

**Responsiveness Summary** to public comments on the City of Bellevue's SMP-update

The City of Bellevue passed *Resolution #8922* on May 18, 2015, authorizing submittal of the updated Shoreline Master Program (SMP) to the Department of Ecology (Ecology) for review. The City submitted materials to Ecology related to the updated SMP on December 30, 2015. Upon review of the submittal, Ecology notified the City of a complete submittal in a letter dated January 25, 2016, initiating state review of the updated SMP. Ecology accepted public comments on the updated SMP from September 30 through October 31, 2016, and at a public hearing hosted by Ecology in Bellevue on October 18, 2016. Notice of the comment period and public hearing was published in *The Seattle Times* on September 29, 2016, and was provided to over 900 individuals listed as regional or local "interested parties". Ecology received testimony from 10 people at the public hearing on October 18 and written comments from an additional 19 individuals or organizations as summarized in Table 1 below. Table 2 provides a summary of issues raised during the comment period as well as a place for the City to insert a response to the issues raised pursuant to [WAC 173-26-120](#) (6).

**Table 1** (below) lists all the individuals or organizations that provided comment and reference to each particular topic/issue as summarized in Table 2 beginning on page 4.

TABLE 1: LIST OF COMMENTERS AND WHERE THEIR COMMENTS MAY BE FOUND IN THE <i>COMMENT SUMMARY TABLE</i>		
COMMENT NO.	ORGANIZATION - COMMENTER NAME (DATE RECEIVED)	SUMMARY/RESPONSE (TABLE 2 – BELOW)
1	Ron Selset (10/1/2016)	A-1
2	Herb Roberts (10/13/2016)	B-3, D-2, F-2, F-3, F-6, G-3
3	Save Lake Sammamish - Joanna Buehler (10/18/2016 Public Hearing & 10/31/2016 Email)	A-3, A-4, B-2, B-3, B-5, B-8, D-1, E-1, F-1, F-2, F-3, F-5, G-1, G-2, G-3, G-4, G-5, G-6, G-7, G-8, G-10, H-1, H-2, H-3, H-4, H-5, H-6, J-1
4	WA Sensible Shorelines Association - Anita Skoog Neil (10/18/2016 – Public Hearing)	B-1, B-8
5	Eric Hansen (10/20/2016)	B-1, B-9
6	WA Sensible Shorelines Association – Martin Nizlek (10/28/2016)	A-2, B-5, L-1
7	WA Sensible Shorelines Association - Charlie Klinge (10/19/2016 Email & 10/31/2016 Email)	B-1, B-4, B-8, B-9, G-9
8	Tom Shafer (10/3/2016 Email, 10/18/2016 Public Hearing, & 10/20/2016 Email)	A-1, B-1, B-4, B-8, B-9
9	Kevin R. Wallace (10/20/2016)	A-2
10	Gene Welch (10/24/2016)	B-3, G-10
11	Linda Nohavec (10/25/2016)	B-2, B-3, B-8, G-4
12	Don Miller (10/18/2016 Public Hearing)	B-1

