterfront owners should include conditions that require planting buffers of native plants adjacent to the beach, with berms, swales and rainwater catchment/rain gardens that keep rainwater on site.</p>	<p>King County cannot require property owners to restore shoreline buffer areas. However, if new development causes impacts to the shoreline, a property owner may be required to mitigate the impact by revegetating the shoreline with native plants. The County is not currently proposing changes to existing stormwater management regulations.</p>	<p>104</p>
<p>Shoreline Protection and Restoration Plan As noted above, the Maury Island Aquatic Reserve Final Management Plan notes that 60% of the shorelines within the reserve are currently modified with shoreline hardening. The Plan sets a goal to restore existing armoring so that no more than 30% of the reserve is hardened, by supporting voluntary efforts to reduce impacts of shoreline modification on nearshore drift cell processes and supporting restoration projects that demonstrate ecological benefits and feasibility. Please include policies and projects in Appendix A that support the Plans goals for restoration, and provide a collaborative approach with DNR towards meeting those goals. We support the inclusion of acquisition of key areas in the Dockton Extension and North for protection of marine ecology. Clarify projects planned for this area.</p>	<p>The Shoreline Protection and Restoration Plan has been revised and clarified according to these comments.</p> <p>The Dockton Extension and North project listed in the attachment to the Shoreline Protection and Restoration Plan is not associated with the King County Road Services Division projects proposed at Tramp Harbor. Please see the Vashon-Maury Island Protection and Restoration Location Map. The Road Services Division is convening a citizen's advisory committee in early 2008 to collaborate on design alternatives for the Dockton Road capital improvement projects.</p>	<p>108</p>

DRAFT February 27, 2008

Comment topics	King County Response	Commentors
<p>Shoreline protection and stormwater management The Shoreline Program update has number of elements geared to water resource management. The Shoreline Restoration and Protection Plan should include a holistic and well-coordinated approach to stormwater runoff.</p>	<p>King County considered the effects of stormwater runoff and non-point pollution in characterizing existing ecological shoreline processes. Stormwater regulations play an important role in the County's critical areas and proposed shoreline protection requirements. The Shoreline Protection and Restoration Plan has been revised to clarify King County's approach to stormwater management in relation to shoreline protection.</p>	<p>442, 484</p>
<p>Create more marine aquatic reserves Please save and create more aquatic reserves in your Shoreline Master Plan for the health of Puget Sound and all the marine life associated with it, including threatened salmon. Please maintain or increase Vashon/Maury Island shoreline protection.</p>	<p>Washington State is responsible for establishing aquatic reserves in Puget Sound. King County has recognized and is consistent with the Maury Island Aquatic Reserve Management Plan in proposed shoreline policies and regulations. The current proposal provides increased protection for marine shorelines by designating reaches as Natural and through the new Shoreline Protection and Restoration Plan.</p>	<p>327</p>
<p>Shoreline restoration in O.O. Denny Park Clarify scope of restoration project associated with the bulkhead in O.O. Denny Park.</p>	<p>The Shoreline Protection and Restoration Plan has been revised to specify that only the timber portion of the O.O. Denny Park bulkhead would be removed.</p>	<p>484</p>
<p>Shoreline restoration priority at North Bend Map S-3b Shoreline Designations, NE King County, WA designates 3 areas as Residential Shoreline and 2 areas as High Intensity Shoreline just outside North Bend current city limits. These same areas are then shown on Map A2 as a Shoreline Restoration Priority (HM) which is meant to enhance and create. The City of North Bend requests those 3 areas of Residential Shoreline and 2 areas of High Intensity Shoreline designation be removed from Map A2 Shoreline Restoration Priority because it is not clear why you would want to or require prioritization of restoration work in existing residential or existing commercial or industrial areas. The City of North Bend also feels the HM Restoration Priority assigned to most of our surrounding areas and UGA should include conservation or preservation in addition to the Enhance and Create that is proposed.</p>	<p>Protection and restoration priorities are intended to guide the type of activities along each shoreline reach in the unincorporated area. The priorities are specifically based on the County's characterization of existing shoreline conditions, salmon recovery plans, biological data and other relevant technical and natural resource planning information. The proposed Shoreline Protection and Restoration Plan is a guide and would not prohibit enhancement or creation activities near North Bend.</p>	<p>73</p>