TABLE 1: LIST OF COMMENTERS AND WHERE THEIR COMMENTS MAY BE FOUND IN THE COMMENT SUMMARY TABLE		
COMMENT NO.	ORGANIZATION - COMMENTER NAME (DATE RECEIVED)	SUMMARY/RESPONSE (TABLE 2 – BELOW)
13	Save Lake Sammamish – Willie Elliot (10/18/2016 Public Hearing & 10/31/2016 Email)	B-2, B-7, F-2, F-6, G-3
14	Diane Tebelius (10/18/2016 Public Hearing)	B-1, B-8
15	Scott Sheffield (10/18/2016 Public Hearing)	A-4, B-4, B-6, B-8
16	WA Sensible Shorelines Association – Laurie Lyford (10/18/2016 Public Hearing & 10/31/2016 Email)	B-1, B-4, B-8, G-9
17	Dallas Evans (10/18/2016 Public Hearing)	B-1, B-4, B-8
18	Meydenbauer Bay Yacht Club – Gerry Lakin (10/18/2016 Public Hearing)	B-1
19	Edward Mills (10/30/2016)	B-2, B-3, B-8, F-5
20	Janet Wall (10/30/2016)	B-2, B-3, D-1, F-5, G-4, G-8, G-10
21	Lake Sammamish Kokanee Work Group – David St. John (10/31/2016)	B-3, B-7
22	Jonathan Frodge (10/31/2016)	B-2, B-3, C-1, C-2, C-3, C-4, C-5, C-7, D-1, F-2, F-4, F-5, G-2, G-3, K-1, L-1
23	Snoqualmie Indian Tribe, Environmental & Natural Resources Department – Angela Dillon (10/31/2016)	B-2, B-3, C-5, H-6
24	Trout Unlimited, Bellevue/Issaquah Chapter – Brad Throssell (10/31/2016)	B-2, B-3, B-7
25	Philip Bloch (10/31/2016)	D-3, F-6
26	Phantom Lake Homeowners Association – Elfi Rahr & Norman Baullinger (10/31/2016)	B-10, L-2, N-2
27	Save Lake Sammamish - J. Richard Arambaru (10/31/2016)	B-2, B-3, B-8, D-1, F-4
28	Carmen McDermott (10/31/2016)	B-9
29	Phantom Lake Homeowners Association – Brian Parks (10/31/2016)	N-1

Please note, the statements below are not the opinions or comments of the Department of Ecology, but rather a summary of SMP issues received during the public comment period.

TABLE 2 : COMMENT SUMMARY/RESPONSE TABLE				
LINE	COMMENT TOPIC	COMMENT NO. (TABLE 1)	COMMENT SUMMARY	LOCAL GOVERNMENT RESPONSE
<b>State Review and Approval Process</b>				
A-1	Ecology review	1, 8	Ecology’s notice requesting comments caused some confusion as to what stakeholders should focus their comments on. A number of commenters thought Ecology had already reviewed the City’s SMP and therefore requested to see Ecology review of the proposed SMP to help inform their public comment.	
A-2	Review time	9	One comment stated the following: “Hurry up. It’s been two years.”	
A-3	Missing pages	3	Page SMP 115 LUC 20.25E.070.C.2.d.ii “Shoreline Setbacks – Allowed Development to:” – numbers 1-4 listed here are not found in the SMP. Page SMP 135 lists LUC 20.25E.080.C.3.c “Excess Material” as the last subsection shown.	
A-4	CAO amendments	3	Commenter requests Ecology not approve Bellevue’s proposed CAO amendments prior to approval of an acceptable SMP update.	
<b>General Comments</b>				
B-1	Approve	4, 5, 7, 8, 12, 14, 16, 17, 18	A number of comments generally urged Ecology to approve the SMP update as submitted.	
B-2	Disapprove	3, 11, 13, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, 27	In contract to the comment above, a number of other comments generally urging Ecology to disapprove/reconsider/make changes to the SMP update.	
B-3	Prioritize ecological protections	2, 3, 10, 11, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 27	A number of comments encouraged Ecology to amend the SMP so that it generally prioritizes the protection of public resources over individual property rights.	

Responsiveness Summary to public comments on the City of Bellevue’s SMP-update

TABLE 2 : COMMENT SUMMARY/RESPONSE TABLE				
LINE	COMMENT TOPIC	COMMENT NO. (TABLE 1)	COMMENT SUMMARY	LOCAL GOVERNMENT RESPONSE
			<p>Citing a general concern the provisions of the SMP do not adequately protect public resources, comments identified the following elements of the SMP to be changed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Setbacks:</b> characterized as too small to protect water quality; suggest increasing size of required buffers</li> <li>• <b>Native Vegetation Buffers:</b> necessary for water quality protection and to provide quality habitat.</li> <li>• <b>Grass Lawn:</b> characterized as equivalent to impervious surface, which does not function as a native vegetation buffer.</li> <li>• <b>Bulkheads:</b> associated with impacting habitat and displacing water onto other properties.</li> <li>• <b>Critical Areas Ordinance:</b> perception that the City’s existing CAO standards are more protective than proposed SMP standards. Overall concern that lake protections will be reduced.</li> </ul>	
B-4	Regulations must respect existing condition	7, 8, 15, 16, 17	<p>Citing the fact that most of the City’s shoreline areas are already developed, commenters emphasized the importance that the new regulations respect the existing developed condition of the lake shorelines in determining mitigation requirements and other regulations potentially restricting maintenance or improvements to these existing uses.</p>	
B-5	Water levels on Lake Sammamish	3, 6	<p>In comments submitted to Ecology, a Lake Sammamish resident requests that Ecology recognize surrounding issues and impacts related to high lake water levels on the lake and support efforts to return to historic water levels and conditions as a reference point in determining structure setbacks.</p> <p>The comments raise concern with methodology used in the City’s Ordinary High Water Mark (OHWM) study and accuracy concerns with the use of two-foot contour data to implement setback standards.</p>	

Responsiveness Summary to public comments on the City of Bellevue’s SMP-update

TABLE 2 : COMMENT SUMMARY/RESPONSE TABLE				
LINE	COMMENT TOPIC	COMMENT NO. (TABLE 1)	COMMENT SUMMARY	LOCAL GOVERNMENT RESPONSE
			<p>The commenter goes on to suggest raised lake levels on Lake Sammamish have damaged many docks, for which they caution replacing them at higher elevation is problematic because of the significant range of fluctuation in seasonal water levels, limiting use of piers during peak summer activity.</p> <p>Other comments request the OHWM be updated to 31.8 NAVD 88 elevation that was established in 2004 for the purpose of establishing the Shoreline Overlay District and measuring all shoreline structure setbacks and vegetation conservation areas.</p>	
B-6	Need to collect data	15	<p>Comments suggest alleviating much of the surrounding priorities for the Bellevue SMP update in the future by collection of meaningful data related to fish declines, water quality, etc. The commenter suggested Ecology start collecting data on water quality of Lake Sammamish.</p>	
B-7	Kokanee salmon	13, 21, 24	<p>Commenters encourage Ecology to ensure the SMP contributes to ongoing efforts to recover the native Kokanee salmon population.</p> <p>Other comments suggest the City’s SMP does not adequately consider long-term survival needs of Kokanee salmon. Specifically, they are concerned about the loss of riparian native trees/shrubs, loss of shallow water habitat, increased use of pesticides/fertilizers, increased shoreline armoring, and increased predator habitat.</p>	
B-8	Private property rights/Public Trust Doctrine	3, 4, 7, 8, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 27	<p>Many comments reference property rights as an important consideration for determining the appropriate balance in managing existing and proposed shoreline uses. Many of the comments received from Washington Sensible Shoreline Association (WSSA) supporters describe extensive efforts throughout the City’s update process focused on finding a balance between property rights and protection of ecological</p>	

TABLE 2 : COMMENT SUMMARY/RESPONSE TABLE				
LINE	COMMENT TOPIC	COMMENT NO. (TABLE 1)	COMMENT SUMMARY	LOCAL GOVERNMENT RESPONSE
			<p>functions. They generally conclude the proposed SMP is a compromise, informed during the Council’s deliberations by detailed review of potential incentives to encourage protections, along with a clear consideration of the nexus or the need for regulations to be proportional to or based on the level of development or disturbance. In short, they would have preferred a less complicated and more flexible system but overall think the City’s final system is fair.</p> <p>Alternatively, commenters from Save Lake Sammamish (SLS) provide a different perspective through a legal interpretation supporting their perspective that ecologic protections cannot be overlooked because of property rights concerns. Comments also reiterate the state’s obligation under the Public Trust Doctrine to protect the public’s right to access and enjoyment of waters of the state. Finally, commenters make the point “...shoreline protective regulations [that are] based on scientific information are not subject to being overturned by the taking analysis in Nollan or Dolan.”</p>	
B-9	Impact to property values	5, 7, 8, 28	<p>Comments from a shoreline property owner voicing concerns for weakening of ecological protections on Lake Sammamish. Specifically, the commenter states the importance in maintaining the environmental health of the lake to continue to support recreation, views, and esthetics they believe are necessary to maintain property values. They identify specific concerns with reduction to shoreline setback standards and native plant buffers.</p> <p>Alternatively, other commenters suggest flexibility in making improvements to one’s shoreline home is important to maintain property values, for which they are concerned too much regulation could limit their ability to protect their investment.</p>	