DRAFT February 27, 2008

Comment topics	King County Response	Commentors
<p>Shoreline revegetation The simplest and most effective measure we can take to protect our lakes and shorelines is to get property owners to leave a percentage of their shoreline in natural vegetation.</p>	<p>King County encourages revegetation of lake buffers through mitigation requirements, rural stewardship planning and public education efforts. The County also supports salmon recovery efforts, including shoreline restoration and public outreach on salmon friendly practices.</p>	<p>36</p>
<p>Review of docks Change Piers and Docks Policy S-784 S-787 to include water related uses and water enjoyment uses for both public and private access.</p> <p>To not burden private single-family residences with expensive shoreline studies and lengthy permitting, add the following as a Piers and Docks Policy: Without requiring identification of impacts or migration of ecological functions, each single-family lot within a Residential Shoreline Environment shall be allowed to construct a permanent 5-foot wide solid-surface pier or dock extending from the shoreline out into a water depth of 6-feet below the ordinary high water mark.</p>	<p>The proposed policies and regulations for single family piers and docks are consistent with State shoreline management guidelines and US Army Corps of Engineers requirements. These policies and regulations will improve consistency and efficiency in the review of in-water project proposals.</p>	<p>453</p>
<p>Shoreline rural stewardship Rural stewardship plans must meet shoreline goals.</p>	<p>King County's provisions for Rural Stewardship Plans have been modified to ensure that the goals and policies of the Shoreline Management Act are met.</p>	<p>1</p>

DRAFT February 27, 2008

Comment topics	King County Response	Commentors
<p>Shoreline traditional cultural properties I would suggest changing wording in Part A of Section 5 at 5-1 and 5-2, Archaeological and Historic Resources, and any other applicable section, to incorporate Traditional Cultural Properties TCP. This is consistent with the language and concepts of Bulletin 38 of the National Park Service on Traditional Cultural Properties. This is more comprehensive language that includes traditional areas of interest, such as traditional use areas, which may not otherwise be incorporated under the current draft language referencing sites and buildings and structures. This is especially important in shoreline areas that may reflect such use.</p> <p>Also in the note on page 5-5, I would like to see the following language inserted: in consultation with potentially affected Indian Tribes. Project evaluation should be evaluated reviewed by County historic preservation staff, in consultation with potentially affected Indian Tribes.</p>	<p>Shoreline policies and regulations have been revised to accommodate these comments regarding traditional cultural properties and consultation.</p>	<p>298</p>
<p>Shoreline update responsibility Shoreline update is huge responsibility. Let me know if I can help.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>	<p>321</p>
<p>Shoreline water-enjoyment definition Change definition of water-enjoyment use to include both public and private use. So not to limit the amount of people that can access and enjoy the shoreline. Remove the words 'substantial numbers of'.</p>	<p>The definition of water enjoyment use is consistent with State shoreline management guidelines (WAC 173-26-020) and will not be revised.</p>	<p>453</p>
<p>Natural designation on Vashon/Maury Natural marine shoreline designation criteria should be revised by deleting requirement that the shoreline has a restoration plan rating of A, and the shoreline reach is at least five hundred feet along the ordinary high water mark. This would result in all of Vashon/Maury Island being designated Natural.</p>	<p>Acknowledging restoration priorities for marine shorelines does not result in all of the Vashon/Maury Island shoreline being designated Natural. The proposed designations do consider the location and intensity of existing development as the characterization of existing shoreline conditions is a factor in determining restoration priorities.</p>	<p>104</p>
<p>Shorelines critical freshwater Add a policy to protect critical freshwater habitat.</p>	<p>A policy has been added to address the level of protection for critical freshwater habitats.</p>	<p>1, 108</p>