Responsiveness Summary to public comments on the City of Bellevue’s SMP-update

TABLE 2 : COMMENT SUMMARY/RESPONSE TABLE				
LINE	COMMENT TOPIC	COMMENT NO. (TABLE 1)	COMMENT SUMMARY	LOCAL GOVERNMENT RESPONSE
B-10	Phantom Lake	26	Since Phantom Lake is a small kettle lake with a peat bottom and had no natural inlets or outlets before manmade alterations, much of what is in the SMP is not applicable, and implementation of its requirements on Phantom Lake is not appropriate.	
<b>Shoreline Master Program Element</b>				
C-1	SMP Goal ‘to give priority to single-family residences’	22	Comments suggest this goal is at odds with the intent of the SMA, related to giving preference to <i>“uses which are consistent with control of pollution and prevention of damage to the nature environment, or are unique to or dependent upon use of the shoreline.”</i>	
C-2	Goal of SMP to maintaining existing ecological function	22	Commenter suggests the City’s goal to adopt <i>“a user friendly...predicable...framework... [with] increased regulatory flexibility for property owners”</i> is a misguided goal inconsistent with the SMA. Alternatively, they suggest the SMP should primarily emphasize protection or restoration of natural resources within shoreline areas and require an appropriate level of technical expertise, best available science, and best management practices as required under the SMA.	
C-3	Accessory parking policies – SH-32 and SH-36	22	Commenter suggests Policies SH-32 and SH-36 related to parking be deleted or amended to require parking be located outside of shoreline setbacks or buffers.	
C-4	General policies “Shoreline Vegetation Conservation and Buffering”	22	Comments generally suggest the City’s vegetation conservation policies are inadequate to maintain no net loss since they allow for increased impervious surface and loss of native vegetation.  In addition, the commenter asks the City to define what ‘comparable’ non-native vegetation is or what ‘proportional’ refers to concerning use of non-native vegetation, or remove the terms from the SMP and require the preservation of native	

Responsiveness Summary to public comments on the City of Bellevue’s SMP-update

TABLE 2 : COMMENT SUMMARY/RESPONSE TABLE				
LINE	COMMENT TOPIC	COMMENT NO. (TABLE 1)	COMMENT SUMMARY	LOCAL GOVERNMENT RESPONSE
			vegetation.	
C-5	Residential use policies (minor expansion) SH-59	22, 23	Comments suggest Policy SH-59 allowing for “minor expansion” into minimal setbacks or buffers is not well defined, is inconsistent with other SMP provisions attempting to minimize loss of ecological functions, and cannot be implemented in a way that maintains no net loss of shoreline functions.	
C-6	Pier/Dock Policy SH-95	25	The commenter argues grandfathering certain nonconforming structures, such as boathouses, puts a premium on their existence, whereas they would suggest SMP policies encourage removal of these structures in order to not provide financial benefits for uses that are inconsistent with best practices.	
C-7	Pier, dock, and recreation policies	22	The commenter questions how the City will manage against a proliferation of docks without more rigorous criteria to determine an applicant’s actual need for a dock.  In addition, the commenter asks if mitigation will be required for additional docks, for which they question how the SMP could satisfy no net loss.  They suggest the SMP include provisions to require joint use or community docks rather than individual docks and only when impacts to ecological functions can be avoided.	
<b>LUC 20.25E.010 - Authority</b>				
D-1	Shorelines of statewide significance	3, 20, 22, 27	Commenters allege there is little emphasis in the SMP regarding protection/restoration of valuable natural resources and that the SMP prioritizes local (individual) interests above statewide interests, inconsistent with SMA policies related to Shorelines of Statewide Significance (SSWS). Commenters recommend Ecology substantially modify the SMP to restore statewide interests as a higher priority.  Commenters also suggested that, since Lake Sammamish is a	



Responsiveness Summary to public comments on the City of Bellevue’s SMP-update

TABLE 2 : COMMENT SUMMARY/RESPONSE TABLE				
LINE	COMMENT TOPIC	COMMENT NO. (TABLE 1)	COMMENT SUMMARY	LOCAL GOVERNMENT RESPONSE
			SSWS managed by several jurisdictions, common policies (similar to those required in neighboring jurisdictions) should apply.	
D-2	Critical area conflicts	2	Commenter alleges changes in the SMP reduce protections already provided by the Critical Areas Ordinance for the lake.	
D-3	Shoreline streams	25	Commenter suggests that the City consider including Yarrow Creek and Coal Creek as shoreline jurisdictional streams as their base flows may actually satisfy the minimum 20 cfs threshold to be considered shorelines of the state. In addition, they suggest these two streams are restoration opportunities with the potential for providing significant natural resource benefits.	
<b>LUC 20.25E - Uses</b>				
E-1	Nonconforming uses	3	Comments allege the SMP perpetuates nonconforming structures and allows them to be replaced or upgraded without mitigation or restoration.	
<b>LUC 20.25E.060 - Development Regulations</b>				
F-1	20.25E.050 - Shoreline Lot Coverage	3	Commenter is concerned the lot coverage requirements within the Shoreline Overlay District are the same as that for the underlying residential land use, which ranges from 50 to 80 percent. They suggest the high lot coverage limits do not take into account the environmental sensitivity of the Shoreline Overlay District nor the provisions of the SMA.	
F-2	20.25E.050 B - Shoreline Setbacks (General)	2, 3, 13, 22	Comments generally suggest the setbacks required under the SMP are too small to adequately protect water quality, satisfy no net loss, or protect neighbors’ views. They are concerned these setbacks will negatively affect wildlife and fish through the close proximity of human activity. To alleviate this concern,	

Responsiveness Summary to public comments on the City of Bellevue’s SMP-update

TABLE 2 : COMMENT SUMMARY/RESPONSE TABLE				
LINE	COMMENT TOPIC	COMMENT NO. (TABLE 1)	COMMENT SUMMARY	LOCAL GOVERNMENT RESPONSE
			they suggest that the City adopt and implement standards that minimize disturbance of existing habitats.	
F-3	20.25E.060 General Requirements Rebuttable Presumption Standard	3	Commenter alleges this provision undermines the authority of the SMP. Further they state mitigation required by LUC 20.25E.050 through 20.25E.080 as proposed is inadequate to protect water quality, fish, and ecological functions.	
F-4	20.25E.060 B - No Net Loss	22, 27	Comments reference SMP Guideline requirements requiring updated SMPs to include policies/regulations that assure no net loss of shoreline ecological functions (NNL). The commenters allege the City’s SMP does not include sufficient protections to satisfy NNL. One commenter (SLS) recommends Ecology modify the SMP to incorporate their previous changes dated September 8, 2013, December 9, 2013, and June 6, 2014.	
F-5	20.25E.060 D - Mitigation Sequencing as a SMA requirement.	3, 19, 20, 22	Commenters allege the proposed SMP does not meet an acceptable standard of resource protection, nor does it satisfy the NNL requirement in the SMA. Further, they point to sections of the SMA requiring SMPs to establish a policy that first avoids negative impacts and second mitigates for those impacts.	
F-6	Vegetation Conservation and Landscape Standards	2, 13, 25	Multiple comments raised concerns with the SMP’s vegetation provisions, suggesting native vegetation buffers be required to protect water quality and provide effective shoreline habitat. Other comments (25) raise concerns the vegetation conservation provisions in the SMP incentivize maintaining a low value system by tying current and future mitigation obligations to the relative quality of the composition of the buffer. Specifically, the concern is it penalizes “good actors” (intent of improving their shoreline buffer through planting or maintenance of native vegetation) with a relatively higher	