DRAFT February 27, 2008

Comment topics	King County Response	Commentors
<p>Watershed protections for small lakes Would like to see the development restrictions increased and extended to the entire watershed of small lakes. Most all small lakes sit in bowls with limited watershed areas. However medium to large development on the hillsides above a small lake can have significant impacts.</p>	<p>As directed by State law, the County Shoreline Master Program applies only to the 200-foot area around small lakes and to associated wetlands and floodplains. However, existing King County critical area, clearing and grading, and stormwater requirements do consider and manage the effects of upland activities on small lakes.</p>	<p>8</p>
<p>Good job on public process, web information and program drafting King County did a fine job drafting the Shoreline Master Program and presenting public information on the web and in public meetings.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>	<p>99, 352, 353, 459, 490, 551</p>
<p>Poor notification effort We found your effort of notifying us poor at best. It should not be the responsibility of the residents to constantly be checking a website. A friend of our neighbors accidentally saw the plan and forwarded it.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>	<p>57, 68, 72, 379, 530, 531</p>
<p>Tree Supported Structures Allow tree supported structures of 200 square feet or less within riparian setbacks. They are low impact structures that permit responsible use of sensitive areas.</p>	<p>King County will continue to evaluate this proposed standard.</p>	<p>397, 398, 442</p>

WA Department of Ecology Review and Comments on October 2007 Draft Shoreline Master Program Update:

The WA Department of Ecology (Ecology) shoreline planners and technical staff worked with King County staff throughout the shoreline inventory and characterization and reviewed the draft Shoreline Master Program update. The Ecology review team submitted comments on the second draft Shoreline Master Program on December 26, 2007 and the WA State Attorney General's Office sent comments to King County via Ecology on January 17, 2008. Key comment topics included integration of critical areas and shoreline regulations, shoreline designation criteria, allowed uses and modifications, a standard that allows limited expansion of existing residences in critical area buffers, rural stewardship planning, shoreline protection and restoration planning and cumulative impacts analysis. King County staff met with the Ecology review team on October 29, 2007 to introduce the second draft Shoreline Master Program and then on December 5, 2007, January 14, 2008 and January 28, 2008 to discuss and respond to comments. Over the course of the review and meeting period, Ecology and King County staff reached agreement on necessary revisions to the draft Shoreline Master Program. These revisions will be incorporated into the August 2008 draft of the Shoreline Master Program update.

DRAFT February 27, 2008

Commentors:

- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1 Ann Aagard | 41 Bill Bennet | 81 Gary N Carlos | 121 Laurette Culbert |
| 2 Ken Adams | 42 Eric Berquist | 82 Robert L Carlos | 122 William and Elizabeth Culbert |
| 3 Jeff Agnew | 43 Hans Bertleson | 83 Kelly Carney | 123 Will Cummings |
| 4 Agriculture Commission | 44 Michele and Shawn Bettinger | 84 Maurice Carpenter | 124 Kim Cunningham |
| 5 Alice Alkire | 45 Shawn Bettinger | 85 Tom Carpenter | 125 Gary Dagam |
| 6 Nancy R Alter | 46 Larry R Blanchard | 86 Tom Carpenter | 126 Shevanthi Daniel |
| 7 Ali Alyazdi | 47 Steve Blankenship | 87 marcia carroll | 127 Holly D'Annunzio |
| 8 dave ambur | 48 Kevin Bodle | 88 Kirsten Carson | 128 Charyl Darra |
| 9 Barry Anderson | 49 Anita Boedeker | 89 Jim Jeri J0 Carstairs | 129 Shane Davies |
| 10 Chris Anderson | 50 Karen Bohlke | 90 Bob Castagna | 130 DK Davis-Moore |
| 11 Darrell Anderson | 51 Richard Bonewits | 91 Bob Castagna | 131 Susan Dawson |
| 12 Pat Anderson | 52 Jeff Boyce | 92 Cheryl Castagna | 132 Mike Dayton |
| 13 Violet Anderson | 53 Margot Boyer | 93 Chris L Caviezel | 133 Mike Dayton |
| 14 Billy Andrew | 54 Peggy Braeutigam | 94 George Cheroke | 134 Dennis Debrowski |
| 15 Fletcher Andrews | 55 BranBar, LLC | 95 Zoe Cheroke | 135 Lori DeGagne |
| 16 Jill Andrews | 56 Alexanndrina Brannan | 96 Dennis D, Vanessa T Chitwood | 136 Charles Delaurenti |
| 17 Scott Andrus | 57 Glenn and Diana Bremer | 97 Patrick Christie | 137 Jeanette Delaurenti |
| 18 Stephen Andrus | 58 Paul Brenna | 98 Chuck Clarke | 138 Greg Denney |
| 19 Anonymous | 59 Lynn Brevig | 99 Stacey Clausen | 139 Holly Denuncio |
| 20 Rein Attemann | 60 Helen Brocard | 100 Kevin Cleary | 140 David Derrer |
| 21 Bill Austin | 61 Helen Brocard | 101 William H. Cleaver | 141 Bob Dixon |
| 22 Diane Ausubel | 62 Diana Brook | 102 John Coates | 142 Debra Dobrowski |
| 23 Andrea B. Avni | 63 Dave Brooks | 103 Elizabeth Colbert | 143 Diane Dohanish |
| 24 Peggy Backues | 64 Pam D Brooks | 104 Pat Collier | 144 Chree Donaldson |
| 25 Brittany Bailey | 65 Todd Broussard | 105 Forest Commission | 145 L Ann Donaldson |
| 26 David Bailie | 66 Arlene Brown | 106 Celia Congdon | 146 Rick Downer |
| 27 Helen Bailie | 67 Steven Brown | 107 Gregg Conlee | 147 Victoria Drake |
| 28 Johnny Ball | 68 Walter and Adrienne Bruhn | 108 Cyrilla Cook | 148 Adelle Drawbaugh |
| 29 Guy Baltzelle | 69 Renata Bruni | 109 Tammie Cook | 149 Paul Drelerich |
| 30 Ed and Jean Bancroft | 70 Patrick Brzuchalski | 110 Tammy Cook | 150 Rene Dubay |
| 31 Randy Bannecker | 71 David Burger | 111 Mark Corliss | 151 Patrica J Dyer |
| 32 Dr. Jack Barbash | 72 Robert Burhn | 112 John Cornelison | 152 Debi Elberk |
| 33 Stephanie Barbee | 73 Jamie Burrell | 113 Matthew Cowan | 153 Mark S Elliot |
| 34 Stuart Barker | 74 Patrick W Busby | 114 Jean Crocker | 154 Sonny Elliot |
| 35 Layne Barnes | 75 Allison Byers | 115 Mark Cross | 155 Lise Ellner |
| 36 Bret Barnier | 76 Shane Camp | 116 Beatrice Crouch | 156 John Emerson |
| 37 Ron Baum | 77 Suzanne Cannon | 117 Jon Crouch | 157 Lynette Emerson |
| 38 Stephanie Begley | 78 Janice Cannon-Kyte | 118 Don Crum | 158 Gina Estep |
| 39 Cheri Bell | 79 Jennifer Cardo | 119 Cecelia Cruz | 159 Michael Evans |
| 40 Deborah Bellam | 80 Amy Carey | 120 Cecelia A Cruz | 160 Perry Falcone |