Responsiveness Summary to public comments on the City of Bellevue’s SMP-update

TABLE 2 : COMMENT SUMMARY/RESPONSE TABLE				
LINE	COMMENT TOPIC	COMMENT NO. (TABLE 1)	COMMENT SUMMARY	LOCAL GOVERNMENT RESPONSE
			mitigation obligation than the “bad actors” removing native vegetation from their shoreline setback. To alleviate this disincentive, the commenter suggests the City rework the approach to create a more equitable system that rewards property owners who maintain higher ecological values on their property, while increasing costs for those that avoid good stewardship.	
<b>LUC 20.25E.065 - Residential Development Regulations</b>				
G-1	A. Shoreline use preferences	3	Commenter states the City’s listed preference ignores the special goals and use priorities articulated for shorelines of statewide significance, particularly the uses permitted in the Residential Chart for Shoreline Environments (LUC 20.25E.030 at page SMP 45). They are concerned the SMP does not recognize the statewide interest over local interest or preserve the natural character of the shoreline.	
G-2	Shoreline structure setback	3, 22	Comments recommend a 50-foot shoreline structure setback landward from the OHWM, comprising 35 feet landward of the OHWM in a no-touch buffer zone, plus a 15-foot building setback line, similar to that adopted by Issaquah.  Another commenter specifically suggested the City replace its 25-foot setback with a 75-foot setback (similar to what is required in Seattle’s SMP) or at a minimum a 50-foot setback, as necessary to protect ecological functions and views.	
G-3	Chart 20.25E.065.F.8.d Shoreline Land Cover Types and Values	2, 3, 13, 22	Comments state grass lawn is equivalent to impervious surface on the shoreline, as it cannot filter runoff and adds nutrients and pollutants to the lake.  More specifically, comments question the effectiveness of allowing “shoreline greenscaping” within setback areas, which they suggest be amended to only allow use of native vegetation and large woody materials.	

Responsiveness Summary to public comments on the City of Bellevue’s SMP-update

TABLE 2 : COMMENT SUMMARY/RESPONSE TABLE				
LINE	COMMENT TOPIC	COMMENT NO. (TABLE 1)	COMMENT SUMMARY	LOCAL GOVERNMENT RESPONSE
G-4	Residential regulations F. Vegetation conservation	3, 11, 20	Commenters suggest standards in the updated SMP authorize a potential loss of up to 70% of existing trees, shrubs, and native vegetation within the Shoreline Residential designated areas. Further, they are concerned the plan considers lawns as equivalent to vegetated buffer, which they dispute as they interpret lawn as not providing the buffering, filtration, or habitat value a vegetated buffer provides.	
G-5	Residential regulations H. Residential Moorage – 6. Boats and watercraft lifts	3	Comments suggest the City did not adequately consider the cumulative impact of an increase in overwater structures.	
G-6	LUC20.25E.65 - Nonconforming boathouses	3	Commenter suggests these provisions perpetuate nonconforming structures without mitigation to compensate for their detrimental impacts and states such provisions do not match the regulations explained in Ecology’s SMP Handbook. “In essence the proposed update deems nonconforming structures as conforming.” Commenter suggests proposed regulations and language need to change to meet the mandates of the SMA. Commenter asks City to disallow expansion of any nonconforming structure and to disapprove alterations to any nonconforming structure without compensatory mitigation.	
G-7	Dock Grating Mitigation – LUC 20.25E.065.F.8.h	3	Commenter questions why the City is willing to grant mitigation credit for an action (dock grating) already required by WDFW. Likewise, they disagree rewarding replacement of solid decking of the entire dock area with grating decking would earn 75 units of mitigation credit. They also raise concerns with the concept of advance mitigation and increases in the value, as detailed in LUC 20.25E.065.F.i.	