DRAFT February 27, 2008

161 Ian Falkenhagen	201 Lynn Glessner	241 Anthony Hemstad	281 Colleen M Johnson
162 Lynne Faulk	202 Tron Glessner	242 Kathleen Hendrickson	282 Cynthia Johnson
163 Greg Fawcett, D.D.S.	203 Cynthia Golfus	243 Ted M Hendry	283 Elmerita Johnson
164 Paul Fawthrop	204 Dorthy Goller	244 Patricia Herbert	284 Jule Johnson
165 Kathleen Fellbaum	205 Roger Goodman	245 Thomas Herring	285 Martha Johnson
166 A Fernandez	206 Linda Goodwin	246 Peter Herzog	286 Pamela Johnson
167 Dave Fields	207 anne gordon	247 Robin Hess	287 Richard R Johnson
168 Dan Finkbeiner	208 Connie Gowin	248 Peggy Heydorn	288 Scott Jonas
169 Michael Firestine	209 Constance F Gowin	249 Peter Heydorn	289 Margaret Jones
170 Denice Fischer-Fortier	210 Wendy Gowin	250 Wade Higgens	290 Michael D Jones
171 Thomas Fish	211 James Grafton	251 Bruce Higgs	291 Richard Jones
172 Reed Fitzpatrick	212 Issaquah Creek Valley Groundwater Protection Committee	252 Dewey Hill	292 Susan Jones
173 Jim Flynn	213 Redmond Bear Creek Groundwater Protection Committee	253 Dewey C Hill	293 Susan Jones
174 Joyce Foster-Konya	214 Vashon Maury Island Groundwater Protection Committee	254 Susan Hill	294 Sonia Kaidas
175 Karen Fox	215 Mary Matsuda Gruenewald	255 Patty Hobb	295 Sonja Kairis
176 Sally Fox	216 Erick Haakenson	256 Scott and Patty Hobbs	296 Alex Kamola
177 Tamara Fox	217 Dan Jennifer Halos	257 Bruce Hoff	297 Mike Kanaga
178 Ava Frisinger	218 Gregory Hampel	258 Jenine Hoff	298 Ian Kanair
179 chelo Gable	219 James Hancock	259 Barb Holt	299 Rhonda Karusaitis
180 Jeffrey Gaffin	220 Bob and Diane Hansen	260 Vaughn Holtz	300 Tom Kaufer
181 Kelly Galloway	221 Marcia Hansen	261 Connie Hooper	301 Charles Kaufman
182 Tina Gann	222 Marcia Hansen	262 John C Hopewell	302 Nancy Keith
183 Michael A and Carol I Garcia	223 Marcia Hansen	263 Jeff Hoyt	303 Bonny Kelly
184 Olaya Garcia	224 Paul E Hansen	264 Alan Huggins	304 Liz Kelly
185 Paul Garner	225 Bill Hanson	265 Freelon Hunter	305 Henry L Kelsey
186 Sandra Gaudette	226 Robert Harmon	266 Sherri J Hunter	306 Karen L Kelsey
187 Heidi Gburski	227 Virginia Harriman	267 David Hutchinson	307 John J Kennedy
188 Kevin Geer	228 Eric Harris	268 Mayor Laura Iddings	308 Mary Jo Kenner
189 Eric Gelbert	229 Jennifer Harrison-Cox	269 Garrett Inouye, P.E.	309 Amy Kessel
190 Jan Gelman	230 Shane Hartman	270 Diane Istvan	310 Ross Kilburn
191 Donna Gering	231 Tim Hatley	271 Rosemarie M Ives	311 Robyn Kimble
192 Steven Gering	232 Michael V Hauser	272 Deboarh Jackson	312 King County Agriculture Commission
193 Noel Gerken	233 Will Hawkins	273 Frank Jackson	313 Andrei Kiselyov
194 Liz Giba	234 Ken Hearing	274 John James	314 Leslie Knoyle
195 Beverly Giberson	235 Peter Heidel	275 Jim Jameson	315 Cyrstal Kolke
196 Chris Gilbert	236 Mara Heiman	276 Gayle Janzen	316 Patricia Koncsek
197 Andy Gillespie	237 Brad Helland	277 Diane E Jensen	317 Ken Konigsmark
198 Suzie Gillett	238 Linda M Hemphill	278 Justin Jensen	318 Bela Konya, Sr.
199 Suzy Gillett	239 William Hemphill	279 Raymond J Jensen	319 Douglas W Koston
200 Mary Jane Glaser	240 William and Linda Hemphill	280 Robert D. Johns	320 Ellen Kritzman

DRAFT February 27, 2008

321 Yvonne Kuperberg
 322 Jadi Lambro
 323 Fred Lanctot
 324 Pat Lanctot
 325 Joseph Lane
 326 Jim Lange
 327 Donald Larson
 328 Terry Lavender
 329 Tai Le
 330 Richard A Leahy
 331 Martha Leanard
 332 Vince Leanard
 333 Barry Lee
 334 Phillip H Leeds
 335 Russell B Leeds
 336 Elke B Lewis
 337 Mike Lewis
 338 Peter B Lewis
 339 Robert Leykam
 340 Jay Likness
 341 Judy Likness
 342 Judy Likness
 343 Shie-Jen Lin
 344 Ida M Lisenby
 345 Stephen L Lisenby
 346 Jessica Lisovsky
 347 Lynda Liukko
 348 melinda livingstone
 349 John Lloyd
 350 Betsy and Jim Locatelli
 351 Jim Locatelli
 352 Bob Loeliger
 353 robert LOELIGER
 354 Daniel Lofstrom
 355 Laura Long
 356 Michael L Lorette
 357 susan lowrey
 358 Nora and Donald MacKenzie
 359 Bartley Madison
 360 Rick Magnussen