Responsiveness Summary to public comments on the City of Bellevue’s SMP-update

TABLE 2 : COMMENT SUMMARY/RESPONSE TABLE				
LINE	COMMENT TOPIC	COMMENT NO. (TABLE 1)	COMMENT SUMMARY	LOCAL GOVERNMENT RESPONSE
G-8	Tree Retention Standards	3, 20	Commenters allege that the tree standards in the SMP would permit the removal of significant trees within the Shoreline Vegetation Conservation Area and allow replacement trees planted <b>outside</b> the shoreline vegetation conservation area, which commenters say would eliminate their value as mitigation.	
G-9	Vegetation conservation require restoration	7, 16	Comments reiterate Ecology’s regulations in stating the following: “ <i>vegetation conservation standards do not apply retroactively to existing uses and structures.</i> ” WAC 173-26-221(5)(a). Inconsistent with this limit, they allege that the proposed SMP contains detailed regulations imposing vegetation conservation standards in existing developed yards. Comments further conclude that these requirements impose extensive requirements on homeowners for any home additions or changes to their landscaping.  Commenters suggest the proposed requirements go beyond protection of existing conditions and seek to attain restoration of lost functions inappropriately through regulatory means.	
G-10	Vegetation Conservation Effectiveness	3, 10, 20	Comments raise concerns the vegetation conservation standards in the SMP are not stringent enough. Citing the need to encourage the retention of trees and woody plant cover both along the shoreline and on adjoining land, commenters allege the changes proposed in the update are inconsistent with established standards, the principles in WAC 173-26-221 (5) (b), and with the overall goal to protect the lake’s water quality for future generations.  Comments also raise long-term cumulative impact concerns with a standard in the SMP they believe would legally allow a property owner to remove up to 1,000 square feet of vegetation within a five-year period without requiring mitigation.	

Responsiveness Summary to public comments on the City of Bellevue’s SMP-update

TABLE 2 : COMMENT SUMMARY/RESPONSE TABLE				
LINE	COMMENT TOPIC	COMMENT NO. (TABLE 1)	COMMENT SUMMARY	LOCAL GOVERNMENT RESPONSE
<b>LUC 20.25E.080 – Shoreline Modifications</b>				
H-1	Shoreline armoring – LUC 20.25E.080.F.3.a.iv	3	Commenter states concerns with this provision, as they allege the consideration of private monetary cost against environmental degradation of the public resource is inconsistent with the NNL mandate and the “special policy goals of the act and guidelines for shorelines of statewide significance.” WAC 173-26-181.	
H-2	New or enlarged shoreline stabilization measures	3	Commenter suggests the words “ <i>legally permitted</i> ” should be inserted between “ <i>protect</i> ” and “ <i>existing</i> ” in the first sentence of LUC 20.25E.080.F.4 to be consistent with the language found in later section LUC 20.25E.080.4.g in dealing with retention of setback with new soft stabilization.	
H-3	Mitigation and restoration - LUC 20.25E.080.F.4.f	3	Commenter suggests mitigation requirements be added to those shoreline stabilization projects fortifying pre-existing bulkheads, as they allege these projects also need to be subject to shoreline restoration and mitigation to offset their damage and disruption to the shoreline’s ecological functions.	
H-4	Removing shoreline stabilization	3	Comments referencing LUC 20.25E.080.F.4.g, LUC 20.25E.080.F.4.h, and LUC 20.25E.080.F.7 – interpret these provisions as creating a disincentive for property owners to remove concrete bulkheads and restore shoreline habitat. To alleviate this concern, they recommend these two provisions be either deleted or replaced with a provision focused on impacts of bulkheads on neighboring properties.	
H-5	Repair of existing shoreline stabilization	3	Commenter disagrees with the statement in LUC 20.25E.080.F.6 that provides for the replacement of all legally established shoreline stabilization measures and says they “...are presumed necessary to protect existing shoreline structures and property...”	

Responsiveness Summary to public comments on the City of Bellevue’s SMP-update

TABLE 2 : COMMENT SUMMARY/RESPONSE TABLE				
LINE	COMMENT TOPIC	COMMENT NO. (TABLE 1)	COMMENT SUMMARY	LOCAL GOVERNMENT RESPONSE
			Commenter alleges there is no basis for such a presumption and suggests the language be removed.	
H-6	Shoreline stabilization and Salmon Recovery	3, 23	<p>The commenters raise general concerns related to the high percentage of existing shoreline stabilization along Lake Washington/Sammamish and their effect on salmon species. Specific to the SMP, comments reference SH-104 as a good first effort to prohibit new or expanded stabilization. However, they remain concerned the SMP would allow new bulkheads for primary residential structures (the most common use in the City) without an opportunity for the Tribe to comment on the proposal. In addition, they are concerned the SMP does not require mitigation for shoreline stabilization.</p> <p>To alleviate this concern comments suggest the City require buffers and setbacks of native plants and the replacement of hard bulkheads with soft bioengineered or mixed shoreline stabilization techniques to begin to improve habitat conditions.</p>	
<b>LUC 20.25E - Procedures</b>				
I-1	No comments received related to this section			
<b>LUC 20.25E - Permits and Decisions</b>				
J-1	LUC20.25E.170.C.7 – appurtenance	3	Commenter raises concern with allowing hot tubs to be located within the vegetation conservation, as chemically-treated water in hot tubs needs to be changed frequently and may be emptied into the lake, creating water quality issues.	
<b>LUC 20.25E – Administration/Enforcement/ Definitions</b>				
K-1	Residential use definition	22	The commenter questions the appropriateness of allowing the wide range of appurtenant uses/structures as part of a “residential use,” as they do not see these uses as water	

Responsiveness Summary to public comments on the City of Bellevue’s SMP-update

TABLE 2 : COMMENT SUMMARY/RESPONSE TABLE				
LINE	COMMENT TOPIC	COMMENT NO. (TABLE 1)	COMMENT SUMMARY	LOCAL GOVERNMENT RESPONSE
			dependent or sufficiently protected by SMP standards (i.e., insufficient setback/buffer) or required mitigation.	
<b>Inventory and Analysis</b>				
L-1	Shoreline is not urban	22	The commenter states: “...there is a recurring emphasis that the current shoreline is urban and that protection, let alone restoration of ecological functions, is not the focus of the SMP.” In addition, they go on to state: “Contrary to the draft shoreline maps, the Bellevue shore of Lake Washington is not urban, nor is the shoreline of Lake Sammamish.”	
L-2	Characterization of Phantom Lake	26	Commenter provides four corrections related to past failed restoration efforts at Phantom Lake. Details are listed in their comment letter.	
<b>Cumulative Impacts Analysis</b>				
M-1	No comments received related to this section			
<b>Restoration Plan</b>				
N-1	PL-2 (Phantom Lake Inlet Channel) and PL-3 (Acquire lake front property for conservation easement)	29	Commenter alleges the creek coming into Phantom Lake is “man-made” - not natural. Commenter opposes Restoration Plan items “PL-2” and “PL-3” and proposes replacement with a new item, “PL-7”, to restore the Phantom Outlet Channel as far as the Weowna Park boundary.	
N-2	Phantom Lake	26	Commenter provides an extensive history of the lake, as well as analysis of past failed restoration efforts. Based on these observations they suggest the following: reduce inflow into the lake, monitor and correct water quality of input at south inlet to the lake, monitor phyto/zooplankton during summer months	



<i>TABLE 2 : COMMENT SUMMARY/RESPONSE TABLE</i>				
<b>LINE</b>	<b>COMMENT TOPIC</b>	<b>COMMENT NO. (TABLE 1)</b>	<b>COMMENT SUMMARY</b>	<b>LOCAL GOVERNMENT RESPONSE</b>
			as an indicator of lake health, and maintain/utilize data gathered to inform future activities/policies within the Phantom Lake watershed.	