361 Nancy Mathews
 362 Sheila Mattingly
 363 Noemie Maxwell Vassilakis
 364 Deborah Mazzadra
 365 Matt McCain
 366 Pamela McConville
 367 Bev McCullough
 368 Matt McDale
 369 Pavo McDonald
 370 Shawn MCGovern
 371 Storm McNeil
 372 Helen Meeker
 373 Dawn Mehrer
 374 Donald Mehrer
 375 Morris B Mehrer
 376 Shirley A Mehrer
 377 Ed Merrill
 378 Minnie Mary Merrill
 379 Joe and Wilma Mihelich
 380 Fr Sun Miles
 381 Alicia Miller
 382 LaVonne Milosevich
 383 Marvin Milosevich
 384 David Minaker
 385 Lee Moderow
 386 Gordon Moorman
 387 Josie Morales
 388 Tammy Morales
 389 Jonathan Morrison
 390 Barbara Morriss
 391 John Morrow
 392 Carole Mullin
 393 Craig Muth
 394 Craig Muth
 395 Michele Myers
 396 Darrel Nash
 397 Pete Nelson
 398 Pete Nelson
 399 David Nemens, AICP
 400 Rose Neuroth

401 Wesley Neuroth
 402 Roger Newby
 403 Myttan Nguyen
 404 Diane Nichols
 405 Wendy Nickolay
 406 Bryn Oakleaf
 407 Mike O'Brien
 408 Jan O'Connor
 409 Eric Oemig
 410 Cameron Olsen
 411 Carl Olsen
 412 Janet O'Neil
 413 David A Orriss
 414 Mary Parides
 415 Ruby James Parker
 416 Janet Parr
 417 Edeen Parrish
 418 Edeen M Parrish
 419 Dennis Paulson
 420 Dorothy Paun
 421 dorothy paun
 422 Rick Perez
 423 Bianca Perla
 424 Karen Perla
 425 Donna Peterson
 426 Jeanne L Pettigrew
 427 Mark Petty
 428 Bruce Phillips
 429 Alex Pietsch
 430 Meghan Pinch
 431 Cecil E Gene Pollard
 432 Bob Powell
 433 Amelia Powers
 434 Donna Prague
 435 James Price
 436 Hilde Prince
 437 Public Meeting Commenter
 438 Public Meeting Commenter
 439 Public Meeting Commenter
 440 Public Meeting Commenter

441 Public Meeting Commenter
 442 Public Meeting Commenter
 443 Chris Purpus
 444 Amber Puzey
 445 Sasha Rabkin
 446 Robert Radz
 447 Gary Ragland
 448 Stephen Raish
 449 Michelle Ramauro
 450 Annette Ramsour
 451 Kim Ratigan
 452 Christopher Raykovich
 453 Mark Reeves
 454 Janet Rehon
 455 Walt Rehon
 456 Dean L Renick
 457 Wanda M Renick
 458 Jeanne Reynen
 459 Craig Rhodes
 460 John M. Patricia J. Richards
 461 Peter Rimbo
 462 Melinda Ritz
 463 Barbara Roberts
 464 Barbara Roberts
 465 Dale L Roberts
 466 Mary J Roberts
 467 Matt Robinson
 468 Weslie Rodgers
 469 Jay Rodne
 470 Darryl Rogers
 471 Steve Roos
 472 Stannette Marie Rose
 473 Nyla Rosen
 474 Mary Rothermel
 475 Charlene Rouse
 476 Dwight Rousu
 477 Kris Rubenaker
 478 Rural Forest Commission
 479 Carlos S. Sanabria, P.E.
 480 Ivy Sacks
 481 Craig Salins
 482 Carrie Salter
 483 Carrie Salters
 484 Richard K. Sandaas

DRAFT February 27, 2008

441 Public Meeting Commenter	481 Craig Salins	521 Larry Springer	561 Seth Truscott
442 Public Meeting Commenter	482 Carrie Salter	522 Thomas Stafford	562 Father Abbot Tryphon
443 Chris Purpus	483 Carrie Salters	523 Tom Stafford	563 Kari Ulatoski
444 Amber Puzey	484 Richard K. Sandaas	524 Bob Stagman	564 Larry Undis
445 Sasha Rabkin	485 Roz Schatman	525 Julie Stangell	565 Gene Uno
446 Robert Radz	486 Ed Schein	526 Jeremy Stendera	566 Nick Vacca
447 Gary Ragland	487 Dawn Schiller	527 Sean Stewart	567 Laara Van Bryce
448 Stephen Raish	488 Laura Schlicker-Long	528 Joseph Storozhev	568 Harriet Van Buren
449 Michelle Ramauro	489 Richard Schmidt	529 John Stower	569 Aldis Vanders
450 Annette Ramsour	490 Linda Scott	530 Ken and Lydia Strange	570 Marilyn J Vanders
451 Kim Ratigan	491 Shelley Scuderi	531 Jean Strom	571 Maria VanZanen
452 Christopher Raykovich	492 Jerry Seimears	532 Dan Sullivan	572 Sharon Vatne
453 Mark Reeves	493 Alicia Sharp	533 Ed Swaya	573 Beverly Vernon
454 Janet Rehon	494 Gayle Shea	534 Debbie Sweeney	574 Kristin Vickery
455 Walt Rehon	495 Patrick Shea	535 Sheldon Sweeney	575 Salamon Vivanco
456 Dean L Renick	496 Susan Sherman	536 Maia Syfers	576 Bob Vos
457 Wanda M Renick	497 H D Shertz	537 Michael Tanksley	577 Andris Vosk
458 Jeanne Reynen	498 Howard and Katherine Shertz	538 John Taylor	578 Peggy Waldron
459 Craig Rhodes	499 Katherine C Shertz	539 Judy Taylor	579 Karen Walker
460 John M. Patricia J. Richards	500 Bill Shivitz	540 Kathy Taylor	580 Mike and Karen Walker
461 Peter Rimbos	501 Gary Shugard, Phd	541 Mark Taylor	581 Janet Wall
462 Melinda Ritz	502 Anton J Sieger	542 Mark T Taylor	582 John Wall
463 Barbara Roberts	503 Melody Sieger	543 Julie Thielges	583 Patti J Wall
464 Barbara Roberts	504 Tom Sill	544 Eugene D and Jean E Thom	584 Craig Wallace
465 Dale L Roberts	505 Doug Sillars	545 Kevin Thomaier	585 W C Wallace
466 Mary J Roberts	506 Lloyd Silver	546 Linda Thomaier	586 William Wallace
467 Matt Robinson	507 Christian Simard	547 Dave Thomas	587 Gwendolyn Walsh
468 Weslie Rodgers	508 Kristie Simard	548 Mike Thomas	588 Susan Ward
469 Jay Rodne	509 Zach Simard	549 Larry Thompson	589 Water Utilities of King County
470 Darryl Rogers	510 Brian Smith	550 Lawrence Thompson	590 Lois Watkins
471 Steve Roos	511 Elinor Smith	551 Gordon Thomson	591 Kathy Wetherbee
472 Stannette Marie Rose	512 Heather Smith	552 Ida L Tingvall	592 Mark Wetherbee
473 Nyla Rosen	513 Heather Smith	553 Dr. Christopher Toombs	593 ae white
474 Mary Rothermel	514 Kerry Smith	554 Audrey Torrey	594 Susan White
475 Charlene Rouse	515 Stephanie Smith	555 Mark Torrey	595 Jeff Whitmore
476 Dwight Rousu	516 Jeanne Snell	556 Patricia Traub	596 Jeff and Karol Whitmore
477 Kris Rubenaker	517 Donna Snure	557 Carolyn Trautmann	597 Karol Whitmore
478 Rural Forest Commission	518 Kirk Snure	558 Robert Trautmann	598 Geraldine Williams
479 Carlos S. Sanabria, P.E.	519 Jerry Nancy South	559 Chris Trevellyan	599 Roy Wilson
480 Ivy Sacks	520 John Spear	560 Tim Trohimovich	600 Greg Wingard

DRAFT February 27, 2008

601 Christina Winge
602 Calvin Wood
603 Bill Woodcock
604 Joan Wortis
605 celina yarkin
606 Joe Yarkin
607 Eugena Young
608 elizabeth younger
609 Gunta Zarins
610 Valdis Zarins
611 Audrey Zeder
612 yvonne zick